

Hybridity as Instrument of Decolonization in Herman Melville's *Moby Dick*

Hajiali Sepahvand

English Department, Faculty of Arts, Borujerd Branch, Islamic Azad University, Borujerd, Iran

Email: Hajis106@gmail.com

Abstract—This study tries to show decolonization in Herman Melville's *Moby Dick*. Melville applies some narrative techniques which closely match those of the decolonization process. The narrative has a potentially representative content which opens one's horizons toward new sources of meaning and conceptual interpretation. The focal point, in this study, is to examine the decolonization level and its strategies as agency, abrogation, undermining, appropriation, multiculturalism and hybridity to see how tangibly these terms agree with the very context of the above-mentioned novel and to find out whether the purely abstract terms extracted from decolonization theory can be concretized in a practical form. Furthermore, this study aims at scrutinizing in detail the frequency and the possibility of the decolonization in the very fabric and texture of fictional narrative of colonized nations in general.

Index Terms—abrogation, agency, appropriation, decolonization, multiculturalism, hybridity

I. INTRODUCTION

The study starts with a brief introduction to decolonization, its strategies, hybridity and the analysis of Herman Melville's novel, *Moby Dick* by tracing the above mentioned elements as decolonization in it.

II. DECOLONIZATION AND ITS STRATEGIES IN LITERATURE

As the very practical advantage of post-colonial discourse, decolonization is the only process of removing the heavy exploitation of empire colonization which is the invaded of the colonized countries both culturally and naturally. But to comprehend decolonization as the central concern of the article, at first it is reasonable to discuss the notion of decolonization itself. Then, various kinds of decolonization including Early, Present, in Settlers and Invaded colonies as well as strategies, and colonies will be delivered. Consequently, decolonization in the settler colonies will be followed by analysis of Herman Melville's novel, *Moby Dick* as the embodiment of this process.

A. A Glance on Decolonization

Decolonization, in general, is a revolt, whether implicit or explicit, against imperial axiomatically legitimized domination. In other words, it is a kind of awareness against oppression and inferiority like what was done in Marxist movement against master class by slaves (working class) or by Feminist against patriarchal societies. Being different in various involvement and engagement stages, like them, decolonization is divided into two waves: the early phase, as will be referred to in the next parts, which was put forward by African decolonizers derived from the works of political theorists like Frantz Fanon (1959, 1961, 1967) and Albert Memmi (1965) who located its principal characteristic in the notion of the imperial-colonial (colonizer-colonized) dialectic itself. In this respect, The early involvement and engagement of decolonization as Ashcroft (2007) puts, is 'a profound complicity with the imperial powers from which they sought to emerge as free agents' (p.56), that is, freedom and emancipation as free subject. Fanon, writing in the 1950s during the Algerian struggle for independence from French colonial rule, through psychoanalysis of colonial subject produced the ways in which the colonial subject's identity is constructed by the colonist. In his famous and influential essay (Fanon, 1986, pp.109–40), Fanon shows the effects of racism on the construction of the subject and the production of identity. In this essay which is an interior monologue, Fanon (1986) uses the constructed identity of the oppressed narrator by the racist oppressors as: "Dirty nigger!", "Negro!" and eventually he puts this construction as the construction of an object among the other objects not a subject:

'I came into the world imbued with the will to find a meaning in things, my spirit filled with the desire to attain to the source of the world, and then I found I was an object in the midst of other objects. Sealed into this crushing objecthood, I turned beseechingly to others.... I stumbled, and the movements, the attitudes, the glances of the other fixed me there, in the sense in which a chemical solution is fixed by a dye. I was indignant; I demanded an explanation. Nothing happened. I burst apart. Now the fragments have been put together again by another self (p. 109).

On the whole, early decolonization seeks to invert the structures of domination and substituting the tradition of the colonized nations in place of imperial-dominated canon. Therefore, the early decolonization is dialectic of subject/object, self/other which is resulted in a national revolt and in Parry (1987) term 'nationalist liberationist narratives'... (p.37).

