

Tribhuvan University

Brushing up the White's Image in William Faulkner's *Intruder in the Dust*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English, T.U.

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Masters of Arts in English

By

Khagendra Kumar Rai

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

November, 2008

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled “Brushing up the White’s Image in William Faulkner’s *Intruder in the Dust*” submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Khagendra Kumar Rai has been approved by the undersigned members of Research Committee.

Members of Research committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Khagendra Kumar Rai has completed his thesis entitled “Brushing up the White’s Image in William Faulkner’s *Intruder in the Dust*” under my supervision. He carried out his research from 04 May 2008 to 16 November 2008. I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted for viva voce.

(Raj Kumar Baral)

Supervisor

Date:

Acknowledgement

First of all, I am largely indebted to my teacher and supervisor Mr. Raj Kumar Baral for his untiring effort and support in completion of this thesis. I express my heartily gratitude to him because one can not stay without praising his selfless contribution, in such a precious moment of life.

Similarly, I heartily express my gratitude to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head of Central Department of English for his kind permission to do this thesis. Moreover, I am also equally indebted to Dr. Arun Gupto, Dr. Anita Dhungel, Dr. Beerendra Pandey, Mr. Sharad Chandra Thakur, Mr. Ammaraj Joshi, Mr. Baikuntha Poudel, Mr. Harihar Jnawali, Mr. Sadan Adhikari, Mr. Shankar Subedi, and Mr. Ghanashyam Bhandari for their valuable suggestions to bring my research into this condition.

I want to dedicate this work to my late father Rana Bahadur Rai whose desire continually encouraged me for its completion. I also can't forget my mother, brothers and sister because their warm love entirely inspired me to do this task. Lastly, I also want to remember my all friends for their help from various sides to bring this research in the present form.

November, 2008.

Khagendra Kumar Rai
Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Abstract

To read William Faulkner's novel *Intruder in the Dust* is to expose the racial conflict and excavate the reason of its reconciliation. In the novel, there is conflicting relationship between the white and black characters and that is established after Crawford Gowrie's accusation of Lucas as Vinson Gowrie's murderer. Since Crawford and Lucas belong to separate race they have bitter relationship which is based on racial conflict. The age long racial conflict which began with master slave relationship during the Greek period continues through the colonizer and the colonized in the colonial era and is still continued in the form of ruler and the ruled in the modern world. This hierarchy only comes to the halt through reconciliation but the whites reconcile only to prove their kindness. Even by misusing law they want to reconstruct white's benevolent image.

Table of Contents

Sub- Titles	Page No.
Letter of Approval	ii
Letter of Recommendation	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Abstract	v
Table of Contents	vi
White's Refreshed Image	1-8
Race and Representation	9-29
Brushing up the White's Image in Faulkner's <i>Intruder in the Dust</i>	30-50
Conclusion	51-53
Works Cited	54-56

I. White's Refreshed Image

William Faulkner, in his novel *Intruder in the Dust*, brushes up the white's image by means of conflict and reconciliation. On the one hand, there is interracial conflict between white and black communities. At the same time, we can find intraracial conflict within white races. The conflict between Gowrie brothers as well as Charles Mallison and his uncle Gavin Stevens to whom Faulkner portrays as the main white characters in the novel can be taken as an instance. Most importantly, the Negro, Lucas Beauchamp's false accusation of murdering a white, Vinson Gowrie, clarifies how sharply and bitterly the inter-racial conflict is working. But, Lucas as a black can't protest against white people who themselves are the real murderers.

In the same way, Faulkner also shows reconciliation in the novel which signifies his desire of presenting white superiority. That is why, it is Charles Mallison, a sixteen year old boy, who releases Lucas Beauchamp from the blame. Similarly, Gavin Stevens as a lawyer advocates in favour of Lucas to make him free from the threatened lynching. Thus, white people, here, are not in dominant and merciless position. Rather they are really, benevolent, helpful and positive towards others, especially the blacks. This is what Faulkner wants to show in the novel.

Through Charles Mallions' obligation to save Lucas Beauchamp, a black, falsely accused of murdering a white, Vinson Gowrie, Faulkner presents the white people as mature, intelligent and morally responsible to the black. The image of Charles contrasts to the image of white as brutal and oppressive in relation to the black people. First of all, Lucas is blamed of shooting Vinson Gowrie that makes Charles feel sad because he was saved by him, some four years earlier, from falling into an icy creek. After Lucas' accusation Charles is obliged to violate Vinson Gowrie's grave to prove him an innocent person with the help of Aleck Sander and

Miss Eunice Habersham. But instead of Vinson Gowrie, they find another white-man, Jake Montgomery, in the grave. Slowly and gradually, the story moves towards the series of discoveries. This discovery, along with Gavin Steven's advocacy makes Lucas' release possible. As a result, not Lucas but, Vinson Gowrie's own brother, Crawford Gowrie, is found as the real criminal.

Through Lucas' release Faulkner treats the white people as the parents of the blacks. For him, whites are mature and intelligent people to save the blacks. This shows that they are white people who rescue the blacks. That is why, Faulkner presents Charles Mallison and Gavin Stevens as ideal white characters of his Southern state in the modern world, who are not brutal and oppressive towards the black people. Moreover, Faulkner is of the view that whites are not only responsible to the blacks but also to all people of the world. That is what Faulkner desires to depict through Chick's obligation to save Lucas. But, indeed, this obligation is just a pretension to present white people as the guardian of the blacks.

William Faulkner, born on 25 September 1897 as the first child of Maud and Murry Faulkner and the great-grandson of William Clark Faulkner, was a renowned twentieth century American writer. When his family moved to Oxford in 1902, Faulkner left high school after tenth grade for a job in his grandfather's bank. Later on, he was rejected as the United States Army because of his underweight and height. However, he was joined in Royal Flying Corps at Toronto, Canada, as a cadet and became an honorary second lieutenant on 22 December 1918. Faulkner suffered several wounds when the plane crashed in the war in which he was serving as a pilot. Then he returned home just as a damaged youth, in lieu of a military hero. After moving to New York City, he took a job in a bookstore. Before returning to Oxford he

even did some odd jobs as carpenter and housepainter. He was also appointed as postmaster at the University but, he resigned from this post, immediately.

Faulkner's first book of poems *The Marble Faun* was published in 1924 with the help of Phil Stone. In the same year Faulkner left Oxford, again, and settled for sometimes at New Orleans where he became very amiable friend of Elizabeth Prall and her husband, Sherwood Anderson. According to Anderson's suggestion he prepared the manuscript of his first novel *Soldier's Pay* (1926) which is about the 'Lost Generation'. When *Mosquitoes* (1927) was also not well received at New Orleans, Faulkner returned to Oxford to publish his third novel *Sartoris* (1929) that helped to find himself as a writer. His fourth novel *The Sound and the Fury* (1929) is about the downfall of the Compson family seen through the minds of several characters. Similarly, *As I Lay Dying* (1930) presents the impermanence of human existence and identity by taking the readers into the minds of Bundren family. *Sanctuary* (1931) presents the degeneration of Temple Drake, a young girl from a Southern family. Faulkner's *Requiem for a Nun* (1951) is the sequel of *Sanctuary* in which a Negro woman, once a party to Temple Drake's debauchery, is in courtroom trial. *Light in August* (1932), like *Intruder in the Dust*, is also about racial prejudice depicted through Joe Christmas' biased attitudes towards his own parents. In *Absalom, Absalom!* (1936), a young man is bitterly rejected by his own father and brother because of his mixed blood. Racial issue is further discussed in *Go Down, Moses* (1942) to which *Intruder in the Dust* is a sequel, to some extent.

Intruder in the Dust (1948) is Faulkner's one of the best novels about racism. It also belongs to Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha novel, from Yoknapatawpha County, a fictional rendition of his Lafayette County that he began long ago in *As I Lay Dying*. After one year in 1949, Faulkner won Nobel Prize for literature along with the series

of Pulitzer Prizes. His Snopes trilogy incorporates *The Hamlet* (1940), *The Town* (1957), and *The Mansion* (1959) which presents the Snopes family rising towards the position of wealth and power. Finally, Faulkner died on 6 July 1962 just after the arrival of his last but, humorous work *The Reivers*.

William Faulkner was one of the leading American literary figures of his time. Most importantly, he was a dominant Mississippian American writer by the mid twentieth century. That is why, most of his works reflected the influence of the major Southern movements such as the 'Agrarians' of the twentieth century. Nevertheless, Faulkner's contribution, in American literary realm, is incomparably tremendous.

