

UNIVERSITY KASDI MERBAH OUARGLA

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of Foreign Languages

English Section



Dissertation

Academic Master

Domain: Letters and Foreign Language

Field: Anglo-Saxon Literature

Submitted by: Abdelhak Korichi

Title:

Deconstruction: Binary Opposition in the Great Gatsby

Publically defended

On 09/06/2014

Before the Jury

President: Mr. Doufan.

UKM-Ouargla

Supervisor: Mrs. Sadoun.

UKM-Ouargla

Examiner: Mr. Bourahla.

UKM-Ouargla

Academic year: 2013-2014

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my parents,
brothers and sisters, my friends not to forget.

It is also dedicated to people wrote books, died without knowing
whose life they enlightened. To my instructors who have been polishing the
way of knowledge and therefore life itself.

Acknowledgment

This work would not have taken place in concreteness without

His Mighty.

My parents have the gratitude and the debt never could paid, my being is

for theirs.

I want to express gratitudes for my supervisor Mrs. Sadoun for her patience with me, I have learnt a lot. I want to thank my colleagues who have been gracious and supportive, Mr. Kentaoui, Khaled Korich, Ben Moussa El Hadj

Moussa, Youcef Medaken and others.

Abstract

In this research, we attempt to account for the prerequisite groundings of theories before Deconstruction, groundings such as the metaphysical thought and how they, the theories, explicate natural phenomenon and then move on to see how Deconstruction explicates human experience and the metaphysics of presence and “the future of the manifest presence” (Derrida. 1981). The main purpose of this study, however, is to show how texts are analyzed using Binary Opposition which makes use of contradicted terms in a literary text the Great Gatsby by F. Scott Fitzgerald to reveal the ideology and criticize them to break the hierarchy or privilege in this text. Deconstruction shows how one term is superior to the other and shows how this classification is spurious. The study concludes that it shows adequacy inasmuch as ideological investigation is concerned. It also arrives at final that Binary Opposition is a workable tool for critical thinking as it leaves out no blind spots in the text in hand, however, that does not do in all cases. Finally, Binary Opposition of Deconstruction does not have a paradigm specific to show where to oppose, is also a final finding.

Key words: Deconstruction, Binary Opposition, ideology, the Great Gatsby, text, meaning.

ملخص

تحاول كل نظرية في الأدب إن تقدم شروحا في وظيفة اللغة وكيفية التواصل وبناء المعاني في عمليات التواصل. ظهرت النظرية التفكيكية سنوات الستينات لتعيد هيكلة الفلسفة الأوروبية ومعها الفكر و المبادئ التي سيطرت على الفكر الغربي ابتداء من الفكر اليوناني الكلاسيكي إلى بدايات القرن العشرين. في هاته الفترة سيطرت أفكار اليونانيين وسلم بها إلى أن جاء "جاكس ديريدا". كان من بين هاته الأمور مثلا سبق الكلام للكتابة واعتقد ذلك لاعتبار الكلام يعبر مباشرة عما يجول في الفكر. كما اعتقد أيضا أن اللغة هي الأداة المثلى للتواصل وان الأخير يتكون من الدال والمدلول. هذا بالإضافة عدد من الأفكار التي هيمنت على الفكر الغربي واستمر الحال إلى دو سيسير. في سنوات الستينات وجدت هذه النظريات و الأفكار من يضع حدا لهيمنتها. جاء جاكس ديريدا ليقدّم أفكاره الجديدة في كتابه "في القوا عدية" و يعتبر هذا الكتاب من بين أهم كتبه. في هذه المذكرة نسعى إلى أن نذكر بوجازة أهم مبادئ النظريات قبل التفكيكية. نظريات مثل الميتافيزيقيا وكيف تستخدم كل نظرية مبادئها لإزالة الإبهام عما شكل من الأمور لنتطرق بعدها إلى النظرية التفكيكية لنرى كيف تعيد صياغة الأفكار الغربية القديمة. يكمن الهدف الأهم في هذه الدراسة في كيفية تحليل النصوص باستخدام النظرية السالفة الذكر و بالتحديد المعارضة الثنائية. هذه المنهجية تعتمد على استخراج الكلمات المتضادة في النص و تبين كيف ان واحدا من هذه الألفاظ الازدواجية تعتبر أولى من الأخرى من حيث سيرانها في فكر المجتمع. هذه المنهجية سنستخدمها لتبيين مبادئ المجتمع الأمريكي في القرن العشرين. لأجل ذلك اخترنا رواية "غاتسبي الرائع" رواية للمؤلف الأمريكي فرانسيس سكوت فيتزجيرالد. نتوصل في النهاية الى ان المعارضة الثنائية منهجية فعالة في سياقات مشابهة لهذا السياق. كما نبين ان هذه المنهجية لاتعتمد على سياقات أو مناهج معينة وإنما كل السياقات مما يحتسب ضدها.

كلمات مفتاحية النظرية التفكيكية, المعارضة الثنائية, المبادئ, النص, المعنى, غاتسبي الرائع.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	I
Dedication.....	II
Acknowledgments.....	III
Table of contents.....	IV
Chapter the first: Deconstruction: The Theory	
Introduction to the study	1
Introduction	4
1.1The foregrounds of Deconstruction	4
1.2 Language for Deconstructionists	7
1.2.1 Binary Opposition	11
1.3 The World for Deconstruction	14
1.4 Deconstruction and other literary theories	16
1.5Criticism of Deconstruction	18
Conclusion	
Chapter the second: Deconstruction: Practicality	
Introduction	21
2.1 Francis Scott Fitzgerald	21
2.2 Twentieth century America: the Jazz Age	24
2.3 Corpus Description	26
2.3.1 The Great Gatsby	24
2.3.2 Major characters in the Great Gatsby	29
2.4.1 Plot analysis of the Great Gatsby	30
2.4.2 Symbolism in the Great Gatsby	31
2.4.3 Themes in the Great Gatsby	32
2.5 Deconstructive Reading of the Great Gatsby	33
2.5.1 Binary Opposition in the Great Gatsby	35
2.5.2 Reading of the Great Gatsby	35
2.5.3 The counter Reading of the Great Gatsby	38
conclusion	41
General Conclusion	42
Bibliography	

Chapter the first

Deconstruction: The theory

Chapter the first: Deconstruction: The theory

Introduction

1.1 The foregrounds of Deconstruction

1.2 Language for Deconstructionists

1.2.1 Binary Opposition

1.3 The World for Deconstruction

1.4 Deconstruction and other literary theories

1.5 Criticism of Deconstruction

Conclusion

Introduction

It is the aim of these papers to trace back the development of the theory of Deconstruction and how it expounds natural phenomenon. Phenomenon being all that which have been the concern of theorists and created wonder such as human experience and language and subsequently literature. The extent to which this theory influenced and gained acceptance will also take place. Focus will be given to Derrida's influential thoughts that established the theory of Deconstruction and also to Binary Opposition for it is the procedure which proves the theory's assumption to language.

1-1 The Foregrounds of Deconstructionism

Literary Theory's main concern is to unravel the ways by which people make use of language in order to make meaning. It gives a set of principles by which language functions as a tool of communication, how the last is processed and in what manner it is received.

Since the seventeenth century a number of thoughts and principles shaped Western thinking. It had for quite a time believed that the world is presented in human mind and that explains how we speak, understand and engage in communication. Beliefs as such would be generalized to view the world from. This position entailed philosophers to relate presentations to their social, cultural and moral importance and also positioned them as judges of goodness and beauty. These credos were employed not in philosophy only but rather generalized to Literary Theory (Rotry.1979). Such kinds of thought were the unarguably immediate influence of Plato who presented "answers" to current issues. Plato's thoughts had influence to the Enlightenments such as Descartes Kant and others.

Humanists, Descartes in particular, insisted that knowledge comes from within to everyone who did not have mental disturbances as long as human subjectivity was the fountain of beliefs and validations. Kant carried this self-consciousness to a transcendental level and stated that "subject of knowledge becomes abstract mind or reason, a reconstruction of the cognitive capacities of human or rational beings in general. Therefore it is the subject that is prioritized as generative and the same can paralleled about literature as the author is the center and he is conscious of that which he writes. The author has a purpose of writing a text that is absent for him but meaning is not, readers therefore can assimilate the meaning precise if they have accurately read the text to reach the meaning

that is provoked by the text. The pleasure of reading then is when the reader attains the intention intended by the author (M. C. Niekrk. 2003). Such kinds of sects that centered an originary and highlighted subject or/and authors were later challenged and breakthroughs were on play. Some theorists attempted to create alternatives and that they did way by introducing rather replacers. Texts were always seen as entities that held truth that were accessible in ways manifold; meanings were attainable to the selves and truth is there ad infinitum, a fact unchangeable. Marxists were the first to repudiate early humanism of Descartes and Kant. For them, precise meaning cannot, at least not entirely, be accessible to the individual since author's texts reflect social believes and attitudes expressed in texts and knowing meaning requires that same schemata of social attitudes (West. 1996). What Marxism does is that it replaces the subject and author to a sequence of historical events that construct the consciousness required to text comprehension "social relations become transparent and individuals attain there true 'species being', the full and the undistorted flowering of all their human capacities" (ibid).

Freud also replaced the notion of subject/author centrality, his account of self-presence is an account for subject as well as "self-identity, self-possession" (Derrida. 1978). He believes that the human mind steers what people may relate to other factors, everything provoked by in innate mental capacity he came to name; "*the ego*" (Meyer in Meyer, Moore and Viljoen. 1993), conventions of the mind come from the mind itself, however, there is a possibility of consciousness, people conscious to overcome that natural, spontaneous control if a number of psychoanalytic steps minutely followed, (West. 1996). Psychoanalytic criticism proved unreliable to the unaccountability of context-literature (Hawks.1992). Psychoanalysis discards self-presence and full authorial control of meaning in texts. That being the case, hence readers have the key to decipher the text once undertaking psychoanalytic critique of texts. If the idea backwards, authors become "conscious" of underlying mental controls, and therefore impinge in the question of authorial intention or if otherwise to content, texts will be rather reductive (M. C. Niekerk. 2003). Equations did not really change and were not even improved upon for centrality was still there. Texts were seen yet still from a singular perspective such as Marxists who view texts, as afore said, not merely through authorial intention but instead outside factors, political, economic and social contributions that precede the being of the text and gives it meaning.

New Criticism's Practical Criticism suggested a close reading that entails the meaning of a text is presupposed in a sense that the text contains an organic unity that gives the text its meaning, readers ought to trace these shred-like pieces of a text to arrive at the meaning, universal and timeless (Eagleton. 1983). Not different from New Criticism was Formalism who acquainted the study of forms to the content and made the essence "making strange" of literature. It was criterion for them to identify difference among discourses (Eagleton. 1983). This was a common feature with Structuralism who were the prey of Derridian critique. Structuralism, as the name implies, focuses on the underlying and governing principles of language as a system. In a general aspect, all that we encounter and come to recognize in everyday life is a surface structure, a chimera strictly speaking, as the real nature of all is not directly met. When we see a building, it is not really it, it rather is an end of a structure made up of pillars and a certain design that makes the fulcrum of the building. Every aspect of life be it whatever it is encompasses an inner reality without which we would not have been able to perceive the surface. The skeleton of some living creatures is the unifying and organizing of the posture of each.