But in the present or advanced wave decolonization criticism is extended by Edward Said into the area of challenging and undermining absolute and axiomatic principles upon which the world classification into superiority of the occident and inferiority of the orient are established. Such classifications in Said's (1978) view are man-made, not absolute (p. 5); therefore, they are used for domination by Europe. Thus, decolonization has turned away from simple inversions towards a questioning of forms and modes, to unmasking the assumptions upon which such canonical constructions are founded in a way that it moves first to make their cryptic bases visible and then destabilizes them as Ashcroft (2007) puts it:

'decolonization is the process of revealing and dismantling colonialist power in all its forms. This includes dismantling the hidden aspects of those institutional and cultural forces that had maintained the colonialist power and that remain even after political independence is achieved. Initially, in many places in the colonized world, the process of resistance was conducted in terms or institutions appropriated from the colonizing culture itself... (P. 56-7).

B. *The Setter and Invaded Colonies*

Complexity of imperialist strategies and different geographical location of colonized countries calls the necessary of various kinds of colonization and colonies. In other words, regarding its benefits and revenues, Imperialism invades some countries, while at the same times, as Ashcroft (2004) puts, it occupies the others:

'...the settler colonies and the invaded colonies. In the case of the settler colonies like the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, land was occupied by European colonists who dispossessed and overwhelmed the Indigenous populations.... invaded societies like those in India or Nigeria, where indigenous peoples were colonized on their own territories'... (p.24).

In both cases, empire imposes its own superiority and domination through its language. This triumph is achieved through introducing English as intermediate and standard language and the writers are the subjects upon whom empire does it. Explaining this phenomenon, Maxwell (1965) demonstrates it as:

'there are two broad categories. In the first, the writer brings his own language – English – to an alien environment and a fresh set of experiences: Australia, Canada, New Zealand. In the other, the writer brings an alien language – English – to his own social and cultural inheritance: India, West Africa. Yet the categories have a fundamental kinship. . . . (pp. 82–3).

However, empire knows how to control and invade each nation.

C. *Decolonization and Its Strategies in The Setter Colonies*

As was discussed, in the settler colonies like the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, land was occupied by European colonists, who dispossessed and overwhelmed the Indigenous populations. Therefore, in these colonies, decolonization which is possible through Agency, Nationalism, Appropriation and Abrogation is different from the invaded colonies. In such colonies, according to Ashcroft (2004),

the first task seems to be to establish that the texts can be shown to constitute a literature separate from that of the metropolitan centre. A vast and impressive body of literary histories, thematic studies, and studies of individual literary traditions has accrued over the last one hundred and fifty years or so in the white cultures of settler colonies. The task of compiling a national literary history has usually been an important element in the establishment of an independent cultural identity (p.131).

This decolonization which was the concern of early decolonizers can be seen in H.M. Green(1961); Carl F. Klinck (1965), a large body of text in the United State (Russell Reising, 1978), and many others. Thus, the early stage of decolonization is a kind of consciousness through which settler colonized people perceive themselves as individuals who can freely and autonomously initiate action and construct their own identity, that is, Agency, which in Ashcroft's (2007) view

'refers to the ability to act or perform an action. In contemporary theory, it hinges on the question of whether individuals can freely and autonomously initiate action, or whether the things they do are in some sense determined by the ways in which their identity has been constructed. Agency is particularly important in post-colonial theory because it refers to the ability of post-colonial subjects to initiate action in engaging or resisting imperial power' (p.6).