Intruder in the Dust is Faulkner's one of the most important late novels. So, it is widely praised novel all over the English speaking world. For instance, Joseph W. Reed, Jr. is one of the admirer who writes, "A novel liked, studied, and still liked becomes a novel explained, excused and defended" (201). Basically, the critics criticize focusing on the theme and narrative technique of the novel incorporating the areas such as racial matters and their fabulous resolutions. One of such critics, Elizabeth Hardwick, commenting upon theme, writes:

Faulkner acknowledges the Negro's moral victory over the South, yields and desires his total civic equality ("someday Lucas Beauchamp . . . will vote anywhen and anywhere a while man can and send his children to the same schools anywhere the white man's children go and travel anywhere the white man does as the white man does it"). (228-29)

According to Hardwick, Faulkner accepts the Negro's moral victory but, along with his acceptance he, secretly, fulfills the desire of uplifting the white. Though Faulkner

wants civic equality among blacks and whites in the South it may be outer desire. In the same way, William Van O'Connor comments that:

Intruder in the Dust (1948), the first of the late novels, is a moving account of the relationships between young Charles Mallison and Lucas Beauchamp – the slow process of the boy's learning to accept the old Negro as human equal. It is reminiscent of Huck Finn and Nigger Jim. (36)

Here, Van O'Connor emphasizes on the relationship between the whites and blacks that resembles to Huck Finn and Nigger Jim's relationship in Mark Twain's novel *The Adventure of Huckleberry Finn*. But he doesn't talk about the conflict between them which covers almost all sections of the novel. On the other hand, the so-called relationship is just to make the blacks inferior. Indeed, Faulkner, through the showy and presumed relationship, is reconstructing the positive image of white. Similarly, Edmund Wilson writes:

Intruder in the Dust is one of the most ardent demonstrations of this reconditioned Southern chivalry; and the question that arises in connection with it is not whether it paints too hopeless a picture but, on the contrary, whether it is not too positive, too optimistic—whether the author has not yielded too much to the temptations of the novelist's power to summon for innocence in difficulties the equivalent of the United States Marines. (220)

Wilson, thus, in Faulkner's novel points out the problems as well as resolutions between two races of the South but, through Southern chivalry he means just white civilization. Similarly, Michael Millgate says that, "Faulkner's attitude towards the contemporary problems of the South is exactly and sensitively imaged in this scene,

and the whole of *Intruder in the Dust* seems no more than a gloss upon it” (80). For Millgate, Faulkner’s *Intruder in the Dust* is just presenting the contemporary problem known as black’s victimization. At the same time he is also maintaining the interest i.e. paternal role of white from the resolution of the problem. Further, W. M. Frohock comments *Intruder in the Dust* that it, “suffers from the division of interest between the private anguish of the adolescent Chick and the public pronouncements of the author through his mouthpiece, Gavin Stevens” (162). For Frohock, there is the division of ideas that both Chick and Gavin Stevens want to save Lucas for different reasons. Thus, his emphasis is just in intra-racial conflict like that of Gowrie brothers that is obviously presented in the novel. Similarly, commenting the theme and characters David Minter says that:

Intruder in the Dust shares several themes with *Light in August* and several characters as well as themes with *Go Down, Moses*, and it is more complex and less sentimental than many readers have suggested. . . In the one sense it took Faulkner back toward *Go Down, Moses* □ specifically in the theme of black-white relations and the characters of Lucas Beauchamp, who plays major role in both novels, and Gavin Stevens, who plays an important one near the end of *Go Down, Moses* and throughout *Intruder in the Dust*. (212)

For Minter, one of the themes of these novels, clearly, is social injustice which can damage the morality of Blacks. He is openly, stating that *Intruder in the Dust* and *Go Down, Moses* not only share themes but also have some same characters. In the meantime, Lewis P. Simpson says that:

Intruder in the Dust dramatizes the irony of the tension between myth and history in a detective-story plot about the threatened lynching of

Lucas Beauchamp, a dignified old Negro (who has white blood, being the grandson of Lucius Quintus McCaslin) . . . As the events develop, Chick faces the dilemma of whether or not he is betraying his own class by trying to repay his obligation to Lucas. (161)

According to Simpson, Chick is in tension and dilemma of what he is doing to repay his obligation to Lucas. This shows that he is not totally ready to help Lucas.

Moreover, Willard Thorp opines that:

Finally, in *Intruder in the Dust* (1948), a Negro and his fate occupy the centre of the stage. Lucas Beauchamp, whose grandfather was white, is willing to be lynched for a murder he did not commit, as a gesture of contempt for white folks. The real murderer is found, and Lucas saved, by a sixteen-year-old boy, an aristocratic old lady, and lawyer Stevens, the boy's uncle. (266)

According to Willard Thorp, the novel revolves round Lucas and his fate. After all, Lucas is just saved by the white people. Finally Joseph W. Reed, Jr. comments upon Faulkner's narrative technique. He says:

Rhetoric, manner, metaphor, device from every sort and condition of context in the novels are brought together in a mad summary-as *The Reivers* seems almost to be racing against time to unite all the Yoknapatawpha genealogies, so does *Intruder* work to complete itself as a fallacious Reader's Guide to Faulkner. This might be merely sloppy if it were not for the pamphlet. (208)

This novel having jumbled narration which according to Joseph W. Reed, Jr., is a mad summary, can, loosely, express inner white feelings. And this sloppy narration makes it a functioning pamphlet. Lastly, New-critics such as Robert Penn Warren and

Cleanth Brooks are somewhat liberal regarding Faulkner's attitudes towards blacks. They are of the opinion that Faulkner is in favour of justice and equality among blacks and whites without considering his real intention.

Though different critics have various opinions about *Intruder in the Dust*, 'Brushing up the White's Image' is a researchable title. Different conservative and post-structuralist readings have been already applied in this novel. That is why, the novel has been analyzed considering how races have been represented. This means it is through literature that Faulkner rebuilds the image of white people of the South. So, it is, completely, distinct and new perspective of reading his novel *Intruder in the Dust*, at present time.

This research has been divided into four main chapters. In the first chapter, slight introduction of this research work has been preceded. The second chapter is about the discussion of the tool. The third chapter includes textual analysis on the basis of theoretical modality discussed in the second chapter. And the last chapter, conclusion, can be called the summary of all the chapters of the research work.

II. Race and Representation

Race is a socially constructed concept for human beings. It refers to a group of people that is constructed by a particular society. And this group of people is just a part of division into the whole human society. After this division each group shares its own norms and values. For instance, one particular group speaks its own language. It has been existed on its own history.

Similarly, any race has its own culture and tradition. Therefore, the people of any race focus upon their own language, history, culture and tradition. Such group of people can be called race. Julian Wolfreys, Rath Robbins and Kenneth Womack are of the view that:

At its broadest, race refers to a family, tribe, people or nation sharing a set of common interests, beliefs, habits or characteristics. However, preeminent African-American literary and cultural critic Henry Louis Gates alerts the reader to a number of important details concerning the thinking and reading of race. To begin with, to speak of different 'races', such as 'black' or 'Jewish' is, says Gates, to 'speak in biological misnomers and, more generally, metaphors'. Despite this error, such usage persists in both everyday language and in literary texts. (69)

According to them, race refers to a family of people which is based on biological misnomers and metaphors. Moreover, they opine:

Race has become a trope of ultimate irreducible difference between cultures, linguistic groups, or adherents of specific belief systems. Thus, as a discursive, political and ideological term, race functions

frequently as a means of definition based on binary oppositions
between self and other, civilized and savage, and so on. (69)

Here, they state that it is race that creates binary oppositions between the people. It differentiates people from the other people of the community. As a result, people are labeled as Caucasian, Mongolian, Negroid race etc.

Race is, mainly, based on physical differences. This means some people of certain race are distinguished from others on the basis of their physical features. For instance, they are called the people of 'this' and 'that' race in terms of color of their skin. Body structure, height and weight can also be called the determinants of race. After all, race is created physically, biologically and genetically.

First of all, the term 'race' was used in the English language by William Dunbar in his poem in 1508. However, it simply denoted the class of people or things throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But it appeared to imply the distinct category of humans with physical characteristics transmitted by descent only in the late eighteenth century. Since biological science gained prominence in the late nineteenth century it was descent that came up as the predominant model of ongoing debate about the cause of human variation.

Firstly, Europeans categorized the people in late 1600s on the basis of physical appearances such as the body structure and skin color. But this categorization just created a hierarchy in the whole human society. The white Europeans placed them at the top of the society. But, contrary to it, African-Americans were put at the bottom of the hierarchy. From the very early history of human writings, we can find the division between human beings. In this context, Kwame Anathony Appiah says:

Almost as far back as the earliest human writings, we can find more or less articulated views about the difference between 'our own kind' and

the people of other cultures, these doctrines, like modern theories of race, have often placed a central emphasis on physical appearance in defining the 'other', and on common ancestry in explaining why groups of people display differences in their attitudes and aptitudes.

(274)

For Appiah, race can be found as the subject matter of discussion in various writings of different periods. Even in the earliest period, people categorized them on the basis of cultures and traditions. However, the categorization was, mainly based on the physical appearances. According to this, white and black people belong to quite opposite race. And the white race is dominant over the black that we can find in their history. Therefore, white people claim that they have pure physical features and civilized manners. For them, blacks have neither such features and manners nor human attributes. Rather they are merciless people who lack beauty and handsomeness.

Twentieth century confronted with various theoretical attitudes regarding race. Universal Races Congress, held in London in 1911 focusing on one species of people remained in favour of universal attitude. But suddenly, this attitude was shattered by the First World War. The term race is always unstable due to different situations. That is why, Martin Bulmer and John Solomos write, "one of the themes that runs throughout this volume is that the very notion of *race* has no fixed and unchanging meaning" (7). Moreover, Ashcroft, Griffith and Tiffin say:

A fraught and volatile term, 'race', continues to hold centre stage while the theories on which concepts of race were established have become more and more blurred. In this way resistance becomes less

and less able to dislodge the vague and untenable concept of race itself.

(206)

Here, they want to clarify that though 'race' is unstable; it always remains in one or the other forms.

Racism is the bad treatment between people of different races. Racists often regard the other race as biologically, intellectually and morally inferior. One of the most important features of racism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is the impact of racist ideas on political ideologies and movements. Martin Bulmer and John Solomos write:

Social and political movements that articulate racial ideas and values have had an important impact on the history of a wide range of societies, often with deadly consequences when such ideas have been interlinked with state power. Racist movements are by no means uniform, and it is clear from the experience of the twentieth century that they can take a wide range of ideological forms. (177)

The extract tells that the racial ideas and values if articulated by social and political movements, promote racial inequality. Moreover, it tells that if such ideas are interlinked with state power the racial discrimination would widen to a large extent.

Racism is a belief in which one race is supposed to be superior to another. So, it is a violent treatment of people of one race towards the others. It is always a hindrance to bring equal dignity and rights among all people. It continues to haunt the world. Statement on Race and Racial Prejudice (Paris, September 1967) observes, "Racism stultifies the development of those who suffer from it, perverts those who apply it, divides nations within themselves, aggravates international conflict and threatens world peace" (360). Racism is not the ideological form which always

remains constant. It goes on changing with different shapes and different political relations. That is why, Paul Gilroy argues that “racist ideologies and practice have distinct meaning bounded by historical circumstances and determined in struggle” (248).

