

Tribhuvan University

Formation of Subject in V.S. Naipaul's *The Mystic Masseur*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in English

By

Binod Kumar Bhattarai

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

September 2008

Tribhuvan University
Faculty of Humanities and Social Science

This thesis entitled "Formation of Subjectivity in *The Mystic Masseur*" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Mr. Binod Kumar Bhattarai has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgement

This thesis is an outcome of continuous labor and research. In spite of different difficulties and problems, it has now reached its target. During the course of this research work, different people have contributed directly or indirectly.

First and foremost, I would like to express my high respect and gratitude for my supervisor Mr. Chitra Kumar Karki, lecturer at Central Department of English for his valuable support and encouragement during the process of providing concrete shape to my abstract thoughts.

In the same way, I must be grateful to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, the head of Central Department of English, Kirtipur for providing me with the opportunity to carry out this research work. I lack words to express my gratitude to Dr. Sanjeev Upreti for his suggestions and providing the materials which were not available outside. I deeply owe my gratitude to my respected lecturers Pushpa Raj Acharya, Ghanashyam Bhandari, Sadan Raj Adhikari, Badri Prasad Acharya for their support in improving my skills in this writing.

In this chain, I am also thankful to my father Mahendra Bhattarai and mother Pabitra Devi Bhattarai, all the family members and my relatives who left me mentally free, encouraged me to secure my Master Degree and helped financially.

At the end, I should not forget my friends Bipin Dawadi, Maheshwor Acharya, Pustak Barma, Deepak Niraula, Hari Budhathoki and Tanka Rai for their valuable assistance. I am thankful to Mrs Savitri Sharma of Creative Cyber & Communication Center who computerized my thesis neatly.

November, 2008

Binod Kumar Bhattarai

Abstract

The present research work basically focuses on V. S. Naipaul's first novel *The Mystic Masseur*. It studies how the western dominant culture functions as hegemonic force that constructs the subjectivity of the protagonist Ganesh in the light of the Foucauldian discourse of subjectivity. Throughout the novel, the protagonist Ganesh is governed by western dominant culture and becomes just like puppet in different fields such as marriage, fooding, clothing, politics and education system.

During the course of novel, Ganesh undergoes a series of changes that creates different identities in his encounter with the people that come one after another in his life. He remains in a state of flux and longs for stable identity that can provide meaning and position in his Trinidadian community. His constant movement from masseur to teacher, as a teacher to author, and as an author to politician clearly shows, how he becomes puppet within western dominant culture and how his identity is formed by Foucauldian discourse of subjectivity.

Contents

Acknowledgement	iii
Abstract	iv
Chapter I: Introduction	1-9
Discourse of Subjectivity in <i>The Mystic Masseur</i>	
Chapter II: Analysis of Tools	10-29
Foucauldian Notion of Subjectivity	10
Hegemony of Subjectivity	15
Discourse, Ideology and Resistance	19
Subjectivity within Orientalism	25
Chapter III: Textual Analysis	30-50
Subjectivity Formation in V. S. Naipaul's <i>The Mystic Masseur</i>	30
<i>The Mystic Masseur</i> and the Hegemony	35
Power and Resistance in <i>The Mystic Masseur</i>	37
Chapter IV: Conclusion	51-53
Works Cited	

Chapter I

Introduction

Discourse of Subjectivity in *The Mystic Masseur*

This research attempts to study Nobel laureate Sir Vidiadhar Naipaul's first novel *The Mystic Masseur* as a representation of the formation of subject among the people of the Trinidadian community. The novel tries to give the most graphic, vivid and realistic account of colonial Trinidadian communities where the subjectivity of the non-western people has been formed by the western dominant culture. The subjectivity refers to the condition of being that describes interior life or selfhood of any individual, as it is theorized in terms of its relationship to gender, power, language, culture and politics. And the subjectivity has been constructed from multiple location of power which operates through intra-racial conflicts, ambivalent nature of the colonized people, resistance, western hegemony, western representation and orientalism. As a representative figure of the East Indian Trinidad community, the protagonist Ganesh's subjectivity has been constructed by the British colonialism in the case of marriage, fooding, clothing, politics and education system.

Since the time *The Mystic Masseur* appeared on the literary horizon in 1957, it has drawn attention of the colonization period and the post-interdependence era of India. It is set in Trinidad. Everyone living in Trinidad including Ganesh, Leela, Beharry, Narayan and other are remarkable characters whose subjectivity have been constructed in the light of the Foucauldian discourse of subjectivity. Within any historical period, various discourses compete for control of subjectivity, but these discourses are always a function of the power of those who control the discourses to determine the knowledge and truth. Subjectivity has been formed by the discourse that dominates the time. This concept has been applied in the case of the protagonist Ganesh who is intrapped within western dominant culture in terms of marriage, fooding, clothing, politics, education system and so forth. To create his identity, he

changes many occupations ranging from masseur to teacher, to writer and to politician. Hence, dominant culture of Trinidad community functions as a hegemonic force that constructs his subjectivity.