In the later stages some decolonizers try to develop their self- assertion through independent national literature in a controversial way as in L. Kramer (1981), W.H. New (1989), and Charles Brockden Brown (1799) in America. But, the problem to which they meet is lack of a national and local language as their own language. In other words, the language through which they want to establish and express a separated independent national cultural identity is metropolitan language:

'The colonial writer does not have words of his own....Try to speak the words of your home and you will discover – if you are a colonial – that you do not know them... perhaps our job was not to fake a space of our own and write it up, but rather to find words for our space-lessness... Instead of pushing against the grain of an external, uncharged language, perhaps we should finally come to writing *with* that grain' (Lee 1974, pp.162,163).

Therefore, the real concern is the control over the means of communication, that is, power of writing in the colonial situation as has been discussed in *The Conquest of America* by Tzvetan Todorov (1974). But how is it possible while the only dominant language as the medium of power is the language of the centre? In other words, post-colonial writing only can define itself by seizing the language of the centre: 'The crucial function of language as a medium of power

demands that post-colonial writing defines itself by seizing the language of the centre and re-placing it in a discourse fully adapted to the colonized place' (Ashcroft, 2002, p.37). It is because language is the medium through which a hierarchical structure of power is perpetuated, and conceptions of truth, order, and reality become established. Post-colonial writing is going to reject such power and; therefore, post-colonial writing is the process by which the language, with its power, and the writing, with its signification of authority, has been seized from the dominant European culture. Post-colonial writing does this through two process of

"the abrogation or denial of the privilege of 'English' involves a rejection of the metropolitan power over the means of communication" and "the appropriation and reconstitution of the language of the centre, the process of capturing and remoulding the language to new usages, marks a separation from the site of colonial privilege. Abrogation is a refusal of the categories of the imperial culture, its aesthetic, its illusory standard of normative or 'correct' usage, and its assumption of a traditional and fixed meaning 'inscribed' in the words. It is a vital moment in the de-colonizing of the language and the writing of 'english', but without the process of appropriation the moment of abrogation may not extend beyond a reversal of the assumptions of privilege, the 'normal', and correct inscription, all of which can be simply taken over and maintained by the new usage (Ashcroft *et al.*, 2004, p. 37).

Therefore, post-colonial text is itself a site of struggle for linguistic control which is resulted in the appropriating discourse. This struggle extends to the disputes concerning theme, form, genre definition, implicit systems of manner, custom, and value.

Now, the question is that may we say that language constitutes reality? Paradoxically, it should be said that yes! But where is the center of reality, that is, its axiomatic center according which the other realities by other languages are constructed? The answer is that there is not any centre of reality just as there is not any pre-given unmediated reality and control over the means of communication determines the center of reality; therefore, the colonized nations through appropriation of language of metropolitan centre-- 'to convey in a language that is not one's own the spirit that is one's own' (Rao, 1938, p.vii), or makes it 'bear the burden' of one's own cultural experience (Achebe, 1975, p. 62)-- and self-assertion abrogate its centrality and they define themselves as the centre and they may reconstruct reality according to their own pattern of conventions, expectations, and experiences, that is, establishment of the link between the received English and place or in Emerson's phrase, , their 'original relation with the universe' (Emerson, 1836,p.21).

In a sense, eventually, abrogation through appropriation, which was operated by some decolonizers, is a kind of deconstruction. Because they use language in a way which disrupts its binary strurcturation. This pattern of binary structuration in European and many other languages, for such critics among whom Wilson Harris (1985) is well known, lies at the root of the continual pattern of conquest and domination that has formed the structure of human history; therefore, tracing *aporia* in such a pattern is possible.