In like manner, language has an inner basic and a governing principle transmitted to us in the way we make sense of it. The structure of language is innate in human beings; the mind consists of "structuring mechanism" that embodies linguistic aspects, Human language being the most fundamental characteristic of human species. Understanding is there not as a result of environmental or external interaction but imposed from within, from the human conscious. The structure, that is to say, organizes and relates parts where they should be. The structure of English vocabulary consists of thirty one phonemes, underlay the sound and have rules of combination that natives themselves are not aware of them (Tyson. 2006). To have that incentive concrete, when a person reads written piece the sense made by the reader is "there always already" as Derrida would say, in human conscious, language being the vehicle that carries out universal entities, somehow presented in it. That however does not mean schemata because that would mean what is in the reader's mind shaped by experience of a number extrinsics and that we control language which is not the case, from a Structuralist perspective. The ability to produce language depends upon the extent to which "grammar" rules have been mastered. It is therefore the structuring principles that generate and make whole of related parts. Unity is dependent upon this fact. (ibid)

According to Ferdinand De Saussure, langue is the structure of language, the rudimentary basic of parole which is the manifestation of the former. This is quite important because it suggests that language fulfills not the mimetic convention that language scientists enthral to, that language refers to the objects around in the world; it rather means that words relate to concepts. A word is actually is a sign, consist of a signifier and a signified, when we say book, the signifiers is the sound and the letters of the word (and mental presentation) and the signified is the concept to which signifier refers to. Language from that perspective means that it is not made up of a collection of words but of a structure that makes use of these words.

If anything this theory entails it is that organized parts come under one umbrella, unity suggests that the component elements in whatever structure all relate to a center from which they are generated and unavoidably have relation among them. Longman dictionary defines unity as "the quality of having matching parts", and the example given is "his essays often lack unity". This fact further implies that a governing concept generates its subsidiary parts, for instance, genre is the generative concept of novel, short story, poetry, etc.

In the light of what Structuralism presents to expound natural phenomenon and ambiguities that were yet in question, emerged Post-Structuralism. "Post" means "after" and "distinct from" as it can mean after and "a result of". Deconstruction provided a number of alternative views and held tight to some others. Jacques Derrida (1930-2004) as a leading and a founding father of Deconstruction attempted to present further insights to the usage and the very being of language as he came to, by all means, to deconstruct common attitudes in western views to language and philosophy and thinking therefore. All that was given an official launch in a colloquium for Claude Lévi-Strauss in an essay (Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of Human Sciences) that dethroned Lévi-Strauss and lévi-Strauss expressed bitterness in this regard.

1-2-Language for Deconstructionists

Language as a means and the only one for communication, a theorem never been challenged. We use language to reach our purposes, we use it because it is the only reliable a stable tool for human interaction. It is the vehicle by which humans express their thoughts and share believes and desires and a number of other functions of language. Indeed, it is by these common grounds that language gains such a standing. When there is a

mistake in one's sentence it is attributed to the person as a performance mistake or misusage of language. Consider the following example:

Time (subject) flies (verb) like an arrow (adverbial clause)

The first structure and interpretation that comes to mind is that time is so important and ought not be wasted because it does not wait. But if we use it in that way:

Time (verb) flies (object) like an arrow (adverbial clause)

This is an imperative sentence that orders for watches to be time their speed as though you'd time the speed of arrows. Furthermore, when we want to say something important to someone who is skeptical for instance, we would try to meticulously select what to say so that would not be misunderstood, also when we meet someone for the first time or send a letter we would be afraid of saying something inappropriately and the outcome would not match anticipations. Therefore, language is not really stable the way we think it is. There is something we overlook which is the fact human language is ambiguous, it is loose and fluid and spurious. A tone would change an entire desired meaning even to its contrary, if a speaker says:

1-*John* brought the cake: it means that John not any other one brought the cake.

2-*John brought* the cake: it means that he kept to his word and brought the cake.

3-*John brought the cake*: it means that John brought a cake we previously talked about. These interpretations in addition to a number of others prove that language cannot settle at one simple ground that consists of a signifier and a signified.

Structualism believes that a word is sign that is made of a signifier and a signified, as aforesaid. If someone says date, let alone the confusing meanings, someone from the south of Algeria would remember a palm tree, himself climbing and picking in the early morning and get an injury by a thorn, another northern Algerian would remember the taste and how he struggled to have a kilo, so there is a signifier that generated further signifiers, things have relation to the experience of a person using language thereof. Thus what we have instead of a sign being a signifier + signified rather is a chain of signifiers and the concept is never reached (signified). What we come to call meaning is in fact a mental trace of the "free play of signifiers" and "meaning" lies in the word being what it is not, i, e its contrast. Human is a human because he is not a cat, a cow, and so on, green is so for it is not blue,

red, black, etc. meaning therefore is deferred and differed, French language "allows" him to combine the two words to be "différance". We use language because we have no other alternative by which we could "live", we make sense of what we say and understand each other simply out of convention. "There is no getting beyond language, beyond the play of signifiers, because we exist—we think, we see, we feel—within the language into which we were born. How we see and understand ourselves and the world is thus governed by the language with which we are taught to see them. That is, language mediates our experience of ourselves and the world."

Language, strictly speaking, controls all the being of ours, it shapes what we understand and thus the way act, we do not really mean what we mean, in light of what have previously been proved, so Derrida said whenever we use a word we put it under erasure to indicate that we use a common word for a new meaning (2006. 253)

Since language controls all and contains all and meaning disseminates, it is not much an exaggeration to assume that it, language, carries a number of conflicting ideologies, beliefs and customs that shape not only individual character but a society as a whole and hence a culture of it. For instance, the fact that the concepts, or the words we should say, policeman, mankind, barman, utilized to name the posts and people having them alerts to the fact that there is a privilege of Men over woman. The conflicting ideologies Deconstructionists label "Binary Opposition" such as that of Structuralism.

Jacques Derrida never set his ideas to literature. But he did apply some of his central thoughts to Literature as long as it is part of language, part of the universal phenomenon. Deconstruction deals with topics such as language, thought and identity, concerns that are tendentious to philosophy (Norris, 2002). The writings of deconstructionists tended to be ambiguous and evasive, never settle at one idea and subsequently the reader is lost in that trend of production, indeed, an inclination as such further asserts and confirms the idea that a text must a form of that which it speaks. Derrida's writing require prior knowledge so as to understand them the way he meant them. For a time long, philosophy had been a mother of sciences and celebrated a sovereign position, the kind of privilege Derrida refuses and so he proves that philosophic style makes use of literary embellishments, metaphors rhetorical devices and so forth and proves at final that philosophic writing cannot do without these elements of writing, seen from that perspective Derrida's critique resonates more with literary criticism than philosophy. (Norris. 2004)

Literature does not represent reality, since what we call reality is no more than a chimera that we convince ourselves. For Deconstructionists concepts like reality, certainty

and truth have no ground in concreteness, they rather perform, along with human identity, a conventional code and systems of believe and principles because we have alternative in our proposals. As a result, how can Literature say in otherwise what is itself otherised.

Nonetheless, to have a "meaning" to literary texts one should find the instability and slippery of meaning. Instability and the free play of signifiers, the dissemination of them and the deferment of signifieds manifests themselves greatly in Literature, way by different interpretations. After all, it is language that shape our experience not the other way around. Originality of literary texts does have any space, all texts are interrelated and intertexted, and the reason is due to the words being used in otherwise yielding to the encircles of the literary work. (Eagleton, 1966)

"Meaning" takes place when encountered by the reader who draws from their cultural milieu. Authors also write texts in light of their social and zone of existence. What matters for Deconstruction is the reader as they assert and partake in proving the ambiguities, Terry Eagleton (1966. 120) said about the writings of Deconstructionists " The biography of the author is, after all, merely another text, which need not be ascribed any special privilege: this text too can be deconstructed. It is language which speaks in literature, in all its swarming 'polysemic' plurality, not the author himself. If there is any place where this seething multiplicity of the text is momentarily focused, it is not the author but the *reader*." It was Roland Barthes who, and Derrida undoubtedly, had much to say and prove about the writing deconstructionally. Barthes (1915-1980) who converted to Deconstruction after years as a disciple of Structuralism and even changed, naturally, the way he perceived language as a grounding principle and as a set of rules that generates infinite number of structures, and signification credo changed to the counterpart. A sign no longer typifies that reference to concept and has meaning simultaneously for that means that language reflects and represents reality a fact that distorts the productive nature of language. (ibid)

A factual point of the Deconstructionists Approach is that breaks what is common, it does seek the unifying aspects of the text, instead it shows how some units of the text pushes the reader away from the main theme, intended if one is to say, that is; as Rob Pope (2002) said in regard of this, "Deconstruction seeks holes in the text while Structuralism seeks a whole of the text." These views of language come about as a result of censure views to language as language itself was undermined by some formalists, and others who conceived language merely a reflection of social and political accumulations, language in the control of users. Deconstruction differs from Structuralism in that it keeps no regard whatsoever to structure.

In each text where supposedly there is structurality that engenders structure, it can be proved that the structure does not in fact, but it is rather focus that eliminates other possible senses. There is blindness in the moments of insights. (De Man. 1983)

1-2-1 Binary Opposition

Once a reader encounters a text and the process of meaning making launches, a number of understandings come to the mind, never forgetting that they are, understandings, multitudinous in nature. All readers would say, for instance, that Macbeth is about ambition, blindness, greed and so forth, yet if read deconstructively other interpretations will take place, interpretations that are opposed to what have been previously outlined or at least found inappropriate and deserve equilibration with other contradictory themes.

That Deconstructionists do way by Binary Opposition. In 1967, Derrida published his essay "*Writing and Difference*" in which he introduced his approach to literature. Because it is tendentious, he states, and readers have a "desire to be faithful to the themes and audacities of athinking". There are elements in the text that contribute to the understanding arrived at. Deconstruction, however, stands against the main stream and finds a meaning to a text that stands counter to the first meaning or, the blinded meaning Deconstructionists would say and all in the very same text. This is what is labeled Binary Opposition.

To put this in another way, the text contains a number of dualisms or dichotomies that are conflicted and contradicted in nature and in most all cases one term or concept is privileged and superiorized over the other. If readers shift focus and read the text backward, if one is to say, an alternative reasonable, fully justified and supported meaning or theme occur (*of Grammatology*). The themes newly found show how texts, language thereof, are unstable and it is ineluctable to encounter equivocations and how language is unstable and ever misleading. It is a kind of reading that transacts only with already existing and "neglected" concepts.

It is worth mentioning that these dualisms can also be reached through extracting the concepts that represent the themes in a work of literature. As it is the case in our corpus The Great Gatsby where we work on the main themes of the novel "innocence and decadence" of twentieth century America. The text contains a number of dualisms that contribute to the themes but not themselves themes, dualisms such as life and death, beauty and ugliness and so forth.

The operation of Deconstruction is so text enclosed, it seems, yet not it is. Since language is the basic of all and the source of all and most importantly the governing principle of our ideologies and values, attachment to texts cannot be considered

enclosure but instead natural since as Derrida said “there is nothing outside the text”. Structuralism were the first to introduce this approach yet privileged, Deconstructionism rejected this hierarchy and rather attempt to show how they create tensions in the text.