Subjectivity refers to an abstract principle that defies our separation into distinct selves and that encourages us to imagine that, or simply helps us to understand why our interior lives inevitably seem to involve other people. The word 'subject' proposes that the self is not a separate and isolated entity, but one that operates at the intersection of general truths and shared principles. There is close relationship between power and subjectivity while forming the identity of any individual because power constructs subjectivity.

Discourse is widely used in analysing literary and non-literary texts. It is a unit of language use or performance. Truth, power and knowledge are essential in analyzing Foucauldian discourse, for discourse has affected through these elements. Discourses do not exist in vacuum but are in constant conflict with other discourses. They are other social practices which inform them over a question of truth and authority. In any society, discourse is power because the rules determining discourse enforce norms of what is rational, sane or true. All discourses are produced by power, but they are not completely subservient to it and can be used as a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Foucault claims that the subject is discursively and socially conditioned and situated within power relations.

In Foucault's description, power is diffused throughout the social field constituting individual's subjects, his knowledge and pleasures. Foucault claims that as soon as there is power relation, there is the possibility of resistance. Resistance refers to a voice against the discourse of dominance. Ganesh in *The Mystic Masseur* represents the Hindu culture in Trinidad who reflects the Hindu identity and history. He is obliged to be a member of British

Empire and does not follow rules and regulations of British school where he goes without wearing *toupee*. This becomes clear that he stands in opposition of the British culture.

Antonio Gramsci defines 'hegemony' as the willfull consent to be ruled and does not examine the power relationship in it in terms of domination. It is exploitation of a powerful country over powerless. In his novel the *The Mystric Masseur*, Naipaul has focused upon Hindu custom, food, ritual, initiation ceremony, Bhagwat, language and way of living to reflect Hindu cultural identity. Being Hindu Brahamin, Ganesh can not preserve his own identity rather his identity has been constructed by the western dominant culture.

The belief, values and ways of thinking energize the ideological consent through which human beings perceive what they take to be reality. It is the complex position and interest of particular class. The dominant ideology embodies and serves to legitimize economic and social class. Louis Althusser declares that ideologies vary according to the form and practices of each mode of state apparatus. It operates by means of a type of discourse which interpellates the individuals to take off a pre-established 'subject position' – that is a position as a person with certain views and values which serve the ultimate interest of the ruling class. Edward Said defines orientalism as a discourse produced by the west about the east. Discourse deals with interrelationship whereas orientalism deals with east-west relationship. Said brings the reference from Foucault. For Foucault, discourse contents three things: representations, truth and power. Orientalism has created hegemonic power. Hegeony is the consent of rule to be ruled. The west rules the non-west by winning the latter's consent. Non-west accept the authencity of the west deliberately. They feel that the west is superior to the east. Said gives the reference of Derrida's differance and difference. The west creates its own identity in binary relationship. Occident is what orient is not. Hence, Said creates dichotomy between 'self' and 'other.' In his novel, *The Mystric Masseur* V.S. Naipaul has highlighted the Trinidadian diasporic culture which is being flourished in Trinidad. The

culture is based on Hindu Philosophy and is dispersed from the east India. The Trinidadian Hindu culture, which has been disclosed as a diasporic culture in *The Mystic Masseur*, is from pure Brahmin origin and wants to identify his own Hindu culture in Trinidad. The novel *The Mystic Masseur*, is the presentation of Hindu philosophy and civilization, being dislocated in the midst of western metropolis.

The novel is densely populated with the early school life of Ganesh, initiation ceremony, funeral process of his father, wedding ceremony, use of spiritual power by *The Mystic Masseur*, Bhagwat, Ganesh as a creative writer and Hindu Philosophy and religion. When Ganesh fails as a Mystic Masseur, he becomes a creative writer and is dedicated to journalism as well. He reflects Hindu religion and philosophy and is elected as the president of Hindu Association. At length, he becomes a member of legislative parliament and is compelled to be a supporter of British Empire.

V.S Naipaul has written many literary works including fiction and non-fiction. Naipaul's first novel *The Mystic Masseur* is about a bright young man, who dreams of becoming a famous writer. In this novel, Naipaul has exposed the nostalgic events and the memories of the past of his ancestral land. While being dispersed from India, it has lost its value and led to identity crisis due to British colonialism. In relation to this colonialism Charles Van Doren writes: "colonialism means the kind of arrangements made and fought over by the European power during the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, mostly in Africa and in the South East Asia" (287). This justifies when and how colonialism operated in different countries. By the time Naipaul was eleven, he and his father assumed that he was to be a writer. About his career and reputation as a novelist, Rob Nixon writes: "By venturing in to travel writing and journalism, he has garnered a reputation of different order . . . he is treated as a mandarin possessing a penetrating analytic understanding of Third

world societies. In short, he has grown into an expert" (4). In the same manner, about his career and subject matter of his works, Edward Said asserts in his *Culture and Imperialism*:

To some degree the early V. S. Naipaul, the essayist and travel writer resident off and on in England, yet always on the move, revisiting his Caribbean and Indian roots, shifting through the debris of colonialism and post-colonialism, remorselessly judging the illusion and cruelties of independent state, and the new true believers, was figure of modern intellectual exile. (40)

It shows the impact of the colonial and post-colonial cruelties on the third world people. How he himself becomes a figure of modern intellectual exile throughout his life and literary career significant.