D. Decolonization in the Invaded Colonies

Regarding the cases of invaded colonies, decolonization, as was discussed in previous parts, was at first a national movement against colonization by imperialism. Therefore, it was an anti-colonialism movement which was shared by all invaded colonies. Like other movements it was changing and taking many forms so that it could get the freedom of its agents. This procedure has been presented by Ashcroft (2007) as:

'...sometimes associated with an ideology of racial liberation, as in the case of nineteenth-century West African nationalists such as Edward Wilmot Blyden and James Africanus Horton (ideologies that might be seen as the precursors of twentieth-century movements such as *négritude*). Conversely, it may accompany a demand for a recognition of cultural differences on a broad and diverse front, as in the Indian National Congress which sought to unite a variety of ethnic groups with different religious and racial identities in a single, national independence movement. In the second half of the twentieth century, anti-colonialism was often articulated in terms of a radical, Marxist discourse of liberation, and in constructions that sought to reconcile the internationalist and anti-*ditist* demands of Marxism with the nationalist sentiments of the period (National Liberation Fronts), in the work and theory of early national liberationist thinkers such as C.L.R.James, Amilcar Cabral and Frantz Fanon, ... (p. 12).

All highlighted points of this quotation as ideology of racial liberation, recognition of cultural differences, radical, Marxist discourse of liberation are different faces of freedom and emancipation from domination of Imperialism. But the radical question here is that how such emancipation is possible? In other words, how can such nations get their radical liberation while domination of Imperialism is influential everywhere and in every field, that is, culture, tradition, routine life and social conduct? The answer is, at first, implicit in a return to pre-colonial languages. Mostly, as Ashcroft (2004) refers to, in invaded colonized as: 'African countries and in India, that is in post-colonial countries where viable alternatives to english continue to exist, an appeal for a return to writing exclusively, or mainly in the pre-colonial languages has been a recurring feature of calls for decolonization' (p.29). Another important basis of decolonization or liberation from domination of Imperialism is recognition of cultural differences which is a kind of cultural and mental decolonization. This is the consequent of the return to pre-colonial language what is in Ashcroft's (2007) view 'a return to indigenous languages can restructure attitudes to the local and the indigenous cultures.... Thus, decolonizing processes that have advocated a return to indigenous language use have involved both a social programme to democratize culture and a programme of cultural recuperation and re-evaluation (p.57).

III. MULTICULTURALISM AND HYBRIDITY AS INSTRUMENTS OF DECOLONIZATION IN MELVILLE'S *MOBY DICK*

Dialectic of pure and hybrid is another instrument by which the colonized countries and nations declare their national and cultural identities. Because of hybridity in the Post-colonial society, Post-colonial nations, in the moment of agency and self-apprehension, overtly establish and introduce their own cultural model which covers all various and multi-cultures as well as this new comer, that is, hybrid culture; therefore, they break away from European domination and excel it, containing a higher capacity as in Canada and America it was introduced as mosaic and melting-pot:

...Clash of the 'pure' and the 'hybrid', is well illustrated by the contradictions that have arisen in the Canadian situation. In Canada, where the model of the 'mosaic' has been an important cultural determinant, Canadian literary theory has, in breaking away from European domination, generally retained a nationalist stance, arguing for the mosaic as characteristically Canadian in contrast to the 'melting-pot' of the USA (Ashcroft 2002, p.34).

It is to say that this cultural hybrid model is not the consequence of absolutely independence and development, but it is the very inevitably nature and result of colonial and postcolonial co-existence. In other words, supplying a space for hybridity in the scheme of things by post-colonial countries as America or Canada is the sign of open-minded culture and society and the instrument of self-assertion as well as its superiority. The critic who has discussed this notion is Homi k. Bhabha whose work (1994) puts forward the space in which the hybrid culture is constructed:

It is significant that the productive capacities of this Third Space have a colonial or postcolonial provenance. For a willingness to descend into that alien territory... may open the way to conceptualizing an *international* culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the *diversity* of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's *hybridity*. To that end we should remember that it is the '*inter*'- the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the in-between space- that carries the burden and meaning of culture (Bhabha 1994: 38)

Thus, Bhabha distinguishes multiculturalism and culture's *hybridity*. For Bhabha, this "Third Space" is what makes the notion of hybridity so important and makes "envisaging national, anti-nationalist histories of the 'people' possible and through exploring it we "may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the other of our selves." Empire authority anxiety is the very consequent of this hybridity which is the ambivalent position for undermining the monolithic hierarchical purity of culture, that is, Good European/Evil Non-European cultures.