Derrida introduced a number of oppositions that Western European Philosophers held to. He trusted that they have been “always there already” in Western Philosophy. One term, again, thought to be superior or fundamental, examples of these terms are nature and culture, inside and outside, mind and body, speech and writing, etc. (Encyclopedia Britannica).

In operating on language using Binary Opposition, Derrida brings his ideas to language and to Literature. He so vehemently disapproved of Western philosophy and created alternative to major thoughts and implications. That he did as he introduces “the Metaphysics of Presence”. Derrida borrowed from the Heidegger (1889-1976) who criticized western thinkers for regarding what is apparent and which is and neglect how it came to be “is” and the contributing factors of its existence:

“who contended that human existence isn’t a continuous presence,
a perpetual living in the moment, but is rather a duration. Being
in time means being embedded in an interval whose temporal horizons
stretch into the past and the future. It means having been born in a particular
place and time and inevitably dying in some unpredictable place and time.
These horizons inevitably influence the way we live in the moment. Ideas
aren’t always present either; they take shape from prior ideas and memories,
work themselves out, come to fruition, become transformed into different
ideas. Ideas have history and trajectory — just like human lives.
The present moment is only a trace of temporal duration as it moves from
the past into future.”(Ktismatics, Heidegger)

What is privileged therefore is present over that which is the reason of its being so. Derrida centers this “Metaphysics of Presence at heart” of western thought, he considers metaphysics as the source of all other oppositions “...conceiving good to be before evil, the positive before the negative, the pure before the impure, the simple before the complex...” (Limited Inc. 1988). Metaphysicians always privilege one opposition and discard the other and so Derrida attempts to “practice an overturning the classical opposition” (ibid).

One of the fundamental oppositions he stood against was that of speech and writing. Western thinkers and philosophers starting from Plato to Rousseau and Lévi-Strauss always thought of speech to have immediate accessibility to human thought where meaning is

“present” directly grasped without any temporal intervention where interlocutors have not any problem, or at least not as writing, comprehending the message. Speech represents truth which timeless and so it is for human when it is present. Truth appears directly on the conscious that is directly made known once pronounced; speech therefore has prior status to writing. Writing on the other hand, present ideas while they are absent, meaning is deferred and there is a lot of potential for misunderstanding, furthermore, writing is only a graphic imitation of speech and symbols of existing data. Derrida positions this dichotomy at the heart of Western thought as it also provokes another dualism which is “the metaphysics of presence”. In *Of Grammatology* (1976) Derrida outlines how De Saussure follows the same trends of ancient European doctrines and how he privileges speech over writing. A paradox created the, for Structuralism relies heavily on the assumption that langue is the structural pattern of human language, as Barthes makes it clear:

A language does not exist properly except in the speaking mass; one cannot handle speech except by drawing on the language. But conversely, a language is possible starting from speech; historically, speech phenomenon always precede language phenomena (it is speech which make language evolve), and genetically, a language is constituted in the individual through his learning from the environmental speech.(Barthes.1967)

Speech takes a higher status while itself regarded with inferiority to langue. When Barthes says that language is possible only starting from speech, he speaks of the generative system of language regarding the “speaking mass” the mass that represents the system as a whole (Norris. 2006) the tension is first of all between langue and speech. For Derrida, speech has the same characteristics as writing in the sense that there is the deferral and dissemination of meaning and the freeplay of signifiers that oscillates meaning and thus creates misunderstandings. The structure of writing is even more elegant than the structure of speech. Writing is derivative and has signification as speech. This equilibrium was further emphasized by Derrida as he stated that philosophers use metaphors that are used for writing. Saussure, furthermore, claimed in “*Course in General Linguistics*” that signification is an arbitrary act, that is, there is no precise or explanation for the relationship between signifier and signified, if this is so then there is no more natural than the other. Derrida stated that arch-writing, intended meaning and grasped meaning, necessarily takes place due to spatial differing and temporal deferring, due to the absence that achieves this furthering. For writing to have significance must absent itself from the moment of production, for instance, we write things down so that we would not forget or to

say something to someone not present. Deferral characterizes writing and also proves that meaning is never entirely reached. Texts have no future, every time the text is read its meaning is pushed further at whatever point the text is read. Derrida states that the difference between *différance* and *différence* requires reference to writing to distinguish between the two. The ideas of difference derived from Saussure's claims which suggests that in language there are only differences, cat is because it is not cap or car and so forth, Derrida states that it has due with presence and absence "The play of differences supposes, in effect, syntheses and referrals which forbid at any moment, or in any sense, that a simple element be present in and of itself, referring only to itself. Whether in the order of spoken or written discourse, no element can function as a sign without referring to another element which itself is not simply present. This interweaving results in each "element"—phoneme or grapheme—being constituted on the basis of the trace within it of the other elements of the chain or system. This interweaving, this textile, is the text produced only in the transformation of another text. Nothing, neither among the elements nor within the system, is anywhere ever simply present or absent. There are only, everywhere, differences and traces of traces" (positions. 26)

1-3-The World for Deconstruction

There can never be a movement, an understanding, a philosophical enterprise, without a point from which all disseminate and overflow, such an attitude had been commonly granted, and unquestioned because it is taken for granted and remained unquestioned for quite some time. Western philosophy has always found sense in centrism*. Descartes' impetus and the basic of his philosophy was "I think therefore I am", each philosophy has a point from which its constituents transgress, or as Derrida would say "a transcendental signifier". Plato himself had his thoughts centered around a "ground of being" and paradoxically these grounds hold the constituents while themselves are "out of play". In other words, these concepts generate, produce and expound the dynamicity and evolvment of the world around us while these concepts are stable. They are the center while they exclude themselves, out of that which they represent. Western philosophy has for so a long time been constrained to logocentric thinking.

The word logos has a religious implication that is ascribed to Hebrew. It expounds what happens in the mind and what is produced to represent it, thought and word which had been inseparable before Jacques Derrida deconstructions the inseparable. Logos means "to speak" or "to say" and it is used to indicate the words of God, what God thinks is done, for christens, it is the words of Jesus whose life signifies the avatar of Jesus. For Greeks this

notion takes a further philosophical dimension and posits the assumption that *logos* is also a word of God and his self-revelation, it is truth and reality, "As such, the *Logos* is the thought of God which is the "transcendent design of the universe and its immanent meaning" (M. A. R. Habib)

Since language is ambiguous, and these concepts are produced by language, how can they be outside that evasive dense. For Derrida the only sensible logocentric is language, it follows this that it is not out play, since language is itself the dynamic, evasive and disseminating as the world it represents (This is why classical thought concerning structure could say that the center is, paradoxically, within the structure and outside it. The center is at the center of the totality, and yet, since the center does not belong to the totality (is not part of the totality), the totality has its center elsewhere. The center is not the center." (Derrida, 1966) Derrida took this notion further to deconstruct it as he said that these central terms are present, and historically has evolved and names of the center are never the same, the same center may, and surly, has been given a number of names, a chain of names, the center therefore "the concept of centered structure is in fact the concept of freeplay based on a fundamental ground, a freeplay which constituted upon immobility and a reassuring certitude, which itself beyond the reach of the freeplay"(ibid) the basic that governs human principles is unstable and ever changing and as a result the world that is shaped by language becomes chaotic and far illusory. It is so because what centers our structures is never present but "has always been transported outside itself and its surrogates." (ibid)

Human existence has no center subsequently, there are only different ways of seeing the world each with a language of its own, there are different discourses (Dodd, 1966). It is worth mentioning that human language, after all what have been said, is not a product of the human psych but rather a creator of our experience, the conceptual framework and the infrastructure of the behavior of ours.

The character of a person therefore is no more than a figment that have the quality of being forceful and functional. The words person character or identity mean that we are made of single entity and that we have control over our world and we are not really out of play. However, for Deconstructionists this is only a misleading figment that we choose to convince ourselves by to provide a place for ourselves in our societies and cultures which again have the characteristics of vagueness."Reality" is something else entirely opposite though; an individual is a collection not a collector, as long as we are made up of conflicting attitudes, believes desires and so forth. Identity is not loose of apparently the

implication of Deconstruction and basically of the freeplay and dissemination. (*Of Grammatology*. 1967)

1-4-Deconstruction and Other Literary Theories

Marxism view to economy was drawn upon from its criticism to capitalists. Indeed, it proved the monstrous doctrines of capitalism and how it creates tensions inasmuch stability is concerned as they shed light on the life people will unconsciously live; the law of the jungle. What is arguable/ criticisable about Marxism is how solutions are drawn as they precisely to the opposing pole. As though to follow deconstructive agenda of criticism.

Indeed, some literary theories count so heavily on the opposition battle that deconstruction takes as fundamental of making its way through in sustaining a state of dignity amongst theories already possess sovereign status. The period in which Deconstruction “freeplayed” other theories was called by its name; the era of Deconstruction. Derrida thought that it was high time people considered and changed their conformity, in “*writing and difference*” (1976) he stated that it is his era that places Western sciences in revelation “still the medievalists, always acutely sensitive to the differentness of their period of study, might well be inclined to wonder about its place in the history of deconstruction, and in the deconstruction of history”. And so for Derrida since the past and history is deconstructed it goes without saying that unless Deconstruction is the criterion future will be only a replication.

The twentieth century manifests itself in that it escapes trends precursor, escaping centrality, the very basic of Deconstruction:

“in the twentieth century, however, these centers were destroyed or eroded; sometimes this caused by historical events-such as the way the first world war destroyed the illusion of steady material progress, or the way the holocaust destroyed the notion of Europe as the source and the center of human civilization; sometimes it happened because of scientific discoveries such as the notion of relativity destroyed the ideas of time and space as fixed and central absolutes; and sometimes, finally, it was caused by intellectual or artistic revolutions-such as the way modernism in the arts in the first thirty years rejected such central absolutes as harmony in music, chronological sequence in narrative, and the representation of the visual world in art.” (Barry. 2002)

Michael Foucault thought history better be conceived as changes and ruptures rather than long periods of time, historians should investigate “several parts, several forms of connections, several hierarchies of importance” (Foucault. 1969). A history therefore is not

seen as the development of this led to that but as what caused this to become and to have a that as a consequence.

When a point of view is given to any domain, it is referred to as, or used to be, “he” for both genders; males and females. This trend shows a deeper social and cultural attitude that considers the opinion of men as superior and of status higher to women, it tells a “habit of seeing”. This “inclusive he” seems to present the two genders but in fact it shows how society disregards the position of women (Tyson. 2006). Women have been for a while disprivileged from their opinions in different areas of life, social, economic and political and subsequently in arts and literature, as the last mirrors the formers. Literary writings also were not an exception as woman did not celebrate respectable consideration, and had been so for a time, indeed, P. Widdowson account for that was sufficiently marvelous a he stated that history of literary theory had been “his-story”. It would not much a surprise then for women, writers in particular, to resort to Deconstruction to gain the position they sought. Deconstructions deconstructed the “habit of seeing” that dominated and put second the view of women. Deconstruction by turning the table the other way around could retrieve the true position of woman. Since degrading women has been the case from earlier societies, any text would reveal women to be second to men, to the favour of the odds, if texts are read backward using Binary Opposition, texts will reveal the neglected elements of the texts and how manly conduct is privileged over that of woman. Binary Opposition of Deconstruction would position men and women alongside each other, it would reveal that women have the same importance and influence as men, that women can contribute in a way similar to men’s. By doing so, Feminists, aided by Deconstruction, can break the structure that marginalizes females, and as a result redefine gender. This deconstruction does stop but moves to other oppositions that do not sound to have gender issues while in fact, for feminists, they are there, oppositions such as culture/nature, political/personal and so forth and it is in these areas that feminism is coded. It is apparent from that Feminism makes a great use of Binary Opposition that destructs the hierarchy that gives precedence to males.