Naipaul's reputation follows him into *The Suffrage of Elvira* in which the Muslim politician leader Baksh regrets that Ganesh is no longer available to "drive away a spirit." As in *Minguel Street*, the comedy of *The Mystic Maneur* and *The Suffrage of Elvira* is undercut by the reality that the characters are trapped by the poverty of their education, the lack of opportunities for their education, the lack of opportunities for intellectual and cultural development in their surroundings and the shallowness of their emotional lives. In Naipaul's first three novels, truth emerges in the comic action. In his *A House for Mr. Biswas*, the protagonist is his struggle to define himself by his tripartite vocation: to build his house, to succeed as a journalist and to prepare his son to leave home for study and a new life abroad.

In his *Guerrillas*, Naipaul depicts the continuity of cruelty and strife in a setting for different from the Egyptian desert but ever more emotionally charged. He shows the impact of post-colonialism in his *Guerrillas*. Although most of the colonized countries became free from military power during 1950s and 1960s. They were still guided by the linguistic, economic and cultural imperialism. People living in these nations were trying to reestablish their own cultural identity but found themselves lost in dilemma because the language,

culture and other behaviours of the colonizers were deeply rooted in them. Regarding post-colonialism, Aleke Boehmer writes: "It designates a politics of transformational resistance to unjust and unequal forms of political and cultural authority which extends back across the twentieth century and beyond" (340). These unequal forms of political and cultural authorities create ambivalent, fragmented and inorganic attitudes toward their linguistic and cultural values.

Themes of alienation, mistrust, rootlessness, mockery and self-deception certainly continue to pervade throughout his works. Naipaul's experiment with form are, perhaps, his greatest achievements of this. He writes: "Literature, like all living art, is always on the move" (Reading and Writing 41). The west thinks that the East is barbarous, primitive, tribal, simple, irrational and without history, futureless, bush, philistine. That's why he has written almost all his books against the west although he is living there. As an English Novelist as well as writer, he has travelled most of the countries as well as parts of the world. As for example, Trinidad, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan and others. He uses feelings of such people and their psychology. There are some critics who differently comment on the fiction.

Commenting on the novel *The Mystic Masseur*, Lillian Feder writes:

Ganesh's development as a writer begins with his work as a professional mystic. In both these careers a mixture of naivete, honest effort, and guile combine to ensure his success . . . as he reads books on psychology and Hindu philosophy, his increasing knowledge gives him the confidence to believe he can rid people of the "evil spirits" that rob them. (168)

Here, it seems to state that the ambivalent nature of Ganesh who sometimes becomes mystic and sometimes writer, and further he talks about the religious nature of Ganesh. Commenting on the novel, Donald observes that the novel is "an allegory of the history of the Hindu community in Trinidad" (3). This line projects the religious description of the novel.

Focusing on the novel, next critic Champa Rao Mohan states in his book *Post Colonial Situation: in the novel of the V.S. Naipaul*. As Mohan writes:

The duality in the lives of the East Indians is clearly evident in their use of language as well. Most of the time they use a dialectal version of English, characterized by the use of Misconjugated verbs. Even Ganesh, in spite of his education, uses standard English on rare occasions and is extremely self-conscious while doing so. (27)

This is where the ambivalence occurs in the lives of the East Indians. Neither they can easily accept the dominant culture of Trinidad nor can they give up their own East Indian culture. Further, H. S. Mann, a critic discussing the effects of the Second World War on Trinidad also points out: "Ill-prepared for the changes thrust on them by World War two with it's economic boom and by universal adult Franchise in 1996, Trinidadians turned to trickery, and to the imitation of England and America" (13). The novel *The Mystic Masseur* moves around the Trinidad community. Commenting on the fiction, Albert Memmi remarks: ". . . far from preparing the adolescent to find himself completely, school creates a permanent duality in him"(3). This line seems to depict the duality of the protagonist Ganesh who follows the traditional profession of a mystic but wears western clothes and makes use of western science for the spiritual cure of his clients.

Unlike ambivalence, it seems that the formation of subject is the central issue in V. S. Naipaul's *The Mystic Masseur*. Ganesh is entrapped within western representation because of seeking his identity in the case of marriage, politics and education system. The subjectivity is the domination of culture and it is the discursive formation. The construction of subjectivity with Naipaul's *The Mystic Masseur* has been elaborated in the light of Foucauldian discourse. The discourse functions through ritualization. Discourse is bound by rituals which limit the number of people who can utter certain types of utterances. Western culture is the

main culture whereas East Indian culture is sub-culture in Trinidad. So, non-western people's subjectivity is formed by the western dominant culture. Therefore, this research is based on the central issue of the formation of subject.

The novel *The Mystic Masseur* has been studied with the background of colonization period during Second World War, during which powerful British government exploited and expanded its imperialism over powerless East Indian community. During the period, there was no authenticity between any margin and center because of the power and resistance which were used simultaneously. This situation just corresponds with the “Truth” which has also no authenticity. Power plays crucial role during the colonization.