Racism existed in different institutional forms such as slavery, imperialism and colonialism. In this sense, talking about the ending of slavery Bulmer and Solomos write, “The legal ending of the institution of slavery by no means meant the end of racism, indeed in some respects it may have led to its accentuation, since its legal protection was less secure” (59). Moreover, they say:

Racism in the colonial empires of the European powers from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries was less clear cut, but was ever present, and its historical legacy is a key to understanding more recent relations between white, brown, and black ethnic groups in the contemporary world. Moreover, it took different institutional forms under different conditions, so that the relations between colonizer and colonized were established differently in countries such as South Africa, Nigeria, or British India. (59)

The extract tells that even in the period of European practice for colonial empires, racism existed in different forms. Further, it tells that there is no period in which racism remains absent. In this context, George Mosse writes:

Eighteenth century Europe was the cradle of modern racism. The major cultural trends of that century vitally affected the foundations of racist thought. This was the age of enlightenment, during which an intellectual elite attempted to substitute an emphasis upon man’s

inherent reason and virtue for the 'ancient superstitions of the past'.

(40)

According to Mosse, Enlightenment marked the initiation of racism in modern era. Since reason was only liberating principle for enlightenment only whites were supposed to be capable of properly using it. Along with the promotion of racism, Enlightenment also challenged the religious practice of Christianity which is deeply rooted towards the faith in Jesus Christ.

While talking about the history of racism, United States of America holds a forefront position. The history of United States of America is the history of racism. This means America is always practicing racism in its history. It plays a vital role to inferiorize the other races especially the blacks. American whites always treat them cruelly and inhumanly. That is why, from the very early history America is a racist country. George Fredrickson says:

Unlike Brazil and other Latin American countries, the United States has been a genuinely racist society. On the whole it has treated blacks as if they were inherently inferior, and for at least a century of its history this pattern of rigid racial stratification was buttressed and strengthened by a widely accepted racist ideology. (71)

Here, he is clearly stating that America is a racist country. It is America which can not be avoided while talking about the racism. Further he writes:

Although few would deny that explicit or ideological racism—the formal doctrine of inherent biological inferiority—became popular at a relatively late date in American history, recent historians have tended to see implicit or societal racism as having sprung up very early, partly because of certain preexisting European attitudes towards blacks which

gave a special character to the natural antipathy of English settlers toward any people who were obviously strange and different. (71)

In this extract, George Fredrickson is talking about the ideological racism. He clarifies that implicit or societal racism which sprung up very early by the influence of preexisting European attitude towards blacks and others, became the foundation of the explicit or ideological racism in America. It can be said that in American scenario racism involves the subordination of people of color by white people. Generally, people of color became the victim of institutionalized and comprehensive prejudice. History provides us with a long record of white people holding and using power and privilege over people of color to subordinate them. Discriminatory actions in America are not only limited to certain time or period within individual and organizations. This process of discriminations has extended across generations, across organizations, and across social structures. It has passed the discriminatory notions of one generation in one area to other generations in many related areas.

First of all, African blacks were brought to America as laborers to work in American farming plantation and industry. So, the exploitation over them began with their arrival to America to support American economy. In this sense, we can declare that the American society was clearly based on exploitation over other races. Previously rich white people and later on the whites in general excessively exploited Afro-Americans and marginalized them. The African-Americans lived in a state of constant humiliation. Their dignity as an individual was not admitted and they got no respect from the white and even non-white people of the world.

The African-American's true identity was only that of a wage earner and professional man in American society. They were never privileged for more skilled jobs. Rather continued to be concentrated on the less skilled jobs and most of them

remained unemployed. They were living with both socially and economically depressed status. It is due to the discrimination against them in training and employment opportunities offered by the armed services, discrimination against them in vocational and academic training, discrimination against them in referral services rendered by state employment services, the African-Americans were forced to live under the depressed status.

Moreover, the African-American students had been denied admission to the white school. Even if given admission, they were not given equal treatment; they were required to sit at a separate table in the library and had a specific seat in the classroom. In this way, the African-American students were segregated from the school, were deprived of public facilities and had to suffer excessive police brutality.

It was believed that many Afro-Americans were poor, uneducated and deficient in health, morals and manners and thus, were not very agreeable as social companions. And, it was also pointed out that African-Americans were different in physical appearance even if they had the same basic mental capacity and moral propensities.

Besides these beliefs centering on Afro-American inferiority, there are a great number of other popular thoughts arranged to justify social segregation, the thoughts that Afro-Americans liked to be separated that they were happy in their humble status and would not like to be treated as equals. Another idea with the same function is that the separation was necessary in order to prevent friction between the two groups.

In their extreme pain, African-Americans moved towards North but, they just faced identity crisis, sense of dispossession and fragmentation, there. When Abraham Lincoln was elected American president, African Americans were declared free from slavery and equal levels of opportunities were provided to them. Except Lincoln's

presidential year, American history is always cruel to them. In American history, they were always other and, therefore, could not get equal levels of opportunities in comparison to the Americans.

In the decade of 1830s, the belief in human inequality was challenged in Europe and even in America. In 1840s, some efforts of reconciling racial diversity were made.

But the decade of 1850s generally acclaimed and adapted racial diversity as a scientific fact. In this context, Reginald Horseman says, “There must have been a time when the Caucasian was as ignorant and uncivilized as the American [Indian] or the African; all were once simple Children of Nature . . . the former have advanced, the latter have degenerated from the original type of their species” (48- 9).

In 1860s, though Civil War declared the freedom of American slaves, slavery prevailed in many more areas especially the South. This means the simple practice of white supremacy still existed even after the Civil War. Nevertheless, the discussion of racism in America is incomplete without talking about Civil War. Similarly, illegal declaration of slave trade by the major colonial powers during the first half of nineteenth century, too, did not work. Therefore, the master slave relationship between the whites and the blacks remained in the “other forms of unfree labor such as indentures, share cropping, and debt-bondage” (Bulmer and Solomos 10).

Towards the end of nineteenth century racism appeared to its height with the influence of Darwinism. Darwinism proved more convincingly than earlier when the people believed that blacks were created separately by God. In this sense, George Frederickson writes:

Pseudoscientific Darwinian racism did not differ from the pre-civil war variety in its basic assumptions about the differences between blacks

and whites. What gave the reformulated doctrine its new virulence was its association with an aggressive southern campaign for the legal segregation and disfranchisement of the blacks who three decades earlier had been freed from slavery. (82)

In this extract, George Fredrickson is talking about the influence of Darwinism. He means it was Darwinism which openly supported racial segregation. In this way, racism got continued in America because it was always supported by Darwinism, some Southern intellectuals, clergymen, environmentalists and others.

At the latter part of nineteenth century and the first couple of decades of twentieth century the blacks started to express the bitter experiences and sorrows through the medium of literature, art and music. As a result, Harlem Renaissance, the first significant movement of black writers and artists in the United States, flourished with leading figures such as Langston Hughes, Claude McKay, Countee Cullen and others in the place called Harlem, Northern New York, during 1920s. Even after such movements and black consciousness, racism continued to exist in America.

Civil Rights Movement of 1950s and 1960s proclaimed the end of slavery and legal segregation in America. But, it could not be applied sincerely in practice. Racial thought, deeply rooted in the minds of American whites, could not be avoided easily. As a result, America is suffering from racial problem even in twentieth and twenty first centuries. That is why, W. E. B. Du Bois says, “the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line” (Qtd. in Bulmer and Solomos 3). In this way, by presenting a meek and miserable picture of black race white people always want to show their superior and praiseworthy condition in the U.S.A.

According to Kathleen Kerr, the dominant race represents the others in America where the racism was accepted scientifically, too. In his essay *Race, nation, and ethnicity*, he writes:

Scientific racism arose in America around the work of Samuel George Morton's comparative study in craniology (1849), which ranked races according to skull measurements and concluded that the Caucasian race, especially Germans, English, and Anglo-Americans, were intellectually superior, while Ethiopians were endowed with the lowest intellectual abilities. (372)

According to Kerr, the Caucasians and Ethiopians were separated on the basis of skull measurements. Here, George Morton by creating a so-called scientific discourse made Caucasian superior to Ethiopian race.

It is generally accepted that literature reflects the society. So, the racial matter, which has been a truth from ancient time to the present, cannot be avoided from literary concern. Race study has become the inevitable part of literary concern from ancient Greece to the contemporary time. In the classical period, a person's worth was determined by his individual character rather than skin colour. Homer's *Iliad* and the works of pre-Socratic Sophists gave importance upon individual behaviour as the necessary factor for individual value.

Coming to the Elizabethan England, individual's value was determined by his race. William Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello*, and Christopher Marlowe's *The Jews of Malta* show racial differences through the characters. In each of the above plays Moors and Jews are shown as the most despised citizens. Shakespeare's next play *The Tempest* can also be seen as a work where racial prejudice exists. In this play, Caliban who is considered of inferior race has been

presented as a devil. It is the nineteenth century which gave a large space to race in literary study. So, Kwame Anathony Appiah writes:

For literary purposes, the developments that begin at the turn of the nineteenth century have another immediate consequence: race becomes important as the theme of a great body of writing in Europe and North America and, indeed, in the rest of the world under the influence of ‘western’ cultures and the concept often plays a crucial role in structuring plot. (279)

The book *Ivanhoe* published by the Scottish novelist and poet Sir Walter Scott in 1819 also carries racial theme in it. Hatred between Anglo-Saxons, original inhabitants of Britain, and the Norman rulers can be noticed in the book. The racial theme of the novel is highlighted as Normans are presented as lawless and corrupt, and Anglo-Saxons as noble and civilized.