On the other hand, as stated in Answers, Deconstructionists do not really share Feminists concerns nor even “care” about their analysis. Female is no more than an object of analysis to deconstruct the opposition created in texts, the interest is not social at all, the focus of Deconstruction is simply to break down the hierarchy created in texts and put in question this privileging. Ideas of Derrida are supportive in as much they are deconstructive, they can prove the unjust categorizing of women in the same way they can

deconstruct women identity as they try to make present the role of women in human experience and sciences (bearing in mind that Deconstruction doubts human identity and considers it an illusion and/or a matter of convention).

Feminism also adopted the principle of difference in order to make a change. Difference shows how two contradicted terms (male and female), one dependent on the other and “its” value thereof and existence is present on only in regard to presence of the other, present while in the same time absent, that is to say; deferred. The writings of some French Feminists were characterized by disruption of phallogocentric discourse.

Not much different from Feminism is Queer Theory. The ideas of Michael Foucault deconstructs the homophobic allusion, as they call it, which holds the assumption that gender is a matter cultural instruction not a natural phenomenon, Beauvoir said that “One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman” (1952: 249). What is put in question is the oppositions of male and female, or rather, all male/all female, heterosexual/homosexual construction, the aim of Queer theorists is to change the politics of heteronormative constructions and into pragmatic steps to change the views regarding sexuality and performance (Sullivan, 2003). Its aim is also to shift the focus of the “public sensibilities” towards norms and as a result change the understanding of gender identity without seeming to subvert human morality, they clam. Such an impetus destroys hegemonic views that enclose the freedom of their, freakiness and immorality some consider, attitudes and principles they attempt make public.

The implications of Binary Opposition served greatly other theories and created tensions to opponents of such moves that threatens the continuity of human race. Deconstruction is a two-edged weapon that ought to be used in a moment and contexts appropriate for not every issue could be refused and turned on its opposite (ibid).

1-5-Criticism of Deconstruction

The vehement insistence of Deconstructionalism on finding wholes in texts on data there always already made its approach non-humanistic. The idea of whatever we come to conceive, understand and make sense is always deferred and absent creates a sort of chaos and confusion in our world and our selves.

It has since ages always been a call on hold whether language precedes thinking or thinking before language, a chicken egg issue still. Nonetheless, as a human grows up, the use of language as a means of seeing and mirroring, that is, as a means of communication, when it comes to speaking about functionality it no longer becomes important. We use language to deliver and transmit our ideas, to reach our desideratum. If a person, say,

wants to have a cup of coffee s/he structures in the language spoken and asks for one without forgetting the context and of course being as clear as possible. If the issue is otherwise, what has been said so far is incorrect or inadequate, how, then, could one say it is incorrect if the text was not understood, if it is understood how could one say it is not, so it is understood, meaning is there, understanding is there and communication as a result is there.

Language thereof is a tool directed in ways users want. Since we are not in need of ambiguous language and they rarely take place. Examples given by theorists to prove language intricacy prove the previous note, that language “serves” human need, in other words, message uttered are intended by the speaker, the apparatus of intention, of deciding to construct and choose words, available, is the mind.

Misunderstanding takes place due to a number of facts, one of which is the schemata of the interlocutor. People get through the same phases of life, birth, childhood adolescence and adulthood, the difference is that each individual passes through experiences specific that provokes his/her thinking, nourishes their mind and pal around meaning made. Language does not escape decorum. Experience is created when people encounter each other, language could be provided with concepts that refer to real objects, or objects presented, *inter alia* and no one can tell for certain, yet that means not that language has systems that shape our experience and our reflections about the world is no more than a figment or a falsehood.

Furthermore, when deconstruction present its ideas they come under on heading, Deconstruction and it has some fundamentals from which it draws and generalizes to other phenomenon, one of the basic principles is that it attacks common norms and reads against the grain and so that assumption is generalizable, an assumption itself based on difference and deferment and on the ideas of signification. There is a “transcendental signifier” from which all generates, that is the case inasmuch as expounding is concern, at least. We know that we are discussing “biology” when we speak about living organs of a plant, an animal or something like that.

One of the American intellectuals who severely criticized Deconstruction was the linguist and philosopher John Searle who criticized Culler’s on Deconstruction on October 27th 1983. He criticized the deconstructive attitude of logo-centrism and the opposition being a device to search truth. He stated that Binary Opposition give only curious results and does not lead to a final answer “this also gives curious results since it turns out now that speech and writing are both forms of "arch-writing," "man and woman are both

variants of arch-woman" (p. 171), etc. "Arch-writing" reforms the "vulgar concept of writing" into a new concept which now includes both speech and writing. Whether or not there is a "vulgar concept of woman" needing similar reform is not explicitly stated, but one may reasonably assume that Culler thinks that such is the case."

Some operations of binary opposition do not do at all, according to Searle, change never take place. For instance, when Culler attempted to break the opposition of cause and effect, cause being in priori, Culler states that, deconstructing, it is effect that makes a cause a cause so the effect should be the origin. Searle subverts this assumption and provides that "The experience of pain causes us to look for its cause and thus indirectly causes the discovery of the cause. The idea that it *produces* the cause is exactly counter to what the example actually shows." (ibid) he also states there is no hierarchy between the two since cause creates effect and the last is a result of the former.

Derrida's preference of writing over speech and speech being a form of writing was exposed to censure. He states that it has not been a focal point of philosophers and linguists to prioritize one over the other. Contradictively to Derrida's assumptions, Searle argues, philosophers of the epoch always superiorized writing "as the more perspicuous vehicle of logical relations" (ibid) difference was also in question by Searle. As mentioned in previous titles, difference has to do with presence and absence of terms, Searle suggest instead and he says "I understand the differences between the two sentences "the cat is on the mat" and "the dog is on the mat" in precisely the way I do because the word "cat" is present in the first while absent from the second, and the word "dog" is present in the second, while absent from the first. The system of differences does nothing whatever to undermine the distinction between presence and absence; on the contrary the system of differences is precisely a system of presences and absences." (Searle. 1983)

Searle says that the idea which Derrida tried to overcome happen to enclose Deconstruction itself, a whole sale of concepts could not escape centrality. This centrality ranked Derrida along side with classical metaphysicians. Derrida remarks that there are no foundations of knowledge, and then he ironically requires the presence of these foundations something will be missed or lost (ibid). One of the benefits of having these foundations, Searle argues, is not a ground for science and language but it organizes everything because humans are biologically and psychologically constituted with these foundations.

Conclusion

Readers get through states of confusion as they move through opinions for and against any given literary theory, one can never say that one theory is more adequate than the other or relate correctness to any and so confusion continues to puzzle readers. Nevertheless, it is this confusion that provokes thinking of readers, students in particular, to have insights into language, the being of it and its functions. Deconstruction has been the theory selected for it provokes such kinds of thinking and as a result improves critical thinking which is the main objective of students and in a general sense the prime objective of instructors to see in their students. Its critique of literature includes all aspects of texts as well as all possible interpretations that go “against the grain”.

Theories that have mentioned earlier are considered to be the most that utilize the Binary Opposition for it serves their quests and makes their posits credential.

General Introduction

Literature has been an area of investigation for linguists and even psychologists and anthropologists. The study of literature differs considerably from field to another. Literature is the field of our enquiry. The vastness of literature repudiates singular incarceration, it rather entails studies from specific angles each of which analyses and expounds elements that are of their proposal. This study aims at a literary investigation that has to do with functionality and being of language and so the approach best suited is Literary Theory.

Literary Theory views literature as a natural phenomenon that deserves attention as a tool to untangle the mysteries of language. Nonetheless, opinions differ from theory to another as the nature of language and usage is related to different aspects, each aspect shows the theory's principles.

Deconstruction (1960s) views language as the principium of human thought, existence, and behavior. The theory also attributes a number of social events and communicative correctness and disturbances to language. It is language, for Deconstructionists, that constrains our views to the world around which we live. Since language shapes our view to the world, our world is misrepresented because language is unstable (Tyson. 2006).

Literature does not escape this undecidability, it is the very manifestation of language disorder. Readers approaching texts using Deconstructionist method should first arrive at the meaning common and usual that any reader can grasp, then, in the very same text, they should look for elements that gives meaning goes counter to the first one. This is the case because each text contains terms that are contradicted in nature like love/hatred, good/bad and so forth. This method Deconstructionists name Binary Opposition.

It is the aim of this study to employ this technique of reading to the *Great Gatsby* as a corpus of study. *The Great Gatsby* is considered as one of the most recognized work of the Twentieth Century. Published in 1925, the novella gave credit to its author, F. Scott Fitzgerald among critics and contemporary writers as well. The way he portrayed the reality of twentieth century in addition to impinging personal events into the work makes it presciently and unprecedentedly remarkable (Barman. 2002)

The choice fell on the *Great Gatsby* for the reason above mentioned, the joy of reading it and its nature being workable and amenable to any kind of literary analysis or theoretical investigation. Indeed, Tyson's book "*Critical Thinking Today*" (2002) makes use of the novel by applying all literary theories in the work above mentioned. Furthermore, the novel being an autobiography, the deconstruction of it is the deconstruction of the real life of Fitzgerald.

Statement of the Problem

Deconstruction claims to offer a reliable view to language that shows its adequacy as it is the case for any literary theory, that is, each theory provides a set of explanation to language that presents truth best. So we attempt to examine the theory's claim, we also investigate the extent to which Binary Opposition is workable and whether or not it can provide "meanings" to language since it is the paradigm Deconstructionists undertake to interpret literary texts. We also investigate if Binary Opposition can be generalized to all texts in all cases. In addition, since Binary Opposition is the paradigm for meaning making, we examine its utility to find truth, realizing that its implication goes beyond literature to other fields such as identity and human experience.

Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that Binary Opposition suits the case in hand, *The Great Gatsby*, and indeed in many other cases. Yet, this procedure may seem to lack criteria by which to make a clear cut, that is, where and where not to utilize Binary Opposition in our corpus and this may be generalized since the stance that shows what is supposed can also so be.

Objectives of the study

This study aims at investigating the meanings that could be derived and generated from a work of literature, in a general sense. It also aims at having practicality in the *Great Gatsby*, specifically, that assists this investigation using Binary Opposition. If this is the case, then, it goes without saying that it, the study, cherishes to give account of Deconstruction theory and how it came to gain acceptance and criticism given.

It is our humble objective as well to add to the already existing knowledge of our Department of English of Kasdi Merbah University, that would be a real honor.

Motivation

The impetus to take such an account is first, as a student of literature, to improve critical thinking which is prerequisite to enhancing judicial capacities so that one can construct a view of his own. Second, to improve one's close reading of text and develop reading skills necessitated to simply; READ.