The present research work has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter presents the elaboration of title, short introduction to the author, a brief outline of his novel *The Mystic Masseur* and introductory outline of the present research study itself. It gives a short view of the entire work. The novel and its related aspects are introduced in it.

The second chapter tries to explain the theoretical modality that is applied in this research work. It brings into four various discourses associated with subjectivity such as hegemony, discourse, resistance and ideology. The theoretical modality moves around the Naipaul's text *The Mystic Masseur* and tries to penetrate with the basis of theoretical modality outlined in the second chapter. The third chapter analyzes the text at a considerable length. It will sort out some extracts from the text as evidences to prove the hypothesis of the study that *The Mystic Masseur* shows the formation of subject created by the western dominant culture which serves as the core of this research work.

The fourth chapter is the conclusion of the entire research work on the basis of analysis of the text done in chapter three. It concludes explanation and arguments put forward in the preceding chapter and reinforces the formation of subjectivity within white dominated

society and treatment of issues of hegemony, subjectivity, discourse, resistance, ideology and orientalism in the text.

In a nutshell, this thesis studies how V. S. Naipaul's East Indian hero Ganesh tries to establish the stable subjectivity and struggles within white dominated society and their western norms and values. As a result, he goes on changing his professions in order to form his stable identity but fails due to his disillusionment caused by the representation of the west.

Chapter II

Foucauldian Notion of Subjectivity

The term "subjectivity" simply refers to interior life or selfhood of any individual, especially as it is theorized in terms of its relationship to gender, power, language, culture and politics etc. For Foucault subjectivity is a discursive production. To him, the discourse functions in structuring the individual's subjectivity though it is not static. The term "subjectivity" directly affects colonized peoples' perceptions of their resist the conditions of their subjections. Hence, there is close link between power and subjectivity. While forming the identity of any individual power operates a lot. As Foucault supports in his work

Power/Knowledge:

The individual is not to be conceived as a sort of elementary nucleus, a primitive atom, a multiple and inert material on which power comes to fasten or against which it happens to strike. It is already one of the prime effects of power that certain desires come to be identified and constituted as individuals.

The individual is an effect of power. (98)

Here, Foucault clearly exposes the concept that our identity or subjectivity is formed by power. He understands subjectivity as associated with power. Power is a machine in which everyone is caught. For him, where there is power, there is subjectivity or identity.

Furthermore, the concept of subjectivity is very prominent in the philosophical field. In Nietzsche also, we find the origins of Foucault's understanding of subjectivity and its relationship to language. In *On the Genealogy of Morals*, he writes:

A quantum of force is equivalent to a quantum of drive, will, effect more . . . which conceives and misconceives all effects as conditioned by something that causes effects, by a subject, can it appear otherwise . . . but there is no such substratum, there is no such substratum, there is no "being" behind doing,

effecting, becoming 'the doer' is merely a fiction added to the deed-the deed is everything. (45)

In the above extract, Nietzsche challenges the common sense notion of cause and effect as it appears in 'popular' judgments of human behavior. It is quite wrong to assume that behind every effect there is a human subject 'intending it' and therefore answerable. Force, will, energy and power circulate in the universe, unable not to produce dramatic and violent conflicts and impacts. Hence, morality and its instrumental language are not universal systems of absolute truths and values, but are weapons in a power game where one group in the human world tries to constrain another.

Unlike the Foucauldian notion of subjectivity, Rousseau's concept of subject is quite opposite. As Rousseau sees the individual as self-sufficient. In his "subjectivity" Nickmonfield quotes Rousseau's saying, "The individual comes first, almost producing itself, power comes after, confusing and limiting the individual. But for Foucault, power comes first and the individual" (55). Here, it seems that we are the very material of power, the thing through which it finds its expression.

For Foucault, Rousseau's free and autonomous individual is not merely an alternative, outdated theory of subjectivity, a quaint forerunner to contemporary discussions. This very model is the one that allows power to conceal itself and to operate so effectively.

Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser developed a definition of the subject place under capitalism. Althusser says that ideology needs subjectivity. As he states "all ideology hails or interprets concrete individual as concrete subjects, by the functioning of the category of the subject" (130). In Althusser's opinion, we distinguish for the moment between concrete individual on the one hand and concrete subjects on the other, although at this level concrete subjects exist only in so far as they are supported by a concrete individual. Hence, ideology hails or interpellates individuals as subject. He further points out "Individuals are always-

already subjects” (132). Hence, it seems that ideology has always- already interpellated individuals as subjects. In fact, the State and Apparatuses have meaning only from the point of view of class struggle. For Althusser, “a subject through the subject and subjected to the subject” (134).

Hence, the subjectivity does not develop according to its own wants, talents and desires, but exists for the system that needs it. Subjectivity, therefore, is the type of being we become as we fit into the needs of the larger political imperatives of the capitalistic state. It requires us not only to behave in certain ways, but to be certain types of people.