Hybridity is a central motif of the novel through which Melville establishes Melting Pot or the Myth of America which has supplied a position for hybridity in the scheme of things. In the novel there is the hybridities of Queequeg /Ishmael through which Melville deliberately shows American superiority and disrupts the apparently axiomatic signifiatory system of Europe which has invested itself with absolute authority over the rest of the world.

Hybridity, in general, is the mixing of separate elements into one whole and in the novel it usually occurs when Queequeg and Ishmael as two races intersect. Part of Ishmael success comes from his ability to combine elements of the European (civilization) and Indian worlds (so-called savagery). In other words, Ishmael as a hybrid white figure has absorbed an Indian's sympathy from Queequeg and a white man's desire to introduce his own culture. With Queequeg and Ishmael, Melville challenges the idea that essential differences separate the two cultures which is like what has been discussed by Ashcroft (2004) as: "...the strength of post-colonial theory may well lie in its inherently comparative methodology and the hybridized and syncretic view of the modern world which this implies. This view provides a framework of 'difference on equal terms' within which multi-cultural theories, both within and between societies, may continue to be fruitfully explored (p.35)." This difference on equal terms is the alternative for "destructive cultural encounter (35)." Through depictions of hybridity maybe Melville, following Cooper, predicts the nineteenth century's extensive debate on the term's cultural and scientific meanings. The term "hybridity" became popular at the end of the nineteenth century, when rapid developments in genetics occurred. Melville greatness and genius is confirmed in our contemporary times by highlighting cross-culturality as the last solution for inevitably social and cultural challenges and struggle of human for a peaceful coexistence:

'both literary theorists and cultural historians are beginning to recognize cross-culturality as the potential termination point of an apparently endless human history of conquest and annihilation justified by the myth of group 'purity', and as the basis on which the post-colonial world can be creatively stabilized. In the same way the poles of governor-governed, ruler-ruled, etc. are inverted and the concept of dominance as the principal regulator of human societies is recognized but challenged' (p.35)

Moreover, hybridity of Queequeg /Ishmael is the challenging monolithic purity of racism or decolonization, that is, abrogation of European Superiority as pure privileged culture. It is operated through unification of pagan Queequeg and Ishmael as a kind of implicitly symbolic hybridity. Analyzing process of ambivalence in the relation between colonizer and colonized, Ashcroft relates it to hybridity which disables monolithic dominance; consequently, undermines and abrogates its authority:

The concept is related to **hybridity** because, just as ambivalence 'decentres' authority from its position of power, so that authority may also become hybridized when placed in a colonial context in which it finds itself dealing with, and often inflected by, other cultures.... In this respect, the very engagement of colonial discourse with those colonized cultures over which it has domination, inevitably leads to an ambivalence that disables its monolithic dominance. (2007, p.11)

The implicit hybridization of these characters occurs when Ishmael and Queequeg sleep in one bed and Ishmael, in the morning, while "waking up and seeing Queequeg's pagan arm thrown round me.For though I tried to move his arm—unlock his bridegroom clasp—yet, sleeping as he was, he still hugged me tightly, as though naught but death

should part us twain (Ch. 3, p.21).” Ishmael pessimistically justifies this unification ...”there is no place like a bed for confidential disclosures between friends. Man and wife, they say, there open the very bottom of their souls to each other; and some old couples often lie and chat over old times till nearly morning. Thus, then, in our hearts’ honeymoon, lay I and Queequeg—a cosy, loving pair (p.41).”