Organization of the study

The study is conducted in two related chapters. The first presents the theory of Deconstruction, tracing back its development and influence in Western philosophy with special account to Binary Opposition. The second chapter gives account of the corpus of the study, the Great Gatsby with extended analysis and biography of the author for the profound relationship between the author and his work being a fictional autobiography. From that perspective, the deconstruction of the novel, will also deconstruct the real life of the author, we assume.

Chapter the Second

Deconstruction : Practicality

Chapter the second: Deconstruction: Practicality

Introduction

2.1 corpus Description

2.2 Francis Scott Fitzgerald

2.3 Twentieth century America: the Jazz Age

2.4 The Great Gatsby

2.5 Analysis of the Great Gatsby

2.5.1 Plot analysis of the Great Gatsby

2.5.2 Symbolism in the Great Gatsby

2.6 Deconstructive Reading of the Great Gatsby

2.6.1 Binary Opposition in the Great Gatsby

2.6.2 Reading of the Great Gatsby

2.6.3 The counter Reading of the Great Gatsby

General conclusion

Bibliography

Introduction

It is the aim of these papers of chapter the second to outline, first of all, the life of Francis Scott Fitzgerald, and analyze his work, the Great Gatsby (henceforth G G). The last will serve as a corpus of study so as to bring the principles of Deconstruction, Binary Opposition in particular, into question as they will experience practicality in the work above mentioned. Again, what we will do is that we work on the main themes of the novel, innocence and decadence, as they represent the conflicting ideologies of twentieth century America. This is the case since the theory focuses on meaning and how it is deferred, in addition to how meaning is disturbed and prove to be instable.

2-1 Francis Scott Fitzgerald

D. H Lawrence (1885-1935) says and advises readers and critics alike to trust the tale not the artist, to focus on what is said and how it is so not who, for that shifts attention from work to the producer which would distort the flavor of literariness. A factual remark that, as any other rule, finds challenges and exceptions, the life of Fitzgerald is indeed inseparable from his work, or his fiction in a general sense. The life of the American novelist F. Scott Fitzgerald has been artistically presented, fictionalized. He wrote fiction starting from his own experience, not in a sense that he learned from his experience but he wrote about what happened to him in otherwise, his personal life was publicized by himself. He by all means found solace in writing.

Born on the 24th of September in the year 1896 in St Paul, Minnesota in the United States of America, Fitzgerald was to become one of America's greatest novelists of the twentieth century. The way his mother raised him opened his interests and inner desire for luxurious life, he lived in a big mansion and enjoyed life that his friends were unlikely to live. His father Edward Fitzgerald had to move in 1898 to Buffalo because his business in wrecked furniture did not meet expectations; It was not the only move young Fitzgerald experienced but rather the first of many to come. He began writing at an early age for his school, St Paul Academy "*The Mystery of the Raymond Mortgage*", and other plays that were intended to be acted on stage. He also studied at the *Newman school*, his academic career was not successful though. He joined the Triangle Club that had the elite of

his society and became a prominent literary figure and made acquaintance with other men of literature such as Edmund Wilson and John Peal Bishop, a friendship that was to last for the rest of their life.

Fitzgerald lived to make use of the promising aspects of life. He, as the Great Gatsby, had an enormous hopeful perspective towards life. He did not want to live a simple life and so he always celebrated parties and travelled to make money beyond his income and yet he showed no intention for making do with what he had. Few are the authors who almost entirely relied upon writing. In 1917 he joined the army, where he ceased the opportunity to begin writing his novel "*The Romantic Egotist*" (1920) The turning point of Fitzgerald's life was meeting Zelda Sayre during camp Sheridan in a dancing party . She refused the engagement at first and said that she did not have any desire for a life based on romanticity without money to back them up, not money to eke out better living conditions but to indulge themselves and enjoy "the best that life has to offer"(G G. 15). He went to New York in 1919 to improve his financial income after he had almost nothing, a state he could live with for quite some time but it was Zelda he wanted to be with. Writing saved him from a serious breakdown, his "*This Side of Paradise*" celebrated an immense success. The novel deals with American morality and truthfulness of the American Dream. The last was the theme of Fitzgerald's writing and life as well.

He wrote three short stories for the *Saturday Evening Post* in addition to his first collection of short stories "*Flappers and Philosophers*" Rare the cases are where the author's life manifests itself greatly in the works of theirs. His writings earned him a great fortune; in 1919 he earned 897 dollars and a year later he earned 18.897 dollars. Writing was also the moral consultant and shelter of his conundrums and indeed life chronology. Fitzgerald married Zelda on the third of April 1920. He found it not auspicious but rather frightening, an aspect that he included in his "*The Beautiful and the Damned*" two years later. He published his second collection of short stories "*Tales of the Jazz Age*", a name that would be used to refer to that epoch of history in which he would be the figure the most famous. Edmund Wilson disapproved the way Fitzgerald wrote and said he writes as a seventeen teenager, events full of joy, spree, luxury and so forth, Fitzgerald said it would be better if he said fifteen. Never appreciated the people who

devoted their life for money, such a goal indeed was a loosened perspective, Fitzgerald turned the equation upside down; we live to make money as though he wanted to publicize, “the question how to live was itself a moral idea” he trusted.

In the year of 1925, Fitzgerald published his master piece “The Great Gatsby”, many saw Jay Gatsby as Fitzgerald himself. A single most hopeful man like a device that can register earthquakes ten miles a head (the Great Gatsby) it was one the most recognizable piece of literature in the Jazz Age. Fitzgerald was cynical about life, not particularly about the principles established by the founding fathers but the way they were understood and acted out; Fitzgerald conceived them as spurious, Gatsby was that sort of men who holds tight to that dream and, on the contrary, Nick Carraway was a simple man who was suspicious about it. He found refuge of his pessimism in that which others censured him about; gratification. Hemingway advised him not to impinge the life of his in fiction and yet Fitzgerald’s quench for autobiographical novels never fully satisfied. His experience nourished his fiction, critics need to take into account Fitzgerald’s attitude to fiction as they come to define what reality is and fiction in literature. Fitzgerald’s reputation was tarnished as he became a heavy drinker, times later his wife suffered a mental breakdown. In 1933 he wrote “Tender is the Night” based, again, on some events that he encountered, it did not gain public attention and it was the last novel he completed. He also wrote another collection of short stories “Taps at Reveille” in March 1935. Paradoxically, Fitzgerald never proved of his short stories, he stated once that he wrote them to support his income not for the merit of writing, critics and publics thought not the same, the short stories received attention and some were even supportive of the weaknesses in his novels that were to be appreciated times to come.

The serious situations and the desperate conditions of his wife lead him back to alcohol. He stopped writing for a while and then moved to movie writing. He signed a six months contract with Hollywood in 1937 and a renewal for the next year, his most and only credited film was “three comrades.” He also met a new lover in Hollywood and started a relationship with her; she was the gossip columnist Graham Sheilah, a relationship that lasted till his death. He worked as a freelance later as a scriptwriter and was hired with the writer Walter Wagner to work on a movie “winter carnival” but the last fired him because of drinking.

Francis Scott Fitzgerald died in the apartment of Sheilah Graham in 1940 December the 27th, he was first buried in Rockville Union Cemetery, and reburied in 1975 in St Mary's Church in Rockville with his wife Zelda who died in a fire incident.

Emphatically he, great men as well, died not. The way he portrayed the social credo of twentieth America will last forever. What dulled Fitzgerald was how to hold tight to what made America the way it was then, and how to hold the torch inherited from predecessors.

2-2 Twentieth Century America, the Jazz Age

American leaders wanted to unite all citizens under one slogan that would spiritually be the bound of all, united so as to insure the prosperity and continue the legacy of the founding fathers. The American Dream seemed to fill the gap. It provides that Americans should work hard and toil to make money and wealth, the continuity of prosperous America relies heavily in that slogan instilled in the mind of individuals. Nonetheless, that attempt seemed materialistic and hollow or at least it was understood as so. In the G G, Gatsby purchases a dream that costs so much, he tried to do whatever necessary in order to make place of his dream in concreteness. Not only is the means that is trivial, the dream itself was disguised in white, colored and promising, and so it seems, while in the essence things are not at all as imagined.

Roland Barman stated that American thinkers and socialists made attempts to sustain the continuity of the American Dream. William James wrote during the 1920s "*The Public Philosopher*" and spoke about the American Dream, he censured the current state of the American society and opted for a renewal of the principles that go in accordance with the social, political and religious imposed. He thought it natural and part of the American Dream to be equipped with personal and instinct desires to make wealth. That in addition to a number of guidelines-like of the American Dream. Such thoughts place morality at stake and the distinction between ways chosen to achieve success becomes almost invisible. Fitzgerald was influenced by such kinds of thoughts, he, as are authors, was an iconoclast of the moral state and materialist life that replaced idealism and religion and made stiff the life of Americans (F. Scott Fitzgerald. 2002).

The *G G* was written in the period of the Prohibition, sales, importations and alcoholism were banned, a chance for illegal activities and bootleggers ceased to make money and they did in some respect, bootleggers introduced accessibility to alcohol and they made a great deal of money. There were differences of opinions amongst different members of the same unity members. The Catholic and Protestant Churches disapproved of the Volstead Act and stated it was an intrusion of rural ideals. The incident gained the intentions of authors and was included in their writings, Fitzgerald was amongst to utilize the Prohibition, Gatsby had no money and no real life that would pave the way for him to become the person he wants to be, after he came from the Army he had no income to go back to Daisy. Bootlegging was the means appropriate to her, to Daisy and life as well. It seems as though Gatsby was put in the coach for his figments and paranoia and the issue, however, is that traditions that were in question. Indeed, Americans divided themselves from the values their predecessors put forward and chose hierarchal classes in societies based on the law of the jungle, all Gatsby aimed at was becoming someone, Nick implicitly states, but the social strata deprived him from arriving at his desideratum and share the statue of Tom, after all, Tom is no different after all, as a matter of fact Gatsby is of a purer soul than Tom, because Gatsby is at least loyal.

The life in New York provided new themes for authors, it was unprecedented, unfamiliar and as some argued; immoral. Barman wrote “A new kind of American novel might not only capture the moment but also understand a new experience American history, the replacement of Victorian public conscience by Modern subjectivity. As Mencken put his advice to writers, the New York scene – democracy and its current incarnation “ought to be far more attractive to novelists than it is” (ibid). Indeed, it caught the attention of Fitzgerald at least, and always did. Life lost of morality and integrity and all that deserved to light cast upon had much to do with individual interests. The pursuit of happiness took another course that is unplanned, unaccustomed and alien, Americans would agree. The period lost loyalty to the American tradition and to the individual relationship, loyalty of ideas and of relationships, Nick is loyal to his relationships and to the ideas as he is inclined to reserve all judgments. Unlike Daisy Buchanan and her husband who made an exception of themselves when they chose not to haunt their thinking by

righteousness and wrongness. John Dewey wrote in that regard “the loyalties which once held individuals, which gave them support, direction and unity of outlook in life, have well-nigh disappeared.”