In the process of analyzing about the term “subjectivity,” we can bring the concept of Lacan and Kristeva too. To Lacan, subject is a language whereas for Kristeva subjectivity is merely a process which has incomplete and unresolved nature. Kristeva argues that there is a zone in which the repression of unconscious material is incomplete, where the dividing line between what the conscious mind does and does not admit is weak or blurred. In *Powers of Horror*, she argues:

The 'unconscious' contents remain here excluded but in strong fashion not radically enough to allow for a secure differentiation between subject and object, and yet clearly enough for a defensive position to be established as if the fundamental opposition were between I and others or, in more archaic fashion between inside and outside.(7)

Kristeva says that the subject is merely the hypothetical inside of an imagined container whose walls are permeable. To her, the subject is not a fixed system but a prone to the occasional outburst of incomprehensible and irrational displacement. In fact, subjectivity never quite forms. The boundary fence is never finished.

In Lacan's opinion the subject is associated with language. He analyzes subjectivity in relation to language. While talking about the concept of “subjectivity” Lacan puts forward the

concept of “The Mirror Stage.” For him, “the mirror stage . . . manufactures for the subject, caught up in the lure of spatial identification, the succession of fantasies that extends from a fragmented body-image to a form of its totality” (899). Here, visual field plays a crucial role in the development of subjectivity. Lacan's theory asserts that the subject obtains an understanding of its gender at the same time as it enters into language. Entering into the mirror stage, the subject is both produced in language and subjected to the laws of the symbolic that pre-exist it.

Lacan first read Sigmund Freud through the lens of structuralism and is best known in theoretical circles for his pronouncement that the unconscious is “structure like a language” (897). Here it is a language which escapes the subject in its operation and effects. The similarity to the structure of language is crucial to Lacan because the subject itself is produced through language in the same way that language produces meaning. He further posits three stages of human development: the mirror stage, the imaginary and the symbolic. As he points out:

In the mirror stage the child discovers its main image, which becomes other to the self, thereby establishing subjectivity. This dualism is further developed in the imaginary. In the symbolic stage, the child enters language, and the subject, now linguistic is continually deferred down the chain of signifiers. Subjectivity is thus always on the move and is formed only in and as dialogue, which is never ending except in death. (897)

Here, Lacan seems to challenge the common sense idea that language exists in order to communicate. As he writes that the subject is continually deferred down the chain of signifiers.

While talking Lacan's concept of subjectivity, it will be relevant to relate the concept of Ferdinand de Saussure. As he points out: “Language is a system of sign” (717). He further

argues that the sign is the combination of 'signifier' and 'signified'. For him, signs are not directly anchored in reality. So, it can be argued that language is not a medium but a system. And this system is not determined by what happens outside of it in some pre-linguistic space. It is built around an internal arrangement of differences. To Saussure, language is not a set of tools haphazardly connected, but a concrete system of conventions built around two relationships: the difference between one signifier and other, and the arbitrary relationship between signifier and signified. So Lacan argues that the position of the 'I' within language, the subject does not simply represent the presence of a subject but produces it by a system of differentiations between the 'I' and which is not 'I'. The distinction is not static but continuous. The subject being in a continual process of development. In Lacanian theory, the critical stage for the development of subjectivity is called the 'mirror stage' and it occurs usually between the ages of six and eighteen months.

From the above concept, it can be seen that subjects exist in the tension and interplay between imaginary and symbolic. In this way, for Lacan as for Freud, subjectivity is not automatic or spontaneous rather it is problematic.

Regarding the Foucauldian concept of subjectivity, postcolonial theorist Franz Fanon in his book *The Wretched of the Earth* puts forward the concept of colonialism at the level of subjectivity. He writes: "Because it is a systematic negation of the other person and a furious determination to deny the other person all the attributes of humanity, colonialism forces the people it dominates to ask themselves the question constantly: "In reality, who am I?" (200-1). Here, Fanon states that the colonial regime needs certain types of subjectivity in order to justify itself in moral terms and to operate in practical terms. But Fanon's solution here is violence. Only in violence the native can discover the sense of subjectivity that can stabilize the world and build freedom. Violence is liberality not primarily because it is able to destroy

the structures of colonial regime, but because it causes a revolution on the level of the subject.

Hence, the term “subjectivity” is used to describe interior life or selfhood, especially as it is theorized in terms of its relation to gender, power, language, political and so on. In Foucault's opinion, subjectivity is a discursive production. He further describes a subject that is the product of power which individualizes those subjects to it. Further, he has traced the deviation and lineage of subjects in and through history. This notion of subjectivity is radically historicized, that is, the subject is held to be wholly and only the product of history. In his opinion, a subject position is that perspective or set of regulated discursive meanings from which discourse makes sense.

Hegemony of Subjectivity

The term “hegemony” generally refers to the domination of one state within a confederation. It is an exploitation of powerful country over powerless. Hegemony is the power of ruling class to convince other classes that their interests are the interests of all. This broad meaning was originally coined and popularized in the 1980s by an Italian Marxist philosopher Antonio Gramsci who investigated why the ruling class was so successful in developing and promoting its own interest in the society. Gramsci defines “hegemony” as the “willful consent to be ruled” and does not examine power relationship in it in terms of domination. People belonging to certain discourses, according to Gramsci, may have consent to be ruled.