This is a hybridity because two men are completely opposites: one civilized; the other a barbarian. Even the fact that Queequeg is dark and painted and Ishmael is fair seems to highlight this oppositeness. And, in truth, the two men are opposites—in every way but the soul. If we scratch away the superficial descriptors, we see in chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7 that each man is, essentially, like the other. Both are tolerant, both are decent. Both are forever helpful, and both are gentle people in an essentially brutal environment. Ishmael and Queequeg are universal characters (Americanhood) that portray the best in man, that is, America as melting pot and establishment of hybridity which violates axiomatically superiority of European and the White. This melting Pot and hybridity is embodied in one bed for two persons who even do not know each others and in the end of the novel, that is Queequeg who indirectly saves Ishmael: “the [Queequeg]coffin like-buoy shot lengthwise from the sea, fell over, and floated by my side (p.460).”

Exaggerating Queequeg’s ideal characteristics, Ishmael concludes that “Queequeg was George Washington cannibalistically Developed.... his very indifference speaking a nature in which there lurked no civilized hypocrisies and bland deceits (p. 40).” Thus, he links him to George Washington whom we know as American hero, quest, and savior and far away from civilization hypocrisies, that is, the son of pure nature or wilderness. They develop this syncretism when they bond by sharing a pipe of Queequeg’s Tobacco “soon I proposed a social smoke; and, producing his pouch and tomahawk, he quietly offered me a puff. And then we sat exchanging puffs from that wild pipe of his, and keeping it regularly passing between us (p.40).”

Ishmael enhances this unity when even joins the pagan in a burnt offering to Yoyo:

I was a good Christian; born and bred in the bosom of the infallible Presbyterian Church. How then could I unite with this wild idolator in worshipping his piece of wood? But what is worship? thought I. Do you suppose now, Ishmael, that the magnanimous God of heaven and earth—pagans and all included—can possibly be jealous of an insignificant bit of black wood? Impossible! But what is worship?—to do the will of God— that is worship. And what is the will of God?—to do to my fellow man what I would have my fellow man to do to me— that is the will of God. Now, Queequeg is my fellow man. And what do I wish that this Queequeg would do to me? Why, unite with me in my particular Presbyterian form of worship. consequently, i must then unite with him in his; ergo, I must turn idolator. So I kindled the shavings; helped prop up the innocent little idol; offered him burnt biscuit with Queequeg; salamed before him twice or thrice; kissed his nose; and that done, we undressed and went to bed, at peace with our own consciences and all the world (p. 40).

The narrator Ishmael justifies his behavior by an allusion to the Golden Rule, which urges us to do unto others as we would want them to do unto us (Matthew 7:12). Opening his mind to religion is an important step for Ishmael, one which Queequeg took by leaving his home to sail the world and learn of Christians. The narrator mentions that both men are discovering that evil exists among Christians at least as much as among pagans. While this knowledge is somewhat disillusioning, it also expands their outlook and leads to a kind of wisdom that narrower minds miss. They are challenging Christians and they believe relativity of sin and guiltiness of man which is an open-minding belief; moreover, Ishmael, in the end of novel, becomes a person who is a mixture of the barbarian, Queequeg’s good features as nobility..., and a civilized man as he is; thus, Melville centralizes his novel on Americanhood who is a mixture and unity of a white and dark person like what was done by Cooper in the unity of Hawkeye and Chingachgook and their final watering Uncas grave as the favorite of future of America.

Ishmael and Queequeg are unified quest in the search of truth of the rest of the world and in Rosenberg terms “to instruct members of the community in the attitudes and behavior necessary to function successfully in that particular culture (hero myth and epics) (p.xvi), because they are characters who can and do grow and change. As we are informed in the novel Queequeg is a native of Kokovoko (called Rokovoko in some chapters), an island in the South Pacific where his father was king and his uncle a high priest. Queequeg as a Quest left his native island of Kokovoko to learn about the rest of the world. Ishmael has similar motives for his ventures. Motivation of these heroisms and mythologies is activation of Jungian (1968) Archetypal Tendency of Quest and Heroism consciously, that is, establishment of American Mythology which has been depicted in the novel in the form of crossing conventional boundaries as a metaphor of crossing limitations of European Knowledge and identification of the frontier landscape through Queequeg /Ishmael actions. Both understand that people from different cultures can learn from each other, and both value their differences as well as their similarities. An example is their respect for each other’s religion. What they discover is that a man’s soul is more important than his appearance or even his religion.