William James, George Santayana, Walter Lippmann, noted how Americans lived their life, at that time, and how dangerous it is for the situation to continue in like process. They accounted for the American Dream, its implications; the way people lived, class hierarchies and monied interests. Barman quoted from Josiah Royce an interesting passage that shows the fear of American intellectuals, fear that is triggered by the social reality “...what are the principles that can show us the course to follow in the often pathless wilderness of the new democracy? It frequently seems as if in every crisis of our greater social affairs, we needed somebody to tell us both our dream and the interpretation thereof. We are eager life..... But what life?” (ibid)

Modernism described life from within, from urban life unlike Romanticists who lent their senses to the suburb to nature and solitude. Their novels thus, Modernists, became colored and more disguised. To write means to be impinged in the society so as to know the ins and outs of the public concerns, as is the case of Fitzgerald. It was him who called the era of his “the Jazz Age.” An era as above outlined full of prestige and empty from the inside.

2-3 Corpus Description

The novel of Fitzgerald is considered as one of the most reflective and influential works of the twentieth century. It consists of 19 chapters. The protagonists of the novel is Gatsby. Earnest Hemingway who severely criticized Fitzgerald gave him credits and complimented his achievement. It is a fictional autobiography in which Fitzgerald presented his life as will be seen in the next pages. The Great Gatsby gained acceptance among the reading public and also granted its author a respectable position amongst American writers.

2-3-1 the Great Gatsby (1925)

Not much different from the of Fitzgerald is Gatsby’s, indeed, much of 1922 summer that Fitzgerald came across lived once more in the life of Gatsby. The

narrator of the story Nick Carraway, a Yale student who wanted to be a writer to find himself at last at bound business introduces his principle of life, a piece of advice he received from his father; to see what is good about people. The advice of his father gains him an insight into people, to see all what is good. He describes the hysteria of New York where money dominates all. The first thing he does is to visit his cousin Daisy Buchanan a wife of a university colleague named Tom Buchanan in their gigantic palace in west Egg where he meets Jordan Baker, a famous golf player and Daisy's best friend. They exchange news of the life of theirs and Nick says that he lives in East Egg and that he knows no one at all, surprisingly Jordan, who is pompous, speaks to him that he must know Gatsby, a name that catches Daisy's attention and she breaks "Gatsby! What Gatsby." The phone ring and Tom excuses himself to answer, soon after Daisy follows to inquire of the caller. Jordan informs Nick that Tom has a woman in New York. After that Daisy speaks to Nick and tells him how lonely and hollow she feels about her life after she has done everything and seen everything, she wishes her daughter to be "a beautiful little fool". Nick sees someone at the end of a dock trying to reach a green light and something tells Nick that it is Gatsby.

Nick receives an invitation to visit Gatsby in his palace for a party; he goes and realizes that he is the only one who received one, for all kind of New Yorkers come to his legendary parties uninvited. He fetches for Gatsby but he never finds him and he hears speculations about him, that he murdered a man, that he is the kisor's cousin and he was a spy during the third Reich. He meets Jordan afterwards and accompanies him to find Gatsby, unexpectedly, they meet him. Through Jordan, Gatsby requests Nick a favor, to invite Daisy to drink tea in his house, Nick's house, a request he understands not. As for all characters, Gatsby is someone who is mysterious and unknown and whose deeds are never sensible. Nick invites Daisy after he knows that she is the reason of his parties and he is trying to gain her attention. It becomes apparent that Gatsby's intention behind the parties was to fascinate Daisy and have her back after five years of waiting and struggle to make things happen once more, the way they were in the past. Nick expresses satisfaction to do him that favor. Gatsby makes all necessary arrangements after he notices that the grass needs to be cut, procedures that are

not surprising, particularly ambiguous, after all, Gatsby threw legendary parties to satisfy Daisy.

Daisy and Jay Gatsby meet at last, both hesitant and Daisy particularly bewildered, they stay in silence for a moment before Nick excuses himself. They recall past days and when Nick comes back he hardly attracts their attention that he is back, Daisy and Nick go to Gatsby's mansion where Daisy is fascinated and stunned by his huge palace. Gatsby shows her around as well as some old pictures and letters he kept. Daisy and Gatsby see each other regularly, a state lasts for quite some time during that summer till Gatsby decides to take his affair with Daisy further, he thus asks her to tell Tom she never loved him. In a meeting Gatsby plans in Tom's house, Gatsby tries to tell Tom that his wife never loved him, she interrupts and asks them to go to New York, Tom emphatically agrees. Gatsby tell Tom what he planned and when he turns to Daisy, she cannot say she never loved Tom, a proposition she could never do after Tom refreshes her memory of the wonderful times they spent together and he, Tom, exposes the illegal business that Gatsby has been secretly conducting. Daisy, along with Gatsby, drives back home furiously and en route she hits Myrtle Wilson, who happens to be Tom's lover and she stops not. Gatsby takes the wheel and drives home after she is in a state of concussion. Tom arrives later and sees the mob next to Wilson's garage and he is accused of killing and he says that his car is blue not yellow and informs Wilson that it was Gatsby who killed Myrtle.

Gatsby waits outside Daisy's house waiting for her but she never appears, Nick finds him and expresses his dissatisfaction toward the murder, thinking that he killed Myrtle and realizes that it was Daisy who did. Nick gets surprised after he sees that Tom and Gatsby together but he cannot tell Gatsby who seems so sure that he can have her back. The next day Gatsby waits for Daisy to call and while so, he is killed by Wilson who shoots him in the pool of his mansion and then kills himself. Nick arranges necessary requirements for the funeral and invites, Gatsby's friends and no one really comes. He tries over and over but no one really comes.

2-3-2 Major characters in “*The Great Gatsby*”

Fitzgerald chose characters to, as probably in all fiction, to refer to certain ideologies, say, or ideas. In the G G, much of Fitzgerald’s qualities greatly featured in his characters, be it real events or ideas held by characters, that is to say, each principle held by a character is a value avatared in human form.

Nick Carraway is the narrator of the story. He is an educated gentleman from Yale University, he moves to New York after the war, the same as Gatsby. Nick involvement in the story moves in a slow pace. He is inclined to preserve all judgments as advised by his father. Unlike the others, Nick has some moral codes that crown him with integrity and honesty. He does not know how to react once he knows about the affair of Tom and Myrtle. He so much wants to thrive in life, a reason drove him to abandon literature and move to the bound business, he realizes the chimera associated with rich people and comes to their true color.

Jay Gatsby, the story’s focal point, he is immensely a rich person who, like Nick, comes from the Midwest. He is a mysterious person whose wealth provoked thoughts and curiosities of people around him. Obsessed he is of luxurious, wealthy life. At first, he is an Oxford man, he wants to persuade people that he possesses the qualities of nobility, honor and good breeding.

Gatsby’s dream is analogous to the Americans; the American Dream, the point around which Americans life centers. He centers his life to make money and try to achieve what no other ever thinks about, changing the past by having Daisy back to him which means to neglect all real events of his life as a poor boy.

Daisy Buchanan is a character who is symbolized by white and light “..... an enormous couch in which two young women were buoyed up as though upon an anchored balloon. They were both in white, and their dresses were rippling as though they have just been blown” (G G. 16). As the story unfolds it is unraveled that Daisy, like white, is void from inside, all that matters to Daisy is herself and how she could live a wealthy life because all woman can be is “little fool” as she hoped for her daughter. Her actions were not so apparent to Gatsby who was utterly blinded. She could fool everyone and live with fooling herself even when

she killed Myrtle; she represents hollowness and the emptiness of rich people and the contamination of their spirit as they are materialized.

Tom Buchanan was a football player who is hulk and brutal. He is descended from a wealthy family. Honesty, as it would seem to the reader, does not have much to do with him. He studied with Nick Carraway and he takes him to an apartment where he meets his lover, Myrtle Wilson. He is also a racist. He says that they are superior race in comparison to other races and need to sustain that position so that other races would not overcome them one day. He is careless and self-centered.

Jordan baker is no different from her friend, Daisy. She is a professional golf player pretty and slender. She cheated to win her first tournament. She meets Nick in Daisy's house. She has aristocratic attitudes. She engages with Nick but refuses him because he is mischievous as she is.

Myrtle Wilson has a dream beyond her reality. She wants to have a life of the upper class without anything in the proposal. She is in affair with Tom Buchanan as a result, the way she threw the party which Nick was first introduced to her tells much about the life she hankers and craves for.

2-3-4 Plot Analysis of the Great Gatsby

As it is the case for all narratives, each has a beginning, middle and end. Fitzgerald establishes Nick to tell the story of a noble, nobility of the twentieth century, character. The story begins with Nick Carraway's father who gave his son an advice that shaped his view and created his charisma. The initial situation takes place when Nick pays a visit to his friend and cousin across the bay Tom Buchanan and Daisy Fay Buchanan, there he is first introduced to Gatsby, the name only not a person, "a gentleman of that name".

What makes the story interesting is the in/outside battle between characters. Gatsby wants something he can never have; to repeat the past and so he takes measures necessary to pursuit his dream that would turn out to be an illusion. Tom wants to have a life based on his desires thinking his money will provide for him what he wants; he wants to have a mistress and to also have a wife who is herself someone's mistress and the threat of his life.

The story reaches climax when Tom meets Gatsby and have skirmishes over who should have Daisy. Gatsby wants her to tell Tom she never loved him and married him only to compensate the love of Gatsby, a request Daisy cannot do and Gatsby stands in bewilderment, he then goes with Daisy upon request from Tom after he made sure he fully has Daisy in order to instigate Gatsby. On their way home, Myrtle Wilson is killed and everybody thinks Gatsby to be the doer after the furtive Tom tells George that it was him.

The story ends in the funeral of Gatsby and what a funeral it is. Nobody attends the party barring his father, Nick and the owl man who was hanging around in Gatsby's library. Nick realizes, in the last lines, that in life we "beat on, boats against the current, borne back ceaselessly into the past."

2-3-5 Symbolism in "*the Great Gatsby*"

The story contains some metaphoric reference as it symbolizes a number of characters and objects to support the overall themes of the story. Gatsby always stood at the end of his dock as though trying to catch the green light in Daisy's dock. The green light had a colossal significance for Gatsby as it reminded him of his dream to pursue; when he had Daisy he no longer glorified that light for he was leaving the reality of it.

The eyes of T. J Eckleburg were referred to as the eyes as the eyes of God. When George Wilson looks at the light while he tells her that "God sees everything". It was a sort of judge of morality. This light in the valley of ashes shows how people consulted this God as the eyes are on an old board of advertisement which indeed announces of materialistic life.

The valley of ashes, between west and east eggs, it is a rotten place created by the carelessness of New Yorkers. A place where Tom has his affair with Myrtle and where she dies.

The use of colors in Fitzgerald's novel and them being repeatedly used in certain contexts hints significance. Green signifies hope and dreams that never come true as it is the case for Gatsby who deluded himself of reuniting with Daisy. White represents purity, but white can always stained, and so it is the case in the G G where white is dressed to convince people of goodness. Blue

represents illusions, the huge “blue palace” of Gatsby is an illusion of honor and success and so are his blue lawn, blue shirts and blue garden. Golden on the other hand refers to richness that leads to destruction, when the yellow golden car hits Myrtle in the valley of ashes, that in addition to a number of other colors that insinuate to other signs.

2-3-6 Themes in the Great Gatsby

The novel gives account of the corrupt people and the blinded focus on rich life and how people become hollow and deprived of "humanity" because of this. The novel is also about the new American Dream and the process of sustaining its value, in the novel, Gatsby sustains to his dream to get rich but the measures he undertakes are illegal and therefore the loss of the innocent American Dream.