Gramsci coined this term, when Mussolini's Fascist government in Italy incarcerated him. Although Mussolini's monopolistic force becomes intolerable for Gramsci that becomes a life-governing and life-sustaining force for the whole Italians. Gramsci describes:

Spontaneous consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group,

this consent is historically caused by the prestige which dominant groups enjoys because of its position and function in the word of production. (12)

In the hegemonical field the ruler heavily exploits and dominates the ruled, but the latter are not aware of the domination and exploitation of the former. So they rather glorify and valorize the rulers ideology and doctrine. As a result, the ruled over get comfored to whatever ideology the rulers force upon them. Gramsci analyses:

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

Here, it can be inferred that any individual is hegemonized not by force but with intensity. And power is excercised over educational and cultural systems. The main intention of the Europeans entering into Africa and India is no other than the henemonial practise. Though they claim that they are the chosen people of God and their main motto is to civilize the uncivilized Africans and Indians, the reality is quite different. They exercize their power to exploit non-western people. In Gramscis's words, the Hegemonic exercise of power also becomes what he remarks:

. . . useful for describing the success of imperial power and over a colonized people who may far out number any occupying military force but whose desire for self-determination has been suppressed by a hegemonic notion of the greater good, often couched in terms of social order, stability and advancement all of which are defined by the colonizing power. (116)

Hegemony is produced by the proper fusion of force and consent. So, hegemony seeks to renew the prevailing common sense mentality in society as a whole. Analyzing the dualistic

notion of rulers and the extremely dependent principle Gramsci writes: "Consent is achieved by the interpeuation of the colonized subject understands itself a peripheral to those Euro-centric values, while at the same time accepting their centrality" (117).

In this context, organic crisis can be seen in which the ruling class begins to disintegrate, creating the opportunity for a subordinate class to transcend its limitations and build up a broad movement capable of challenging the existing order and achieving hegemony. But if the opportunity is not taken, the balance of forces will shift back to the dominant class which establishes its hegemony on the basis of a new pattern of alliances.

In Raymond Williams's opinion, culture can not be taken only as a vehicle of exploitation but also a language of co-operative shaping of common contribution. He further considers that Gramsci proposed the concept of hegemony as a uniform, static and abstract structure. In *Marxism and literature* , he avows:

A lived hegemony is always a process. It is not, except analytically, a system or a structure. It is a realized complex of experiences, relationships and activities with specific and charging pressures and limits. In practice, that is, hegemony can never be singular. It is also continually resisted, limited, altered, challenged by pressures not all its own. (112)

Here, Antonio Gramsci's opinion of hegemony and the distinction between civil society and political society can classify Saidian notion of hegemony in terms of Oriental stereotype. The civil society is made up of voluntary affiliation of schools, families and unions. Culture according to Gramsci, operates in civil society because here the influence the of ideas of institution and people works by consent not force. However, the political society is made up institutions of every police, central bureaucrat, the direct domination of power. In such civil society, certain culture plays the dominant role over others so much so that the people of

other cultures remain satisfied of being ruled by other culture. Such cultural relationship is hegemony.

In this way, hegemony can be understood in relation to the strategies by which the world views and power of ascendant social groups are maintained. There is close link and relationship between the hegemony and the subjectivity. Foucauldian subjectivity is a discursive production. The hegemony also operates with the help of power or any discourses. The powerful can hegemonize the everyday life of the powerless. Consequently, hegemony is not a static entity: it is marked by a series of changing discourses and practices intrinsically bound up with social power. Hegemony, at the level of class society, is to determine the continuation and consolidation of the existing power maintenance and at the level of nation is to prove dominance of one nation over another.

Discourse, Ideology and Resistance

To understand the Foucauldian discourse of subjectivity, it is necessary to know the relationship between discourse, resistance and ideology. The term “discourse” in its general is a unit of meaning that is coherent succession of utterances. It further refers to the use of the language in a particular way or rather a special type of language. It is a “practice” through which the world makes the sense. It is a loose structure of interconnected assumptions that make knowledge possible.

Foucault attributes this term “discourse” to power, a term that has provoked much discussion because he may be said to have used it rather loosely. It clearly has much in common with Althusser's 'ideology' and Gramsci's 'hegemony' because it rules by consent. Discourse is a way of classifying and ordering. Foucault states that specific discourses such as medicine and law service, specific interests, power and control of the human subject are exercised in discourse. Here, language operates in the interest of the institutions of society to construct people in certain ways. It is not always power, however, but also resistance to

power that is embedded in such discourse. As soon as there is power relation there is possibility of resistance.

Discourse deals with interrelationship. In Foucault's opinion, discourse contains three things-Representation, Power, Truth. Regarding it, Foucault discusses about the interrelationship between truth and power. In his essay *Truth and Power* Foucault remarks: "How power diffuses itself in systems of authority and how effects of truths are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true or false. Truth, then, is itself a product of relations of power and of the systems in which it flows, and it changes as systems change" (1134). Here, Foucault declares that truth is the product of relations of power, and as the systems changes the truth also changes. Foucault further says that representation becomes truth as it is made by those who are in power. Truth is expressed in terms of binary oppositions. Having direct link with power if power changes truth also changes.