Ishmael has sensed his friend’s noble spirit, with or without the pedigree. In fact, almost immediately Ishmael recognizes Queequeg’s noble character, noting that he “treated me with so much civility and consideration, while I was guilty of great rudeness (p.22).” Queequeg is a synthesis of all racial and ethnic characteristics; that is, he is a symbol of all mankind. Queequeg uncovers this capacity as a universal man- melting pot in chapter XII when he recalls two anecdotes revealing cultural differences and relativity of social conventions (pp. 47-8). In chapters IV to VII we are informed that certain cultural distinctions broaden the two men’s insights towards a melting pot in which cultural blunders depend so much on one’s point of view, that is, relativity which is resulted in directing both men to the

positive possibilities of diversity. As a result, the novel is proposing American culture of cross-culturality as the norm of social community in which hybridity, also, has a position in its scheme of things, that is, abrogating the dominant European mono-dimensional culture.

IV. CONCLUSION

A number of decolonization techniques in this article were applied to Herman Melville's novel, *Moby Dick* to see how decolonization can be accounted for in terms of literary development.

The early American literature, including political allegory, morality and satire were borrowed from European literature frame, resulted in the primary cornerstone of decolonization, that is, Agency, especially cultural agency, and appropriation of English language as the best instrumental advantage for self-assertion which is decolonization of content and challenging their own inferiority.

In *Moby Dick*, the decolonization was strategically and essentially used in the various ways. The focal point is that the novel is symbolically replete with hybridity as one of its central theme. In the beginning chapters this hybridity is evident. Therefore, decolonization through hybridity at least can be applied to this American novel.

Symbolically hybridity of Queequeg /Ishmael is purposely challenge of European axiomatically cultural superiority in the novel by Melville in a way that thoughtful readers will notice its significance as soon as they start reading the novel. In this hybridity, the spiritual unity of two men who are completely opposites has been depicted: one civilized; the other a barbarian. Even the fact that Queequeg is dark and painted and Ishmael is fair seems to highlight this "oppositeness." And, in truth, the two men are opposites—in every way but the soul.

To actualize abrogation of the absolutely monolithic pure culture of Europe, we proposed the very plot of this novel as American melting pot which contains multiculturalism a part of which is hybridity through the masterly spiritual and physical heroism and the high capacity of Queequeg /Ishmael.

The worthy of note point is that Ishmael and Queequeg, whose particular attitudes and behaviors are Melville's purposely and symbolically establishment of the prototype ideal American individual and the challenging monolithic purity of racism or decolonization, that is, abrogation of European Superiority as pure privileged culture, are unified quest in the search of truth of the rest of the world because they are characters who can and do grow and change. Both are forever helpful, and both are gentle people in an essentially brutal environment. Ishmael and Queequeg are universal characters that portray the best in man, that is, America as melting pot and establishment of hybridity which violates axiomatically superiority of European and the White. Actually, they are the matured and self-reliance characters. Thus, abrogating and undermining European literature and characters as the universal superior literature and characters or declaration of independence of America through literature, that is, decolonization is centralized.