The French novelist, Gustave Flaubert, in his book *Solamambo* projects the similar theme of *Ivanhoe*. The central conflict of the book is between civilized and barbarians. Scott’s thematic influence can also be observed in the works of American writer James Fenimore Cooper. His “Leather Stoking Tales” like *The Pioneers* and *The Deerslayer*, incorporate racial themes. In these tales, ‘Redman’ is shown as the declining race and ‘Whiteman’ as the emerging one. In Cooper’s racial theme, the ‘Indian’ is below the ‘Whiteman’ but above the ‘Negro’.

Mark Twain’s greatest novel *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* also does have racial concern. In this novel a white hero Huck befriends an escaped slave, Jim. Both of them float down the Mississippi river on the raft. Although Huck’s legal duty is to return Jim to his owner, he does not do it thinking that the slave is a man, not a thing.

Finally, Frantz Fanon also talks about the white insights of the Negroes in his essay *The Fact of Blackness*. In this context, he writes:

The Negro is an animal; the Negro is bad, the negro is mean, the negro is ugly, look a nigger, it's cold, the nigger is shivering, . . . goes through your bones, the handsome little boy is trembling because he thinks that nigger quivering with rage, the little boy throws himself into his mother's arm: mama, the nigger's going to eat me up. (120)

Here, Fanon is of the opinion that whites are always negative towards the Negroes. They think that Negroes are no more than an animal.

Representation, on the other hand, means using one thing to stand for another. Ross Murfin and Supryia M. Ray define representation as, "the use of one thing to stand or substitute for another through some signifying medium. A representation of an event is not the event itself but rather a statement about or rendition of that event" (338). Furthermore, they write:

Recently, this term has been given a more specific meaning by **new historicists**, who use it to refer to the **symbolic** constructions of a given society in a specific era. . . New historicists view representations as both the products of and the means of propagating the culture's prevailing **ideologies** and power relations. In other words, representations maintain the status of the dominant **class** or classes by re-presenting the belief systems and preserving the institutions upon which their status and power depend. (338)

In this way, representation has been adopted by new historicists who use the meaning in regards to the symbolic construction of a particular society at a particular period in time. For instance, the reproduction or copies of the Mona Lisa stand in for or

represent the original. It is important to recognize that the ability of representation to do this may often be problematic, raising issues of authenticity and value. Another definition implies that 'representation' is the ability of texts to draw upon features of the world and present them to the viewer, not simply as reflections, but more so, as constructions. Hence, the images do not portray reality in an unbiased way with cent percent accuracy, but rather, present 'versions of reality' influenced by culture and people's habitual thoughts and actions. Representations are, as a result, influenced by culture and in much like the same way, have the capacity to shape culture and mould society's attitudes, values, perceptions and behaviours.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines representation primarily as 'presence' or 'appearance'. Representation can be clear image, material reproduction and also can be performances. It can also be defined as the act of placing or stating facts in order to influence or affect the actions of others. So, the term, representation has a semiotic meaning in which something is 'standing for' something else. But presently representation is a much debated topic not only in postcolonial discourse but also in the larger cultural arena, too.

Representation, in cultural studies, focuses on how the world is socially constructed and represented to and by us. Indeed, the central strand of cultural studies can be understood as the study of culture as the signifying practices of representation. Cultural representations and meanings have certain materiality, they are embedded in sounds, inscriptions, objects, images, books, magazines and television programmes are produced, enacted, used and understood in specific social contexts.

For cultural critics like Chris Barker, representation plays a key role in the formation of cultural identities. Representation for him is "bound up with the object of study (texts, events, social processes), the preferred conceptual armature (discourse,

ideology, institution, economy) and the methods of investigation which map out these changing fields” (192). Representation is, thus, verbal formations, which are the ‘ideological product’ or ‘cultural construct’. So, they are produced, enacted, and understood in special social context.

In contemporary postcolonial theory ‘representation’ is closely related with Foucauldian concept of ‘discourse as representation’. He takes discourse as inseparable from power. For Foucault, ‘discourse’ unites both language and practice and refers to the production of knowledge through language which gives meaning to material objects and social practice. That is why, he writes:

By discourse, then, I meant that which was produced (perhaps all that was produced) by the groups of signs. But I also meant a group of acts of formulation, a series of sentences or propositions. Lastly— and it is this meaning that was finally used . . . discourse is constituted by a group of sequences of signs, in so far as they are statements, that is in so far as they can be assigned particular modalities of existence. And if I succeed in showing, as I shall try to do shortly, that the law of such a series is precisely what I have so far called a *discursive formation*, if I succeed in showing that this discursive formation really is the principle of dispersion and redistribution, not of formulations, not of sentences, not of propositions, but of statements. (107)

Here, Foucault is obviously stating that discourse is series of sentences or propositions for representation. That is why, history, in his opinion, is merely an interpretation of those who are victorious. In this context, he writes:

. . . interpretation is the violent or surreptitious appropriation of a system of rules, which in itself has no essential meaning, in order to

impose a direction, to bend it to a new will, to force its participation in a different game, and to subject it to secondary rules, then the development of humanity is a series of interpretations. (91)

History, thus, is just an interpretation of the ruler who is in power over general people. In this sense, history can also be called a discourse. Discourse which handles power and stimulates opposition is not always fixed. It maintains the sense of superiority and authority over the other. Foucault, further, defines discourse as strategic possibilities. In this sense, representation is a type of discourse which is also inseparable from power. Representing the powerless people, power creates truth through the medium of discourse.

Edward W. Said's *Orientalism* is a prime example of Western discourse that formed stereotypical image of East for gaining control. Through western discursive practices, the westerners try to gain power over the orient which Foucault has suggested 'discourse as representation and a form of power'.

Observing the politics behind 'truth', 'power', knowledge' and 'representation', Said critiques the 'othering' notion of the westerners in *Orientalism*. He has observed such notions being transmitted historically and subjectively. He questions the objectivity behind such notions. He hints the interest of colonization involved in the practices of Orientalism. Supporting this he points:

Orientalism, therefore, is not an airy European fantasy about the Orient, but a created body of theory and practice in which, for many generations, there has been a considerable material investment. Continued investment made Orientalism, as a system of knowledge about the Orient, an accepted grid for filtering through the Orient into Western consciousness, just as that same investment multiplied—

indeed, made truly productive—the statements proliferating out from Orientalism into the general culture. (6)

Said's expression has explicated how systems of knowledge are created in societies. Furthermore, it shows how those created values get the stamp of truth, legitimacy and generality through the political interests and practices to create the social psychological approvals. Meanwhile, Ross Murfin and Supryia M. Ray define Orientalism as:

A term most closely associated with Edward Said, a **postcolonial** and **cultural critic** who, in his book *Orientalism* (1978), uses the term to refer to the historical and **ideological** process whereby false **images** of and **myths** about the Eastern or “oriental” world have been constructed in various Western **discourses**, including that of imaginative literature. . . Said has been influenced by the work of Michel Foucault, a French theorist often associated with **the new historicism** who examined the ways in which power is manifested and exercised through discourses. (262)

In this way, they also accept Orientalism as western discourse about the east which is propounded by Said. Said talks about the Western discourse and, therefore, representation of the East in *Orientalism*. Thus, *Orientalism* is his study of European views of the East. Clearly, Said is impatient with a criticism that views the text only as a “silent printed object” (1210). For Said, all texts are ‘worldly’, that is involved in a particular historical situation. For him, a text is not the heteroglossia of Mikhail Bakhtin's novel. Rather discursive situations are more like the unequal relation of colonizer and the colonized, for many texts are characterized by a ‘self confirming will to power’ (1210). In this way, the colonizer through hegemony, are trying to

represent the colonized. According to Italian Marxist-activist and philosopher Antonio Gramsci, hegemony is domination by consent. Talking about hegemony Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffins write:

Fundamentally, hegemony is the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interests are the interests of all. Domination is thus exerted not by force, nor even necessarily by active persuasion, but by a more subtle and inclusive power over the economy, and over state apparatuses such as education and the media, by which the ruling class's interest is presented as the common interest and thus comes to be taken for granted. (116)

For them, hegemony is the ruling class's domination over other classes. It is the power through which the ruling class imposes its interests upon the lower class. Thus, the colonizer through hegemony represents the colonized. Similarly, Chinua Achebe, seriously, criticises Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* regarding the colonizer's behaviours. In his essay *An Image of Africa: Conrad's Heart of Darkness*, he says:

Heart of Darkness projects the image of Africa as "the other world," the antithesis of Europe and therefore of civilization, a place where man's vaunted intelligence and refinement are finally mocked by triumphant bestiality. The book opens on the River Thames . . . But the actual story will take place on River Congo, the very antithesis of the Thames. The River Congo is quite decidedly not a River Emeritus. It has rendered no service and enjoys no old-age pension. (1373)

Here, Achebe shows how colonized are dehumanized by the colonizers in Africa. During the colonization, the colonizers not only dehumanized the colonized but, also exploited the whole Africa.

The powerless people are just represented by powerful ruler or victorious that we can find in the history. Fascism can be taken as a clear-cut example of how the powerless people are cruelly represented. According to Ortwin De Graef, Dirk De Geest, and Eveline Vanfraussen, people are nothing for Nazi ideologues such as Joseph Goebbels. Talking about him they write that, “The people are for him what stone is for the sculptor. . . Politics are the plastic arts of the state as painting is the plastic art of color” (75). Moreover, they opine:

The history of fascist politics shows a recurrent pattern in which fascism’s rise to actual power, especially in nations where it is imposed by a foreign aggressor, is accompanied by a series of strategic political concessions intended to win over alternative important political factions. In its bid for cultural power fascism employed similar strategies of qualified compromise but it would appear that its mechanisms of representational control were relatively unsuccessful in fully accommodating potentially ‘major’ fellow travellers. (76)

The extract shows that the history of fascist politics was directed to win its interests by hook and crook. Fascist rulers impose their ‘representational control’ over the powerless people.