For Foucault, 'truth' is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation, and operation of statement. Truth is linked in a circular relation with systems of power.

Power is nothing more and nothing less than the multiplicity of force relations within the social body. He argues that there is equality in terms of power distributions. It is not hierarchical flowing top to bottom and is not used vertically to dominate the 'Other' but it circulates multifariously. Power, for him, is not just the ruthless domination of the weak by the stronger. This idea is similar to Nietzsche who says that power is not to be "had" of all. In *History of Sexuality*, Foucault writes:

Power is everywhere, not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere . . . power comes from below; that is, there is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between ruler and ruled at the root of power relations, and serving as a general matrix-no such duality extending from the

top down and reaching on more and more limited groups to the very depths of the social body. (93-94)

From this above extract, it becomes clear that Foucault's main project was to turn the negative conception of power upside down. In doing this, he supports Nietzsche more than Karl Marx. On the other hand, Foucault sees power as a complex of forces that produces what happens in the society. For him, many different forms of power exist in our society such as legal, administrative, economic, military and so forth. Where there is power, there is resistance. In his book *Madness and Civilization*, he states: "Resistance does not exist outside of the system of power relations. It is instead inherently part of the relation in modern day normalizing power relation. This tends very much to isolate the individual resistance into a series of "special cases" which do not allow generalization" (145). Here, it can be seen that resistance is inseparable from power and Foucault defines it as the component of the power relations. In fact, Foucault does not mean to say that power is evil in itself. His concept of power is related to productivity. This productive power limits an individual and subjects him to certain conditions. This subjection of an individual is viable with the help of "techniques" of truth and knowledge. But the subject can resist his position and identity that are set for him by the ideological framework of the discourse.

The 'subject' is always placed within a network of power, truth and representation. Power categorizes the individual, provides him with his own identity and imposes the law of truth. It is a form of power that makes individual "subject" due to this power, an individual has been identified or subjectified. So, power attempts to subject an individual becomes successful with the help of knowledge. To subject an individual means to compel someone to be under controlled or dependent and to a conscience or self knowledge to his own identity. Therefore, according to Foucault, subjects also have kept "guts" to resist from a certain location in the power structure. They resist from "within" and try to alter the power relations

by rising from another discourse. Because of being component of power structure, the subject cannot get rid of the subjectivity imposed on him but only tries to alter the prevailing power relation. Although the subjects cannot liberate themselves from the ditch of the state's institution but can, according to Foucault, "promote new forms of subjectivity through refusal of this kind of individuality that has been imposed on them for several countries" (336).

Subjects are sure to fail if they attempt to create the next essentialist notion by rupturing the prevailing one. Such kind of discourse will also be more adjustable in comparison to the previous one. In Foucault's view the claims arising from the resistance are also the products of another discourse and can never be disinterested and objective. Truth, power and knowledge are essential in analyzing discourse. Discourse has effected through those elements. Foucault sees truth as being something far more worldly and more negative. In his book *Discipline and Punish*, he writes:

Truth is of the world: it is produced these by virtue of multiple constraints. Each society has its regime of truth, its general politics of truth: that is the types of discourse it harbours and causes to function as true; the mechanism and instances which enable one to distinguish true from false statements, the way in which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures which are valorized for obtaining truth.(46)

Truth is something which societies have to work to produce. It is produced by multiple constraints. So, it can be said that discourses do not exist in a vacuum but are in constant-conflict with other discourses and other social practices which inform them other a question of truth and authority.

According to Foucault, power is dispersed throughout social relations. Power produces possible forms of behavior as well as restricting behaviors. The role of power is of great importance in discussion of discourse. For discourses are produced as the dominant and

marginal respectively which are supported by social institutions, state and which are not supported . Thus, power is not always repressive but productive as well.

Traditionally, ideology refers to the system of ideas, values and beliefs common to any social group. Ideology is not just a case of the powerful imposing their ideas upon the weak: subjects are created into ideology, they find subjectivity within the expectations of their parents and their society. Louis Althusser's essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" quotes that "Ideology is a "Representation" of the imaginary relationship of individual to their real conditions of existence" (123). For Foucault, there is no space for critique outside the false consciousness. In terms of "Ideology," Marxist theorists use the term to denote the domination of powerless by powerful one. Foucault sought to distinguish and distance his work from Marxist thinking, though he openly acknowledged his debt to Marxist thought. Marxist notion of ideology were crucial for him in the development of the notion of discourse.

Foucault's differences between ideology and discourse are in terms of "subject" and "economy." Foucault's distinction between ideology and discourse is mainly due to the subjectivity. He was concerned to write the history of ideas without referring to the sovereign subject, the individual. He tries to move away from the notion of the Cartesian subject. The subject whose existence depends on its ability to see itself as unique and self-contained is distinct from others, because it can think and reason. Foucault tries to formulate a way of examining historical processes without relying on the notion of the subject. Sara Mills writes in her *Discourse*, "Foucault chooses rather to ignore the subject in itself, and concentrate on the processes which he considered to be important in the constitution of our very notion of subjectivity" (30). Here, an ideological analysis still retains the notion of the individual subject who is capable of resisting ideological pressures and controlling his/her actions. Ideological analysis may minimize the importance of the subject because of its concern with

groups or classes of individual and because of its interest in the construction of individual subjectivity through the actions of institutions such as the state. Discourse theory is far more difficult in locating and describing for this individual subject who resists power.