REFERENCES

- [1] Achebe, Chinua. (1975). *Morning Yet on Creation Day*. New York: Doubleday.
- [2] Ashcroft, W.D., Griffiths, Gareth and Tiffin, Helen. (2004). *The Empire Writes Back*. London: Routledge.
- [3] Ashcroft et al. (2007). *Post-colonial Studies, The Key Concepts*, Routledge, Taylor & Francis e-Library, p. 3,4, 12,57, 56, .
- [4] Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [5] Brockden Brown, Charles. (1973). *Edgar Huntly*. Ed. David Stineback. New Haven: College and University.
- [6] Emerson, Ralph, Waldo. (1836). 'Nature' in Stephen E. Whicher (ed.). *Selections from Ralph Waldo Emerson*. Boston, MS: Houghton Mifflin. 1956.
- [7] Fanon, Frantz. (1959). *Studies in a Dying Colonialism*. Trans. H. Chevalier. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.
- [8] Fanon, Frantz. (1961). *The Wretched of the Earth*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- [9] Fanon, Frantz. (1967). *Black Skin. White Masks*. New York: Grove Press.
- [10] Fiedler, Leslie. (1960). *Love and Death in the American Novel*. New York: Dell.
- [11] Fussell, Edwin. (1965). *Frontier: American Literature and the American West*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- [12] Fender, Stephen. (1992). *Sea Changes: British Emigration & American Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- [13] Fanon, Frantz. (1986). *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann, London: Pluto Press.
- [14] Fanon, Frantz. (1952). *Black Skin White Masks* (trans. Charles Lam Markmann). London: Paladin [1968].
- [15] Green, H.M. (1961). *A History of Australian Literature*, 2 vols., Sydney: Angus and Robertson
- [16] Guerin, Wilfred L. (2005). *A Hand Book of Critical Approaches to Literature*. Oxford University Press.
- [17] Harris, Wilson. (1985). 'Adversarial contexts and creativity', *New Left Review*, 154 (Nov.–Dec.).
- [18] Jung, C. G. (1968). *Man and his Symbols*, London: Adus.
- [19] Klinck, Carl F. (1965). *Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English*, 3 vols, Toronto/London: University of Toronto Press.
- [20] Kramer, L. (ed.) (1981). *The Oxford History of Australian Literature*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- [21] Lee, Dennis. (1974). 'Cadence, country, silence: writing in colonial space', *Boundary 2*, 3, 1 (Fall).
- [22] Lewis, R. W.B. (1908). *The American Adam*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [23] Maxwell, D.E.S. (1965). 'Landscape and Theme' in Press 1965.
- [24] Melville Herman. (1936). *Moby Dick or the White Whale*, Spenser press.
- [25] Memmi, Albert. (1965). *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (trans. HowardGreenfield). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- [26] Memmi, Albert. (1965). *The Coloniser and the Colonised*. New York: Orion Press.
- [27] NEW WORLD BIBLE TRANSLATION COMMITTEE: (1984). *New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures*.

- [28] New, W.H. (1989). *A History of Canadian Literature*. London: Macmillan.
- [29] Parry, Benita. (1987). 'Problems in current theories of colonial discourse', *Oxford Literary Review*, 9, nos 1 & 2.
- [30] Rao, Raja. (1938). *Kanthapura*. New York: New Directions.
- [31] Reising, Russell. (1987). *The Unusable Past: Theory and the Study of American Literature*. New York and London: Methuen (New Accents).
- [32] Roderick, Colin (ed.) (1972). *Henry Lawson: Short Stories and Sketches 1888–1922*. Vol. 1 of *Collected Prose*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
- [33] Roosenberg Donna. (1986). *World Mythology*, NTC Publishing Group, Lincolnwood, Illinois USA.
- [34] Said, Edward. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
- [35] Stow, Randolph. (1979). *Visitants*. London: Picador.
- [36] Todorov, Tzvetan. (1974). *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Harper and Row 1982.
- [37] Tutuola, Amos. (1952). *The Palm-Wine Drinkard*. London: Faber & Faber.

Hajiali Sepahvand is an instructor at Payame Nor University, Khoram Abad, Iran. His main areas of research are Criticism, Novel and drama. He holds a B. A. and M.A in English Language and Literature and he is pursuing his studies in PhD level at National Academy of Sciences in Armenia.