According to Terry Eagleton, even media, speaking the dominant ideology, is representing common people. Talking about Television, he says:

Many people spend most of their time watching television, but watching television lies benefit the ruling class, it may not be chiefly because it helps to convey its own ideology to a docile populace. What is politically important about television is probably (less) its ideological content than the act of watching it. Watching television for

long stretches confirms individual as passive, isolated privatized roles and consumes a good deals of times that could, be put to productive political uses. It is more a form of social control than an ideological apparatus. (34 - 5)

The extract clearly states that television is capable of controlling people's thought and motivating them according to its own version of presentation.

According to Friedrich Nietzsche, who is also known as one of the first real deconstructionists, truth is "A mobile army of metaphors, metonymies, anthropomorphisms" (636). Similarly, Jacques Derrida views that the final signified is always absent. The more we try to reach to final signified, the farther it quits away. That is why, meaning, for Derrida, is peeling the onion and never getting its kernel. However, in his essay *Differance*, he is agreed with Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure that the meaning is derived via differences. So, he quotes:

In a language, in the *system* of language, there are only differences. Therefore a taxonomical operation can undertake the systematic, statistical, and classificatory inventory of a language. But, on the one hand, these differences *play*: in language, in speech too, and in the exchange between language and speech. On the other hand, these differences are themselves *effects*. (680)

Here, Derrida means that though differences make meaning possible, it is always in a play. To sum up, what he focuses upon is instability of meaning and, hence, the truth. For him, truth is unstable due to its hierarchical basis. Truth is just representation of language system. There is merely a mode rather than absolute truth which is represented. This is what Faulkner had exactly applied in his novel *Intruder in the Dust*.

To sum up, racial issues especially in the United States have become the inevitable part of literary studies. Anglo-Saxonists who are the dominant group of the U.S. had excluded African-American culture and many other minority cultures from the official American canon. As a result, discussion on race relation came to the forefront in the later period. So long as the racial difference exists, the literary study will go on incorporating racial themes in it. Since racial matter is unavoidable, Faulkner as a white American writer creates positive discourse about whites representing the blacks as immanent creature in his novel *Intruder in the Dust*.

III. Brushing up the White's Image in Faulkner's *Intruder in the Dust*

This novel *Intruder in the Dust* works as a discourse and creates 'other' image of Lucas, a black, representative of powerless race. He is a member of black community and hence, 'other' for powerful white people. And Gavin as a powerful white person treats Lucas in a way that he is inherently weak and inferior. Gavin, thus, exercises his power upon Lucas in whatever way he likes. By presenting the pathetic image of Lucas, William Faulkner wants to show the necessity of whites to save the blacks in every event. This is nothing more than his intention of presenting whites at the upper position over the blacks.

Lucas Beauchamp, a black, had saved Charles Mallison, a white boy, from falling him into an icy creek some four years earlier. And, quite contrary to this, Charles is going to defend Lucas for he has been accused of murdering a white man, Vinson Gowrie. Hence, the whole novel revolves round these two incidents.

In the novel, Lucas Beauchamp is wrongly blamed of killing a Whiteman, Vinson Gowrie. Despite Lucas' innocence, he is really a murderer in front of Charles. Now, Charles doesn't know Lucas himself but through the constructed conscience. He understands him, "as any white person knew him" (5). Suddenly, Charles wants to erase an unforgettable relationship with Lucas, created by his pleasant hospitality at the time of crisis.

While hunting rabbits, Charles has to cross a foot log over a creek but, he loses the balance and falls into it. At this crisis, Lucas appears there but, Charles finds him no more than a pitiless pagan hero. In this context, Lucas is identified as:

. . . a Negro man with an axe on his shoulder, in a heavy sheeplined coat and a broad pale felt hat such as his grandfather had used to wear, looking at him and that was when he saw Lucas Beauchamp for the

first time that he remembered or rather for the first time because you didn't forget Lucas Beauchamp; gasping, shaking and only now feeling the shock of the cold water, he looked up at the face which was just watching him without pity commiseration or anything else, not even surprise: just watching him, whose owner had made no effort whatever to help him up out of the creek. (8)

Here, Lucas is described as an uncivilized person carrying 'an axe' which can be taken as a pre-historic weapon. And he is like a vagabond wearing a heavy coat and a broad pale felt hat. Moreover, he is portrayed as a man who has no sense of pity and surprise. He is presented as 'other', mainly, in the manner of human feeling, clothing and speaking. Unlike such portrait, Lucas utters, "come on to my house" (9). In this way, he dismantles the boundary of his constructed picture. And he redraws his real image that he has also mercy, pity and feeling. But he is easily ignored by Charles, who says, "I'll go back to Mr Edmonds'," (9). Ultimately, Charles goes to Lucas' house to live in that day. Despite Lucas' offer, as a guest he finds distinct odour there, which makes him feel other. There, he is, "enveloped into the quilt like a cocoon, enclosed completely now in that unmistakable odour of Negroes" (12). He takes Lucas' supper as "nigger food . . . it was what Negroes ate, obviously because it was what they liked, what they chose" (15). Finally, Chick wants to pay Lucas' help thinking that black people need white benevolence and treats him in the same manner.

Moreover, Charles is identified through Lucas' social and economic background. He teases Lucas' poor social and economic condition. Similarly, he also finds Lucas politically backward, unconscious and uncivilized. Thus, Lucas is socially, economically and politically 'other'. He is made a nigger having distinct figure at Beat Four, "We got to make him be a nigger first. He's got to admit he's a

nigger” (19). In this way, Chick finds Lucas’ ‘other’ image which is distinct especially, from him and his uncle Gavin Stevens.

Later on, when Chick meets Lucas outside the court house, he finds him quite distinct than himself. There, he:

. . . saw Lucas come out of the courthouse and cross the Square directly towards him, in the black suit and the tie-less shirt and the fine old hat at its swaggering rake, walking so erect that the coat touched him only across the shoulders from which it hung and he could already see the cocked slanted glint of the gold toothpick and he could feel the muscles of his face. (26)

Here, Chick finds Lucas in a state in which he has dressed awkwardly. He is in ‘black suit’ with ‘tie-less shirt’. He is also wearing a fine but old fashioned hat. His coat covers the shoulders in an odd manner. As a whole, he comes out of the courthouse in a distinct way than Chick and the others have. However, he helps Lucas to be free.

In the same way, Gavin Stevens always tries to put him away from Lucas who is just “a goddamn stinking nigger” (53). He addresses him as a Negro. He doesn’t consider him as human being. Gavin doesn’t even realize that he is going to fight for Lucas’ case and he also belongs to a human category. Rather he thinks and behaves him as an object. In this sense, opposite to the claim of the so-called civilized; Gavin himself can be taken as a barbaric fellow. He behaves like a person who has just arrived from the jungle. That is why, rather he is like a person who has no sense of address, manner and respect. To sum up, he seems to be a man who has lost all human qualities. But, here, Lucas, as a black, is made such a quality less man by white people like Gavin Stevens.

In the novel, Lucas is made a victim of a crime he did not commit. This accusation makes him a cruel murderer in front of other people's eyes. Thus, Lucas' accusation is itself a great racial prejudice through which Faulkner is trying to negate the black's image. And through such negation, he is attempting to brush up the white's image. We can realise this through Gavin who says:

Only a nigger could kill a man, let alone shoot him in the back, and then sleep like a baby as soon as he found something flat enough to lie down on; still looking at him when without moving otherwise Lucas closed his mouth and his eyelids opened, the eyes staring up for another second, then still without the head moving at all the eyeballs turned until Lucas was looking straight at his uncle but still not moving: just lying there looking at him. (57)

Here, Lucas is, generally, expected to lose his temper and kill a white man. He is quite a violent man, for Gavin. For him, Lucas has violent emotion. Because of his animalistic emotion, he can not control himself. As a result, he kills the man and, hence, becomes a murderer. Moreover, he is also expected to hang by the family of the man he killed. The murdered man's relatives hang the murderer after his investigation. He is even expected to burn by them.

When Gavin also doesn't try to understand Lucas, he is worried about the law. "I'll worry about that when they walks in here," he said. "I mean the law. Aint you the county lawyer?" (58). Lucas is also very much worried about Gavin himself who can't understand his innocence.

Tine and again, Gavin denies Lucas' request of studying his case. The reason behind this is that he wants Lucas to be a murderer. He understands Lucas just as a

murderer and says, “I dont defend murderers who shoot people in the back,” (59).

Now, both of them are silent when:

. . . Lucas was watching his uncle, his head lowered so that he was watching his uncle up-wards from beneath through the grizzled tufts of his eye-brows – a look shrewd secret and intent. Then Lucas said: ‘I wants to hire somebody –’ and stopped. And watching him, he thought remembered an old lady, dead now, a spinster, a neighbour who wore a dyed transformation and had always on a pantry shelf a big bowl of homemade teacakes for all the children on the street, who one summer (he couldn’t have been over seven or eight then) taught all of them to play Five Hundred. (59)

Here, Lucas is in deep thought and remembrance of an old lady because Gavin makes him sad. According to him, the lady used to provide teacakes to children and teach them to play Five Hundred. Again he remembers the same lady who is:

. . . sitting at the card table on her screened side gallery on hot summer mornings and she would wet her fingers and take a card from her hand and lay it on the table, her hand not still poised over it of course but just lying nearby until the next player revealed exposed by some . . . his intention to trump or overplay it, whereupon she would say quickly: ‘Wait. I picked up the wrong one’ and take up the card and put it back into her hand and play another one. That was exactly what Lucas had done. He had sat still before but now he was absolutely immobile. He didn’t even seem to be breathing. (59)

Here, Lucas compares his choice of Gavin as a lawyer with the wrong card that the old lady used to pick up. This shows his frustrated view towards Gavin. Hence, he

remains totally immobile so that he is not even breathing. He just expresses his desire to take or hire somebody. So, “Hire somebody?” his uncle said. “You’ve got a lawyer. I had already taken your case before I came in here. I’m going to tell you what to do as soon as you have told me what happened” (59). Suddenly, Gavin clarifies his acceptance of Lucas’ case on some condition. However, through such condition he wants to prove him as a guilty person. This makes Lucas angry and so, he says, “I wants to hire somebody. It dont have to be a lawyer” (60). Such bargaining remains until Lucas’ release as an innocent man.