2-4 Deconstructive Reading of “*the Great Gatsby*”

In this part of the research, we show how the life of characters in *The Great Gatsby* is full of disorder. Deconstruction analyses literary texts in ways different that prove the disability and slippery nature of language. This nature of language can be seen in the manifold interpretations of texts, none of which can bring about the meaning fully adequate and precise. It is all part of the free play of signifiers. Texts carry out ideologies in the form of themes that usually readers come to arrive at. Deconstruction undertakes a counter reading of these ideologies and extracts the opposed ideologies and show how they are conflicted, one theme privileged over the other and so forth. That will prove how ideologies are conflicted in the very same text, though the text is “supposed to” give one stable ideology not conflicted ones. The analysis of Deconstruction to texts therefore is thematic. “There is nothing outside the text” as Derrida states. (1976. 15)

Throughout the *G. G.*, Nick Carraway struggles to make his way through in a world all he wanted from is to “to see the world in uniform at a sort of moral attention forever” (6; ch). Nick went to the West with all innocence and willingness to make something that really counts. These themes, Innocence and Goodness being privileged and pursued over the Decadence and Past. Principles of morality fade as the events of the novel unfold, and Nick the most who loses a lot for he is the only one who really cares.

The novel is full of longing to the past. A period in which America prospered, prosperity that relied basically on morality and goodness of its people. From the East, Nick goes to West Egg determined to provide life aliened to the founding fathers. Nick, alongside with Gatsby, are the innocent and the initiative people that the novel presents. They both wanted to move forward and make place for themselves in the world that is corrupt and unjust. They find not what they expect though and so the Past fondles them. The Nostalgia for the past mourns the innocence that once found welcome and now rejected and replaced by an alternative ideology that granted wealth and success at any cost, be it sufferance of other people. The past is contaminated by the decedent present. Nonetheless, this ideological process that is presented in the novel will turn out to be a disillusionment, it is created way by the principles and values instilled in the

language of the East and the West, this will become clear after the ideologies are brought to question, East/West, Innocence/Decadence, Present/Past, Morality/Immorality, these conflicts characterized in Nick Carraway and Jay Gatsby, all that will be done through the text itself, which deconstructs itself. Some conflicting ideologies will end up reversed, that is the privilege will be reversed. Others may not be privileged but rather equalized.

Life of most characters in a New Yorker society is itself instable and full of disturbances. Tom and Daisy Buchanan never settled, they moved and “drifted here and there unrest fully wherever people played polo and were rich together.” Nick Carraway moved from Mideast to the West in order to establish a kind of life that he wants to have. Wilson Myrtle craved to change her life because she did not accept her reality, the last that severely clashed with the ideologies that were instilled in her repertoire and surrounded the life of hers. Jordan moves through parties, homes and places and finds her life intriguing.

There is a pronounced inclination for wealth over simplicity, Myrtle lived humbly with her husband Wilson but she thought it necessary to cheat him to quench her thirst of rich life. The way she arranged the room in New York has to do with what she had in mind. The room was congested with furniture. Materialism, strictly speaking, manifests the utmost goal of people in New York. This pursuit of happiness, happiness as they perceived it, had consequences; shifting of ideologies and corruption of morality. People of good breeding, of good past, attempt to find place for themselves in a world that lost its innocence. As Lois Tyson pointed out, the valley of ashes is a metaphor to the spiritual emptiness of Americans and it is the result “of the culture that produced it.” (2006. 268)

"A fantastic farm where ashes grew like wheat into ridges and hills
grotesque places; where ashes take the forms of the houses and
chimneys and rising smoke. (Ch;2)"

2-4-1 Binary Opposition in “*The Great Gatsby*”

2-4-2 Reading of “*The Great Gatsby*”

In this part of the second chapter, we chose to begin by, first of all, reading of the Great Gatsby to show how, using Deconstructionists expression, a common or conventional reading is established to reach the main theme of the story. The kind of Deconstruction applied in the Great Gatsby is thematic, that is, we will work on concepts that represent the ideologies in the text instead of extracting terms that go counter to each other. However Deconstruction is there since we will break the privilege and the hierarchy found in the text between innocence and decadence. The second step is to show how the same text deconstructs itself, as Derrida says “there is nothing outside the text”.

One of the ideologies in the novel characterized by Nick mainly is innocence. Nick is a descendent of a respectable family that is of good origin and carries out hardware business. He goes to the West in order to partake in the wondrous life of New York and so he goes for bound business. He full heartedly impinges in a world with determinacy and youthful vitality. Nick lively describes the palace of Gatsby and atmosphere of New York as a first impression “big bursts of leaves growing on the trees...” He is a man of a good breeding, coming from a place where children were taught good manners. Nick knows about the affair of Tom with Myrtle and he beer red and tries to dodge their invitation to go with them. He also tries to snick from Tom and Myrtle’s apartment but he is forced to stay because of his innocence and shyness, he gets drunken for one of the few times he has been so.

What Nick finds out at final is rather contradictory to that which he expected. Tom is no more than a traitor. Despite his social status he is shallow and arrogant; Nick realizes that the social position of New Yorkers does not match with morality. Most of people in New York were corrupt and never cared about the greater good of all. Wolfsheim is the one who fixed the World Series and have been a bootlegger for as long as, at least, Gatsby came back from the war. Tom and Daisy careless and self-centered, even Jordan Baker, the one he was infatuated with, is swindler and dishonest. He described them as “rotten crowed”

and that he “had enough from all of them.” Their life is Decedent, full of deception and allusion and personal interests and the issue is that they can live with their guilt, if such a concept ever exists in their minds. Daisy chose to live with Tom and cover up the truth of murdering Myrtle, Jordan cheated in a tournament and thought it fine. She said she does not care about what is peculiar inasmuch as Gatsby is concerned because he “gives large parties.” To the surprise of Nick, even black chaps have a tendency to spoilt life. When he went to New York with Gatsby, he met some “negroes” in their limousines and they looked at them in contempt and their chauffeur was white. In a few, New York is a city where “old men pushing girls backward in eternal graceless circles” (Ch; 3)

Nick was not alone to run along with several disappointments. Gatsby too was a victim of the period in which he lived. So much he was corrupted but he was exceptioned from Nick’s consideration because it was “what preyed on Gatsby, what full dust floated in the wake in his dreams.” Gatsby devoted and dedicated all his being to his dream; his money, personality and reputation. He is, as Nick describes him, hopeful and ambitious to the extremes. He ceased every opportunity to have his dream before his eyes like “those intricate machines that could register earthquakes ten thousand miles away.” It is “an extra ordinary gift for hope.” That convinced him he could change the past. Gatsby is a romantic hero for Nick. He is generous and has a “creative temperament.” His participation in the war increases his social status. He is also a self-made and a rags-to-rich, like the founding fathers of America, he has a “romantic readiness such as I have never found in other person and which is not likely I shall ever find again.”

The social strata that Gatsby celebrates and the way he treated people did not shield him from the sever and brutal reality. People went to Gatsby’s from all over New York from different social strata, went to entertain themselves not for the person of him. Wolfsheim used Gatsby and told Nick that he made him and at the end he could not come to Gatsby’s funeral. Daisy was a pig disappointment, she took advantage of his gigantic feelings he keened for her and did not even attend his funeral. She betrayed him when he spoke to daisy and all she thought about was herself. His closest friend has the same quality as Daisy and even more; pragmatic and fraud. Gatsby has extraordinary qualities for hope though, being a

romantic dreamer and his pursuit to the single “object” he lived for did not save him from the cruelty of society.

George Wilson was the most innocent person. He kept himself busy, he was too poor to care about other people or indulge himself. He was engaged in his little world enough for his wife to cheat on him. His friend Tom Buchanan took advantage of his good heartedness and caused him great grief. Tom said that he, Wilson, does not even know that he is alive.

George wanted to go west to have more control over his life after the breakings down he got through in the East. Nick ends up longing for life in the East, in the Past, where there is predictability of life and purity of souls. He feels he spent his summer in vain. He turned thirty in a “decade of loneliness, a thinning list of single men to know, a thinning briefcase of enthusiasm, thinning hair.” He found how intriguing is life in the East and how it is void, broken and vulgar. So Nick decides to go back West after some callous time disappointed him of the blight consciousness of the present. Nick reminisces of the time in the west and says:

"when we pulled out into the winter night and the real snow, our snow began to stretch out beside us and twinkle against the windows , and the din lights of small Wisconsin stations moved by, a sharp wild brace came suddenly into the air."

The narrator misses the old times and “real snow” that is white, pure clean and falls equally on all. Snow in New York gets dirty after it is mingled and stepped on and thus becomes blackened unlike in Wisconsin where it stays for quite a time. The narrator relates images of nature that are stunning and grandeur to old time and to the west. He says about the east that “I see it as a night scene by El Greco: a hundred house both conventional and grotesque, crouching under a sullen, overhanging sky and lusterless moon.” This is how the east; grotesque and the moon that is a sign of hope is lusterless unlike the Wisconsin where the sky is clean and bracing. Even Daisy was “by far the most popular of all young girls”

(ch;4) she dressed in white and waited for Gatsby before she abandoned her dream to be with him once more.

The modern world lost its purity and innocence when Gatsby dies in a result of a brave act; he accepted to make of himself a scapegoat for the better good of Daisy so that she would call him the day after. He lives with vital enthusiasm of his dream and yet he receives murder! “Gatsby breaks like glass against Tom’s hard malice.” The American dream characterized by Gatsby fell on knees against the modern decadence characterized by Tom. (ibid)

It is an immoral world full of fraudulent where first class people like Tom and Wolfsheim ensnared others of lower classes. There are classes not of economic but of moral decadence. It is living for an objective, an organized life based on principles that is lacking. People turned far away from the path, moral path drawn by the founding fathers of America. All a girl can be in that world is “a beautiful little fool, that’s the best thing a girl can be in this world.” It is better for them to be so so that they would not be tormented for conscience has no place in a rotten world.

The text of the Great Gatsby, as has been proven so far, attaches the east to the present decadence of the 1920s. It also places west along side to morality, purity of that time America. Nonetheless, the text will deconstruct itself by its own ambivalence. Again, there is nothing outside the text.

2-4-3 Counter Reading of “*The Great Gatsby*”

The text idealizes the youthful and vital spirit of the past that undermines and outreaches the present, an unbalanced opposition where the past, characterized by beautiful scenes and characters of respectable breeding, also turns out not to be vacant from contamination. What the text also, paradoxically, provides is that the past was not prosperous for all people in the west or the east. Gatsby had a childhood that he vehemently rejected and abjured, he thought of himself as a son of God. He lived a very poor life with his parents who were “shiftless and unsuccessful farm people.” Gatsby changed all that he leads to his mortifying past, his name included he “invented just the sort of Jay Gatsby that a seventeen year old boy would be likely to invent” (ch, 6) he informed Daisy when he first

met her that was a man of great wealth so that she would choose to venture with him. Even to his friend Nick, he told him that he earned a great deal of money from his family who died and inherited their wealth. When Nick told him that he cannot change the past he seems to be thoroughly convinced otherwise. He wants to repeat the past to escape from it as posited by Tyson. (2006.273) so the past is not really pleasant for all, neither it is a siege of innocence.