Even now, Gavin, unconsciously, tries to portray Lucas as a murderer and not as an innocent person for whom he is going to advocate as a lawyer. Hence, Lucas’ attempt of clarifying Crawford Gowrie as a cheat goes in vain. Rather he goes to face Gavin’s vulture eye as his answer when:

His uncle stared at Lucas for perhaps ten seconds. He said in a voice of calm, almost hushed amazement: ‘So you took your pistol and went to straighten it out. You, a nigger, took a pistol and went to rectify a wrong between two white men. What did you expect? What else did you expect? (62)

Here, Gavin doesn’t care about Lucas’ clarification of Crawford Gowrie. Therefore, what he claims turns into a fruitless noise. Staring at him fearfully, Gavin blames Lucas of taking a pistol to shoot the white man. He asks Lucas some questions by addressing him as a nigger. He is attempting to erase Lucas’ subjectivity and personal character by generalizing him as a black.

Moreover, Gavin as a white lawyer still has negative psychology towards Lucas. He always doubts upon Lucas’ activities. And Gavin still doesn’t believe him,

mainly because he has no positive view towards Lucas. Despite Lucas' innocence, he is a murderer who had killed Vinson Gowrie, for Gavin. In this context:

‘You went to the store,’ his uncle said, ‘only you happened to find Vinson Gowrie first and followed him into the woods and told him his partner was robbing him and naturally he cursed you and called you a liar whether it was true or not, naturally he would have to do that; may be he even knocked you down and walked on and you shot him in the back –’ (62- 3)

Gavin tries to make Lucas a murderer with his supposition. According to him, Lucas shoots Vinson Gowrie because he had knocked him at first. Through this he wants to make Lucas accept Vinson Gowrie's murder.

Later on, when Gavin fully accepts to study Lucas' case and he convinces him as if that is his prime duty. At that time, he says:

Now you listen to me. You'll go before the grand jury tomorrow. They'll indict you. Then if you like I'll have Mr Hampton move you to Mottstown or even further away than that, until court convenes next month. Then you'll plead guilty; I'll persuade the District Attorney to let you do that because you're an old man and you never were in trouble before; I mean as far as the judge and the District Attorney will know since they dont live within fifty miles of Yoknapatawpha County. Then they wont hang you. (63- 4)

According to Gavin, the grand jury is going to indict Lucas. Here, Gavin promises that he would persuade the District Attorney to save him. And he claims that, they won't hang Lucas after his persuasion. This signifies nothing more than Gavin's desire for paternal role. Gavin always tries to present him as the patron of other

people like Lucas. That is why, he behaves as if he was the parent of Lucas. Such behaviour helps him to create superiority over other races like that of Lucas.

Moreover, while talking with Lucas, we can point out paternal role that Gavin Stevens wants to perform:

‘Right,’ his uncle said harshly, then to him: ‘Come on:’ already moving towards the door. Then his uncle stopped. ‘Is there anything you want?’

‘You might send me some tobacco,’ Lucas said. ‘If them Gowries leaves me time to smoke it.’

‘Tomorrow,’ (64)

Gavin behaves in a way in which he is capable of fulfilling Lucas’ every needs and desires. He wants to present him as if he has some responsibility towards Lucas. And he is not less responsible than a father towards his children. Through this he wants to convey that Lucas is always in need of his guardianship. Here, Gavin asks Lucas to demand something. So, Lucas tells him to send some tobacco. Later on, Gavin says that, ‘I’ll take Lucas some tobacco tonight’ (65). To fulfil his role as a parent of Lucas, further:

‘Officially he is,’ his uncle said. ‘By the county records he is. And if you, living right here and knowing Miss Habersham and me all your political life, had to ask me twice, what do you think Jim Halladay is going to do? Then you’ve got to drive sixty miles back here with your witnesses and the petition and get Judge Maycox to issue an order –’
(106)

Gavin is clarifying that Vinson Gowrie isn’t in his grave. But, officially and by the county records, he is. He clarifies this after Vinson Gowrie’s grave is investigated.

In the novel, Gavin is always attempting to other Lucas' image. For example, when he tries to clarify of Lucas to Miss Habersham:

‘He’s a country man,’ his uncle said. ‘Any food he eats after daylight in the morning is dinner. Mrs Hampton’s in Memphis with their daughter waiting for the baby and the only woman who’ll cook a man’s breakfast at half-past three a.m. is his wife. No hired town cook’s going to do it. She comes at a decent hour about eight o’clock and washes the dishes.’ (104)

Here, Gavin goes his best to tease the poor condition of Lucas along with his wife. Gavin is just mocking at their poverty in which they are bitterly surviving. He talks about what they eat and do. He places Lucas' wife below than any hired town cook. Lucas' 'other' image, as the reversed image of Gavin, is no more than a clear-cut example of his attempt of inferiorizing the black people. To sum up, almost all white characters make 'other' image of black people, in general, and Lucas, in particular. And this is what they identify themselves as having the image of self not the other.

But, Gavin is, after all, thwarted by Lucas' constant resistance of his help. In a frustrated mood he says:

He wont want it of course and he'll try to resist it. But he'll get it and so we shall watch right here in Yoknapatawpha County the ancient oriental relationship between the saviour and the life he saved turned upside down: Lucas Beauchamp once the slave of any white man within range of whose notice he happened to come, now tyrant over the whole county's white conscience. (192)

Gavin is worried because of the fear that 'the ancient oriental relationship between the saviour and the life he saved' might turn 'upside down'. From his early childhood in

Yoknapatawpha County, he has a deeply rooted belief in his mind according to which he wants to make Lucas a slave. But, when Lucas refuses his tobacco, suddenly, he is frustrated. This frustration reaches its summit after he is made Lucas' paid agent towards the end of the novel.

White characters are always dominating others, especially, blacks from the very beginning of the novel. Thus, Charles, Gavin and others are, by nature, dominants over Lucas. For instance, Gavin does his best to dominate Lucas. He even creates torture in the mind of Lucas to make him mentally weak. So, one of the ways of domination, he adapted, is mental torture. In the novel, Gavin himself as a lawyer creates such torture after Lucas was wrongly blamed:

. . . It's the District Attorney that'll hang you or send you to Parchman – not me.'

Lucas was still blinking, not rapidly: just steadily. He watched him.

And suddenly he realizes that Lucas was not looking at his uncle at all and apparently had not been for three or four seconds.

'I see,' Lucas said. 'Then you can take my case.'

'Take your case? Defend you before the judge?'

'I'm gonter pay you,' Lucas said. 'You dont need to worry.'

'I dont defend murderers who shoot people in the back,' his uncle said.

(58- 9)

Here, Gavin is openly, threatening Lucas of hanging that makes him mentally weak and sad. According to Gavin, District Attorney is either going to hang Lucas or send him to Parchman. In a fearful mood, Lucas severely, requests him to take his case to rescue him. But, Gavin rejects him because he is a murderer. He addresses Lucas as a 'murderer' on the basis of cast system.

After the violation of Vinson Gowrie's grave and the revelation of the real criminal, the sheriff acclaims Miss Habersham as:

'You go home. You and these boys have done fine. Likely you saved a life. Now you go home and let us attend to the rest of it. That won't be any place for a lady out there.'

But Miss Habersham was just stopped, nor even that for long: 'It wasn't for a man either last night.' (113- 14)

According to him, Miss Habersham with the others had saved Lucas' life. But, she remains indifference towards her praise. Moreover, Gavin Stevens asks Lucas Beauchamp to pay his homage to Miss Habersham with the flowers. Therefore, after Lucas' release:

'Go and see Miss Habersham,' his uncle said.

Lucas looked at his uncle. He blinked twice this time. 'I aint much of a visiting man,' he said.

'You were not much of a hanging man either,' his uncle said. 'But you dont need me to tell you how close you came.'

'No,' Lucas said. 'I dont reckon I do. What do you want me to tell her?'

'You cant,' his uncle said. 'You dont know how to say thank you. I've got that fixed too. Take her some flowers.' (233)

Here, Gavin is of the view that any white member of the investigation of Lucas' case should be praised. That is why, he forces Lucas to see Miss Habersham as soon as possible. But, Lucas doesn't accept him at once, thinking that it would be disrespect to his dead wife Molly. So, he says, 'I aint had no flowers to speak of since Molly died' (233). This line shows Lucas' sincerity towards his dead wife. This also shows

that Lucas has sincere human feeling and sentiment which Gavin as a white, doesn't believe in.

Since America is a technologically developed country of the world, its people are half-living. American people are, entirely, affected by modern technology. Science and technology have made them the cog of machine. Thus, they have only mechanical emotion and sentiment. They have neither true love and sentiment nor human feeling. We can find this when Gavin says:

. . . American really loves nothing but his automobile: not his wife his child nor his country nor even his bank-account first (in fact he doesn't really love that bank-account nearly as much as foreigners like to think because he will spend almost any or all of it for almost anything provided it is valueless enough) but his motor-car. (230)

Here, we can see that Americans are engaged to automobile but not to anything else. They are far from even their own relatives such as the wife and children. They don't care even their country and bank-account. They don't love anything except their motor-car. In such a situation, how do the white Americans like Charles and Gavin help a Negro, Lucas, inwardly? Can we believe that such dominant white people help Lucas, selflessly?

Since the genuine help of white to black people is doubtful, Gavin's representation of the case doesn't signify to justice in favour of Lucas. Rather this representation is directed towards the severe injustice. It is directed not to Lucas' progress but to Gavin's own prosperity and superior position. After Lucas' suspicion upon Gavin's legal service they converse in the following way:

'I believe you got a little bill against me.'

'What for?' his uncle said.

‘For representing my case,’ Lucas said. ‘Name whatever your fee is within reason. I want to pay it.’

‘Not me,’ his uncle said. ‘I didn’t do anything.’

‘I sent for you,’ Lucas said. ‘I authorized you. How much do I owe you?’ (235- 36)

Lucas wants to pay Gavin’s charge and be a freeman. So, he asks about Gavin’s fee and then a little bill. Gavin is advocating in favour of himself i.e. a racial interest but not according to the norms and values of law. He is not fighting against exploitation. Since he himself sounds an exploiter Lucas too, wants to make him his paid agent. And he receives Gavin’s reply surprisingly:

‘ . . . Of course the paper belongs to the county but the fountain pen was mine and it cost me two dollars to have a new point put in it. You owe me two dollars.’

‘Two dollars?’ Lucas said. He blinked twice again. Then he blinked twice again. ‘Just two dollars?’ (236)

In this way, Lucas wants to pay Gavin’s fee asking in such a manner as if money is nothing for him. Though he is a poor farmer, he pretends to be a prosperous landowner realizing the bitter reality that Gavin has no positive human consideration towards him. When Gavin asks for two dollars to put a new point in his fountain pen, Lucas repeatedly asks him, ‘Just two dollars?’

Charles Mallison, Gavin Stevens, Miss Habersham and even other white characters placed them far from Lucas. They all categorized them as people of separate race for whom Lucas’ race is ‘other’. In opposition to their category, they placed Lucas as a man of other race. Through these all they wanted to create hatred

towards Lucas in other people's heart. In this sense, Lucas is ugly looking, pitiless, uncivilized, rude, emotional and irrational. He is inhuman and hence, a murderer.

In this way, they constructed Lucas' stereotypical image. His 'other' image is forcefully created. Such discourse, created to stereotype Lucas' other image makes him, too, aware of his identity, on the one hand. Therefore, this discourse makes him identify himself as descendant of white father and says, "I aint a Edmonds. I dont belong to these new folks. I belongs to the old lot. I'm a McCaslin" (20).

But on the other hand, Lucas is constantly refusing Gavin's help to him. He is always resisting him regarding his help. So, his resistance is functioning as reverse discourse to Gavin's racial discourse. And this is a strong challenge for white's superiority over inferior black people.

In this way, Faulkner brushes up the white's image through Lucas' negation. He establishes the white characters as people having positive image. But he labels Lucas as a man of negative image. Through Lucas' negative image he is constructing white's positive image. He identifies themselves as people of superior class through Lucas' inferiority. He is enjoying their superiority placing Lucas in the lower level. So, the white characters climb up to the peak pushing Lucas into the gulf of human status. Hence, they create their 'self' in Lucas' 'other' image.

Chick goes to hunt rabbits with his assistant black boys and different types of hunting dogs. Chick is decorated with lordly shotgun and the other boys carry atavistic, metal-tipped throwing sticks. Similarly varieties of dogs we can glance as:

. . . a true rabbit dog, some hound, a good deal of hound, maybe mostly hound, redbone and black-and-tan with maybe a little pointer somewhere once, a potlicker, a nigger dog which it took but one glance

to see had an affinity a rapport with rabbits such as people said
Negroes had with mules. (6)

Here, the rabbit dog, some hound, potlicker and nigger dog are different varieties of hunting dogs. The various types of hunting dogs along with armful rabbit hunters make environment, too, colourful. This indicates heroic culture and aristocracy, on the one hand. But, on the other, such culture is degenerating the black boys placing them in the same position of hunting dogs. Here, they are treated not more than the tamed hunting dogs. This is a hierarchy between the people upon which Charles and other white characters believe. They create their superior position on the basis of binary opposition.

Lucas' attempt of paying Gavin's bill can also be taken as heroic culture which is working as resistance against white superiority and the stereotype provided to black people like him. On the other hand, Gavin's refusal of his service charge belongs to benevolent culture through which he wants to create white's helpful image and govern Lucas. He wants to save that very culture to highlight his community's image by helping Lucas.

Gavin wants to help Lucas not because he is innocent but to save the white benevolent image. That is why, he behaves as if his service to Lucas is a charity. He is advocating Lucas' case devoid of charge. As a result, he doesn't expect money from Lucas in the beginning. He resists his service fee that Lucas is extremely eager to pay. Through Lucas' release he wants to prove him a benevolent lawyer.

Similarly, Gavin wants to help Lucas not to legalize the lynching policy. If it is legalized it would be harmful for lower class white people, too. Thus, Gavin is opposed of lynching policy and as a prestigious lawyer of his community, he decides to advocate in favour of Lucas. Through this, we can easily define that law is an

institution serving the interests of powerful group of society. It is a medium through which the dominant people legalize their discourse and, hence, the power. Therefore, it can help the dominant rulers to remain in power. In the racial society, the dominant race imposes their desire through the means of law. Hence, law also creates hierarchy among the people of different races.

In this novel, Gavin is trying to establish his superior position through the medium of law. He is physically releasing but mentally enslaving Lucas by using law. He is governing Lucas by making law as medium of his power. By releasing Lucas he tries to make him believe that he needs the lawyer like Gavin. Then it, obviously, tells us that Gavin is misusing law. In this sense, his profession as a lawyer is just a licence of corruption.

Along with Chick and Gavin, other characters of the novel are also not helpful towards Lucas, selflessly. For instance, Miss Habersham provides her aid to Chick for Lucas just because she belongs to Chick's community. She is helping Lucas just because she is also a member of white community. Her help to Lucas, thus, is not guided by religious norms but by the racial obligation. It is racial obligation but not Christian spirit that makes her to help Lucas.

Similarly, Miss Habersham also treats Lucas as if she is not far from the same ideology like that of Chick and Gavin. She has also not positive attitude towards Lucas. For her, he can't speak truth just because, "he is a Negro" (87). But, we find her addressing Gavin as 'man', at the same time. Therefore, she is also not biased-less. She is also racially biased.

Since Vinson Gowrie is murdered by shooting, different varieties of guns are investigated in the novel. Here, the guns refer to the means of exercising power. In the debate between Mr Gowrie and the sheriff the latter says, "it wasn't Lucas

Beauchamp's old forty-one Colt that killed Vinson either" (172). According to him, it was not Beauchamp's forty-one Colt that killed Vinson Gowrie. Moreover, they widely converse as:

'What was it killed Vinson, Shurf?'

'A German Luger automatic, Mr Gowrie,' the sheriff said. Like the one Buddy McCallum brought home from France in 1919 and traded that summer for a pair of fox hounds.' . . .

. . . 'All right, sons. Let's load our boy on the mule and take him home.' (172- 73)

According to the sheriff, Vinson Gowrie was not killed by 'forty-one Colt' but by 'A German Luger automatic'. Here, the only image of Lucas' 'forty-one Colt' is the reversed image of more modern machine gun, 'German Luger automatic' that belongs to Crawford Gowrie. This is one example of Faulkner's attempt of describing a white as an armful and powerful man than a black-man, Lucas.

Similarly, the black boys have just atavistic metal-tipped throwing sticks whereas Chick uses lordly shotgun while hunting rabbits. Here, Chick wants these boys to help him with the weapons that are more traditional than his modern one. Chick needs their help but, they are controlled to use some powerful weapons. They have to help and accept him as an inborn power-holder. In return, he treats them in a manner in which he is also protecting them by his powerful weapons. This obviously, points out to the white Chicks' passion for power. He is really, a power hunger who struggles for power at any cost. In this way, he always adapts fascist tendency to exercise and maintain the power.

In the novel, we can find that the white and black characters eat separately in the separate room. The whites don't eat with the black characters simply because of their race. In this context:

They left Aleck Sander with his breakfast at the kitchen table and carried theirs into the diningroom, he and his uncle and Miss Habersham carrying the platter of fried eggs and meat and the pan of biscuits baked last night and warmed again in the oven until they were almost like toast and the coffeepot in which the unstrained grounds and the water had been boiling together. (110)

Aleck Sander is left at the kitchen whereas Chick, Gavin, Miss Habersham and others go to the dining room for the breakfast. They even don't allow Aleck Sander to enter into their dining room. Aleck Sander, as a black is expected not to eat with his white masters and others.

In the novel, Gavin, as a white, has his own car whereas Lucas travels by foot. In this way, Lucas has no vehicle to travel. When Gavin asks Lucas to go to see Miss Habersham, he says, "Chick'll drive you up in my car to get them and then take you out to Miss Habersham's gate" (233). By providing car to Lucas, Gavin presents his upper rank in the society.

In this way, white and black characters travel separately by separate vehicles. Here, Aleck Sander is allowed just to drive a truck but not other vehicles. In this context, Miss Habersham asks:

'Drive me home first. I've got some mending to do. I aint going to sit there all morning doing nothing so that Mrs Tubbs will think she has to talk to me. Drive me home first. I realized an hour ago what a rush and hurry you and Mr Hampton are in but you can spare the time for that.

Aleck Sander can bring my truck to the jail on his way to school and leave it in front of the gate.' (115)

Aleck Sander, as a black can only drive truck which is also belonged to Miss Habersham. But Gavin and Miss Habersham travel by separate automobile i.e. more comfortable motor-car. On the other hand, Miss Habersham is of the opinion that she and some other white characters such as Gavin Stevens and Mr Hampton have busy hours. According to her, she is always busy than Mrs Tubbs. She has to do this and that for twenty-four hours. For instance, sometimes she has to mend something and other times the other things.