Gatsby left his parents for he never approved of them as his parents and he thus is also a self-centered. So for a romantic hero who represents the past, past becomes as decadent as the present. Nick, on the other hand, who comes from a well-to do and decent family, is also mingled with the decadence of the present, the Nick in the west is not the one encountered in the east. He likes Jordan Baker who is a cheater, he is aware of that and yet he says that “dishonesty in a woman is something you never blame deeply.”(ch;3) he is taken by her for a thin rejected in the west; dishonesty.

George Wilson and Nick Carraway are the innocent character in the novel. They come to the world with their innocence and as a result they stay bewildered and even, Nick who gets engaged and Wilson commits murder. Innocence therefore means lack of knowledge and ignorance that allows people to take advantage over them.

Wilson is by all means as Tom describes him; does not even know that he is alive. So days pass on and he is not aware of his wife’s affair with a man whom he never truly knows. Once he finds out he is crushed down and shattered and then he decides to take action. Nick falls a prey in the hands of decadents; he attends Gatsby’s parties and gets intoxicated and always the last one to leave. Innocency means rather, then, lack of experience and knowledge about the world. As a result, decadence is the result of innocence; innocence does not mean purity of the self and goodity of intentions. Innocence in the novel is portrayed as “ignorance” where all innocent characters become dirtied in some sort; the equation hence is not innocence over decadence but decadence that is created by innocence.

The text locates innocence and decadence of America to geographical areas; east and west subsequently. In the west, Nick grew up and learnt qualities that

preserve morality. The past also fostered Daisy and Jordan in Louisville, the west also raised young Jim Gatz and were the source of his dream that pushed him to abandon his parents and so it is not really a pasturage of innocence. Decadence on the other hand is associated with present and the east, yet, Wilson is innocent and is harmless but from the east. Chicago and Detroit are from the west but they are lined up along side with the east. Gatsby was raised in the west and in the past with Dan Cody. Gatsby was known with “his brown hardening body lived naturally through the half fierce, half lazy work of the bracing days. He knew women early, and since they spoiled him he became contemptuous of them, of young virgins because they were ignorant, of the others because they hysterical about other things which in his self-absorption he took for granted” (G G. 113). The past again sheltered people who were to spoil the present and create the troublesome that devastates innocent persons.

It becomes apparent, hopefully, that innocence and decadence do not have to do with east and west, they rather are horizontalized with natural goodness and the “old island that flowered once for the Dutch sailors.” old island is aligned with the west because when the Dutch sailors arrived to old Island it was pristine. (Tyson. 2006) she also said in analyzing the novel that nature is associated with civilization;

He compares “the great bursts of leaves growing on the trees” to the way things grow in fast movies” (8.ch 1). And in the very next sentence after he describes the “fine health to be pulled down out of the young breath-giving air”, he speaks in the same exalted tone, of the “shining secrets” he will learn about making his fortune from “the dozen Volumes on banking and credit and investment securities.”

Tyson (2006) also remarked the fact that Gatsby being a protagonist deconstructs what the text actually stands for. He was made by Meyer Wolfsheim out of the blue and became engaged in liquor business that was prohibited and he was so successful in that. When the business is at stake someone will be sacrificed so as to save many!

It turns out at final that the way we come to perceive the world clouds a number of facts whereas if we have our attention against the clockwise other facts will emerge and realization of language conflicting binaries will further stress the ambiguous nature of language.

Conclusion

Binary Opposition of Deconstruction can to a certain extent give alternative meanings that are based on the theory's assumptions about language. In this regard, it is the tool appropriate for perceiving meaning against the stream.

General Conclusion

Authorial intention leads the text to arrive at a certain ending assisted by a number of different devices to express the reality artistically or in otherwise. When readers encounter these texts, it is their focus to trace authorial intention and attempt follow the tracks left by authors and so whenever an interpretation provoked, it always is supported by clues in the text.

Deconstruction however, reads the text against the grain. Since the text contains a number of oppositions that are conflicted in nature, these conflicted terms reveal social conventions, values and ideologies that happen to be adopted by a certain society, furthermore, these terms in most of the cases differ in hierarchy and therefore in social priori, this hierarchy is unjustly or unconsciously established for reasons people not entirely aware of. To nullify this prioritizing, Deconstruction focuses on elements “there always already” in the text yet ignored as above mentioned so as to prove how a text contradicts itself. Again, for Deconstructionists, all readers do is that they cloud facts also given in texts but choose to read it in one way for the convention that language is stable and reliable, the very conventions Deconstruction attempts to abolish.

Deconstruction, speaking of positive sides, proves itself to be a reliable tool for critical thinking that assists readers’-and students’-abilities to improve their insights on literary works and as a result, they have the ability to have a view of their own towards different areas of life. Indeed, what happens after having been exposed to Deconstruction is to deconstruct previous habits, such as reading blindfoldedly, in a purpose of searching clues to reach authorial intention, and start a close reading that takes everything into account. Deconstruction is not the only source of critical thinking but one of which that greatly increases it. Reading without having a thorough focus on different and all apposing features that a text offers is to, as Fitzgerald (or Nick) said describing Gatsby, “the only dead dream fought on as the afternoon slipped away, trying to touch what was no longer tangible, struggling unhappily, undespairingly towards toward that lost voice across the room” (G G. 153).

As readers opt for a deconstructive approach to literary texts, a number of blind sides in the overall build up of the text become unfolded. Deconstructive

reading (not alone in this regard) offers a cautious and close experience of reading. The focus shifts from arriving at a certain conclusion to instead attain possible conclusions that prove the theory's presuppositions of language and reading experience. Opinions may clash in this method of criticism for it seeks only to "deconstruct" common grounds for the sake of validating their assumption which authenticates the chaotic dense of language and therefore human experience since it is-for deconstructionists- our ground of being, an approach that is for many obtrusive.

The breakdown of texts using binary oppositions offers a great deal of insights as well as focused experience that is, one should say, intricate at first. This reading may prove sensible as it may not. For instance, when Nick went to West Egg and got indulged in New York's lavish life, it does not mean that he is corrupt but he became so after he lost innocence. But it is the former that is the case for Deconstruction because the last is conformity to traditional readings.

In this regard, deconstruction does not have a paradigm to utilize binary opposition. This is a view from other perspectives, for Deconstruction it simply means that Nick does not have the repertoire sufficient in order to face the indecent life if East Egg. That proves that, as mentioned earlier in the first chapter, that language is the ground of our being and the source of our values, principles and behaviors therefore. On aggregate, Deconstructive reading could not be said to lack appropriateness or inadequacy, nor can one say it is the one most adequate, it has advantages and disadvantages as any other theory according to critics such as Psychoanalysts and Marxists who attribute language understanding to factors beyond language; socio-economic and mental aspects. It was worth mentioning that readings are not the same using deconstructive approach due to manifold interpretations that could be introduced to one text, though undertaking the same paradigm.

Bibliography

- Allison, David (ed.) (1985) *The New Nietzsche*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Altizer, Thomas J. et al. (1982) *Deconstruction and Theology*. New York: Crossroads.
- American Writers, a collection of Literary biographies*, volume II, 1968,1969,1970,1971,1972 University of Minnesota.
- Appignanesi, Lisa (ed.) (1985) *Ideas From France: the legacy of French theory*. London: ICA Publications, Documents 3.
- Atkins, G. Douglas. *Reading Deconstruction: Deconstructive Reading*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1983.
- Barry, Peter, *Beginning Theory an Introduction to Literay and Cultural Theory*, 2002.
- Benjamin, Andrew (ed.) (1989) *Post-Structuralist Classics*. London: Routledge.
- Berman, Art (1988) *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction: the reception of structuralism and post-structuralism*. Urbana-Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.
- Bernasconi, Robert and Wood, David (eds) (1988) *The Provocation of Levinas: re-thinking the other*. London: Routledge.
- Bowie, Malcolm (1988) *Freud, Proust, and Lacan: theory as fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Callinicos, Alex (1990) *Against Post-Modernism: a Marxist critique*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cantor, Norman F. (1988) *Twentieth-Century Culture: modernism to deconstruction*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Caruth, Cathy (1990) *Empirical Truths and Critical Fictions: Locke, Wordsworth, Kant, Freud*. Baltimore, Md and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. 1967. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.
- “*Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences.*” 1966. The

- Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques, *Writing and Difference*, 2001, Routledge, Translation © 1978 The University of Chicago.
- Eagleton, Terry, *Literary Theory; An Introduction*, 2003, Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press.
- Geoffrey Hartman: *Criticism as answerable style*. London: Routledge.
- Graff, Gerald (1979) *Literature Against Itself: literary ideas in modern society*. Chicago, Ill. and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Griffiths, A. Phillips (ed.) (1987) *Contemporary French Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Griswold, Charles L. (1988) *Platonic Writings/Platonic Readings*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1987) *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: twelve lectures*. Trans. Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Halliburton, David (1982) *Poetic Thinking: an approach to Heidegger*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- Hamacher, W., Hertz, N. and Keenan, T. (eds) (1989) *Responses: on Paul de Man's Wartime Journalism*. Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska Press.
- Hartman, Geoffrey (1970) *Beyond Formalism*. New Haven, Conn., and London: Yale University Press.
- Hartman, Geoffrey H. *The Unremarkable Wordsworth*. London: Routledge, 1987.
- Johnson, Barbara (1981) *The Critical Difference: essays in the contemporary rhetoric of reading*. Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lois Tyson, *Critical theory today: a user friendly guide*, Routledge 2006 ISBN 0-415-97409-7 (hb) -- ISBN 0-415-97410-0 (pb)
- M. A. R. Habib, *A History of Literary Criticism*, Routledge, 2005, First published 2005 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

- Marthinus Chridtoffel van Niekerk, *Shakespearian pla: Deocnstructive readings of the Merchant of Venic, The Tempest, Measure for Measure and Hamlet*, 2003, University of Pertoria.
- Norris, Christopher. *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Rob Pope, *The English Studies Book, An Introduction to Lnaguage, Literature and Culture*, 1998, Second Edition, 11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE, Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada by Routledge, 29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001
- Sarup, Mandan. *An Introductory Guide to Post-Structuralism and Postmodernism*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989.
- Royle, Nicholas, ed. *Deconstructions: A User's Guide*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.
- Ruth Brigozy, *The Cambridge Companion to F. Scott Fitzgerald*, Campridge University Press, New York. 2002.
- Sedgwick, Peter (2001) *Descartes to Derrida: an introduction to European philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Simpson, David (ed.) (1988) *The Origins of Modern Critical Thought: German aesthetics and literary criticism from Lessing to Hegel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, John H. (1987) *The Spirit and its Letter: traces of rhetoric in Hegel's philosophy of Bildung*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.
- Tate, Allen (1953) *The Forlorn Demon*. Chicago, Ill.: Regnery. Taylor, Mark C. (1984) *Erring: A Postmodern A/theology*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- Todorov, Tzvetan (ed.) (1989) *French Literary Theory Today: a reader*. Trans. R. Carter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ward, Graham (1995) *Barth, Derrida, and the Language of Theology*.
- Warminski, Andrzej (1987) *Readings in Interpretation: Hölderlin, Hegel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Heidegger. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wolfreys, Julian (1998) *Deconstruction: Derrida*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Wright, Elizabeth (1984) *Psychoanalytic Criticism: theory in practice*. London: Methuen.