We can see that Aleck Sander has his own Negro school where he goes to read. Despite his capacity, he is not allowed admission to read in the white school. That is why, Gavin says:

'There wont be a Negro school today for Aleck Sander to be going to so he can leave it at the jail. And even if there was I doubt if Paralee's going to let him cross the front yard inside the next week.' Then his uncle seemed even to have heard his father or at least decided to answer him: 'Nor any white school either for that matter if this boy hadn't listened to Lucas, which I wouldn't, and to Miss Habersham, which I didn't. Well?' his uncle said. 'Can you stay awake that long? You can get a nap once we are on the road.' (124- 25)

Gavin commands Aleck Sander to drive Miss Habersham's truck for his Negro school doesn't run that day. This shows that he is not allowed to read in the white school. Even if he is allowed he is treated separately. Aleck Sander, as a black boy, is considered not to read with the white students. He has to read with the same black

students who have quietly, distinct image, for whites. Hence, he reads in Negro school, which is other for white students.

When Vinson Gowrie's grave is dug up Jake Montgomery appears there. This makes Lucas free from his guilt and Crawford Gowrie is found out as an actual criminal. This is the revelation of mystery in which Lucas is wrongly blamed merely because of his so-called lower cast. In this context:

'It wasn't Lucas Beauchamp, Mr Gowrie,' the sheriff said. 'Jake Montgomery was at Vinson's funeral yesterday. And while Vinson was being buried Lucas Beauchamp was locked up in my jail in town.'

'I aint talking about Jake Montgomery, Shurf,' old Gowrie said.

'Neither am I, Mr Gowrie,' the sheriff said. 'Because it wasn't Lucas Beauchamp's old forty-one Colt that killed Vinson either.' (172)

Here, what Crawford had expected goes in vain. Now, what he had hoped turns into falsity. His expectation is just an assumption. Therefore, such assumption that Lucas killed a white man is not final truth. Rather it is falsely and, hence, linguistically constructed truth by white characters like Crawford Gowrie. Such constructed truth is solely based on binary opposition between people of white and black races. Thus, such constructed truth is not an absolute truth. In this context, the truth that tries to prove Vinson's murder is Crawford's false representation of Lucas. Therefore, he is misrepresenting Lucas, here. Through this misrepresentation, Crawford is trying to save his white image which is not assumed to murder a man. More than that, he is not supposed to kill his own brother just because he is a white. Since it was unbearable for him, he commits suicide after the revelation of reality that would efface his positive white image.

Once again, Lucas' other image is presented towards the end of the novel. His image is other especially to the white characters such as Charles and Gavin who present him negatively. In this image:

. . . Lucas came tie less and even collarless this time except for the button but with an old-time white waistcoat not soiled so much as stained under the black coat and the worn gold loop of the watchchain the same face which he had seen for the first time when he climbed dripping up out of the icy creek that morning four years ago. (232)

Lucas is wearing a white waistcoat which seems to be out of fashion, now. He is presented as a distinct man than others. He is still somewhat similar to his image which was known as 'other' four years ago. Thus, Faulkner's frequent highlighting upon Lucas' bad image signifies his emphasis upon white's good image.

IV. Conclusion

William Faulkner's novel *Intruder in the Dust* deals with various facets of racial matter. Problematic racial relationship, based on white people's assumption, is at the core of his novel. Such racial relationship occurs in different phases between white and black races. Whites are entirely keen towards the black people. They treat blacks as if they are, innately, weak and unintelligent. Through such inferior position of black people they place themselves in a superior position. They want to clarify their positive white image through black's poor condition. Miss Habersham's treatment of Lucas as a Negro whereas Gavin a man is one of the striking examples.

Faulkner, in his novel, refreshes the white character's image, mainly, through the inferiority of a black man, Lucas Beauchamp. However, he presents Charles Mallison, Gavin Stevens, Miss Habersham, Crawford Gowrie and almost all other white characters in a superior position in comparison to Lucas Beauchamp, Aleck Sander and other black people.

First of all, Lucas defends Charles from falling into an icy creek which is considered as a medium of relationship through which the latter appears as an actual defender. Lucas is, after all, made a saved man and Charles emerges as a saviour. Charles appears as a victorious man whereas Lucas is made a victim. So, Lucas' earlier positive role is easily shadowed by a chain of events and shifted to Charles.

Time and again, Charles identifies Lucas as other figure which indicates his desire of superiority. His othering tendency shows that he has a deeply rooted sense of superiority. Such a sense of superiority is always serving to degenerate a black man, Lucas. In this sense, Charles' act of helping Lucas is not an exchange of help but the search for superior position.

In the novel, Lucas is treated not as an individual but as a stereotype. His stereotypical image is distinct from those who are helping him. He is presented as a man who has no constant subjectivity. His true subjectivity is frequently, erased. He is identified with the constructed subjectivity. Such a denial of subjectivity shows the white character's desire for egalitarian society which is based on hierarchy between people of different races. Moreover, Lucas is a goddamn stinking nigger, for Gavin Stevens. Thus, he is addressed as a Negro by him. Furthermore, he is considered just as an object, not a man.

Law is an institution of exercising Gavin's power as a lawyer of superior race. It is working as a medium of imposing his personal interests. Law is not freely and fairly functioning in favour of black people like Lucas who is in need of justice. Hence, racial injustice is what Gavin Stevens as a white lawyer, advocating through the medium of law in the Southern America. This also shows that Southern America is not governed by rule of law.

Gavin as Charles' mouthpiece is very much active to help Lucas. Through this help he is performing his desired paternal role. He treats Lucas as if he has a responsibility to defend him. That is why, he openly says, 'I'm defending Lucas'. But indeed, reality is very far from what he says. Though Gavin makes Lucas free from being lynched he is misusing law. Gavin is investigating Lucas' case and advocating in favour of him to save the lives of poor white people. He is defending Lucas not because of his innocence but to save his own white benevolent image.

In this way, William Faulkner in his novel, *Intruder in the Dust* brushes up the white's image through the medium of discourse. That is why, Faulkner's narration, here, is none other than his discursive practice to refresh white people's positive image. Through such discursive practice a complexity is created which makes white

people represent the blacks. In this sense, the so-called reconciliation of the novel is just a biased treatment of Lucas, a black. Being a black, Lucas is blamed of killing a white to portray his cruel image as a murderer. Meanwhile, he is saved by white people especially Charles Mallison and Gavin Stevens to show that they have pitiful image.

Works Cited

- Achebe, Chinua. "An Image of Africa: Conrad's Heart of Darkness". *The Story and its Writer: An Introduction to Short Fiction*. Ed. Ann Charters. Boston: Bedford, 1995. 1373- 78.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Race". *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Eds. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Ashcroft, Bill et al. Eds. *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Barker, Chris. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage, 2000.
- Bulmer, Martin and John Solomos. "Introduction". *Racism*. London: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Derrida, Jacques "Differance". *Intellectual History Reader A Critical Introduction*. Ed. Beerendra Pandey. Kathmandu: M. K. Publishers and Distributors, 2005. 669- 700.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology*. New York: Verso, 1998.
- Fanon, Franz. *The Fact of Blackness*. London: Macgibbon, 1965.
- Faulkner, William. *Intruder in the Dust*. First published in 1948. Victoria: Penguin Books, 1960.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Trans. Sheridan Smith. London: Tavistic, 1972.
- - -. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History". Pandey, 2005. 81- 102.
- Fredrickson, George. "Social Origins of American Racism". *Racism*. Eds. Bulmer Martin and John Solomos. London: Oxford University Press, 1999. 70- 82.

- Frohock, W.M. "William Faulkner- the private vision". *The Novel of Violence in America*. Extended Ed. Dallas, Texas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1957. 144- 65.
- Gilroy, Paul. "The Whisper Wakes, the Shudder Plays: 'Race', Nation and Ethnic Absolutism". *Contemporary postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Padmini Mongia. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Graef, Ortwin De et al. Eds. "Fascist Politics and Literary Criticism". *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticisms*. Eds. Christa Knell Wolf and Christopher Norrison. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 71- 85.
- Hardwick, Elizabeth. "Faulkner and the South Today". *Faulkner: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Robert Penn Warren. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966. 226- 30.
- Horseman, Reginald. "Superior and Inferior Races". *Racism*. Eds. Bulmer Martin and John Solomos. London: Oxford University Press, 1999. 45- 49.
- Kerr, Kathleen. "Race, nation and ethnicity". *Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. 362- 85.
- L. C., Dunn. et al. "Appendix: Four Statements on the Race Question". *Race, Science and Society*. Ed. Leo Kuper. Paris: The Unesco Press, 1975. 341- 64.
- Millgate, Michael. *William Faulkner*. (Rev. Ed.) New York: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- Minter, David. "The Dark Years and Beyond". *William Faulkner*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980. 192- 219.
- Mosse, George. "Eighteenth Century Foundations". *Racism*. Ed. Bulmer and Solomos. London: Oxford University Press, 1999. 40- 44.

- Murfin, Ross and Supryia M. Ray. *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*. Boston, New York: Bedford Books, 1997.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "Truth and Falsity in an Ultramoral Sense". *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York: Harcourt Brace, Jovanovich, 1992. 634- 39.
- O'Conner, William Van. *William Faulkner*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963.
- Reed, Joseph W. Jr. "Faulkner's Failure: Intruder in the Dust, Requiem for a Nun and A Fable". *Faulkner's Narrative*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974. 201- 17.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1994.
- . "The World, the Text and the Critic". Ed. Hazard Adams, 1992. 1211- 22.
- Simpson, Lewis P. "Southern Fiction". *Harvard Guide to Contemporary American Writing*. Ed. David Hoffman. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979. 153- 90.
- Throp, Willard. "Southern Renaissance". *American Writing in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960. 233- 74.
- Wilson, Edmond. "William Faulkner's Reply to the Civil-Rights Program". *Faulkner: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Robert Penn Warren. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966. 219- 25.
- Wolfreys, Julian et al. Eds. *Key Concepts in Literary Theory*. Edinburgh University Press ltd., 2002.