Similarly, next element in Foucault's discussion of the difference between ideology and discourse is the role of the economy. Some Marxists believe that the economic base determines what can be said and thought at particular time. But Foucault sees the relation between economic, social structures and discourses as being a complex interaction with none of the terms of the equation being dominant while he is very aware of the importance of state control and power relations based on economic imbalance. He does not see economic relations as primary, but as one type of power relation within a range of others. Foucault tries to move the analysis of power relations within capitalism away from assuming that certain structures of power and capitalism are the same as Patton in his book *Michel Foucault* comments: "It is not perhaps, capitalist production which is autocratic and hierarchized but disciplinary production which is capitalist. We know after all that disciplinary organizations of the workforce persist even when production is no longer strictly speaking capitalist" (124). Likewise, further differences between the conceptions of ideology and Foucault's notion of discourse are the relation of discourse and ideology to nations of power. Individual's subject is an effect of power relations in which discourse plays role. In general, Marxist thought seems to characterize power within what Foucault terms the "repressive hypothesis" that it sees power as negative infringement or someone else's rights. In Marxist opinion, power is taken or seized from other and it is viewed as something which one can possess or hold. But Foucault emphasizes on the productive nature of power which produces certain norms, behaviors as well as represses.

Hence, it can be said that theory of ideology focuses on the overview of repressive power relations. The notion of revolutionary subject is central to this power because of the

characterization of power as repressive. It is sometimes difficult to understand how subjects can develop a revolutionary consciousness and how they can resist oppression. Foucault argues that resistance is already contained within the notion of power.

For Althusser, ideology works through “ideological state apparatuses.” Ideology has a material existence in the sense that it is embodied in all sorts of material practices. Althusser states: "The material existence of an ideological apparatus, be it only a small part of that apparatus: a small mass in a small church, a funeral, a minor match at a sports club, a school day, a political party meeting etc" (127). Here, it seems that ideology is waiting for us whenever we go and what we do and everything we engage in.

For Althusser, ideological discourse constructs subject positions or places for the subject from which the world makes sense. Foucault claims that the subject is discursively and socially conditioned and situated within power relations. He sees that individuals also have the power to define their own identity, to master their body and desires and to force a practice of freedom.

While analyzing Althusser's ideology and Foucauldian discourse of subjectivity, it is necessary to note some crucial distinction between them. Althusser's theory cannot be much impersonal such as scientific truth. Anyway both are very closely related to each other. Hence, ideology has the general function of constructing the subjectivity of the people. Ideology needs subjectivity. Ideology is involved in the reproduction of the social formations and their relations of power.

Subjectivity within Orientalism

The term “Orientalism” generally refers to the western gaze over the orient. It is western perspective toward the non-west. With the help of discourse of orientalism, they create the subjectivity of the non-western people. They make the distinction in terms of binary opposition in which the former is privileged and the other. The privileging epithets are

given to the west. They create the identity of the non-west such as irrational, sexual, wild, barbaric, etc. All negative characteristics are given to the non-western people. Orientalism therefore is neither merely a political subject matter nor is a large collection of text about Orient. It is shaped by the exchange with power political, power intellectual and power cultural.

Western people have represented the east textually, using British and French scholarly works such as "works of literature, political tracts, journalists texts, travel books, religious and philosophical studies" (23). Said stresses how these texts construct subjectivity of the orient through imaginative representations. All these forms of western writing forms a Foucauldian discourse – a loose system of statements and claims that constitute a field of supposed knowledge through which such knowledge is constructed. For Said, such discourses always establish relationships of power.

For Said, orientation is a style of thought raised upon the ontological and epistemological distinction between the orient and the occident. Further, he says that orientalism is a discourse created by the west about the east. It is the westerner's invention and the identity maker. For him, orientalism is a means of exploitation, as he says "orientalism was a kind of intellectual authority over the orient within western culture" (19). Here, it can be seen that western dominant culture function as a hegemonic force that constructs non-western people's subjectivity.

Foucault's "discourse" deals with interrelationship whereas Edward Said's "orientalism" deals with east-west relationship. Said brings the reference from Foucault and puts forward his concept as to how western people first hegemonic and create the subjectivity of the non-western people. For Foucault, discourse contains three things – representation, power and truth.

The west has made the representation of non-western people through their knowledge. westerners visited non-western regions, took few fake instances and generalized accordingly. Therefore, representation is mis-representation according to Edward Said. Said further argues that according to their own generalization and perspective western people create an ideology and form the subjectivity of the non-western people. This concept comes under the Foucauldian concept of discourse. Hence, truth becomes a function of learned judgment which seems to owe even its existence to the orientalist.

Orientalism has created hegemonic power. The west is needed to rule the non-west. Non-west accept the authenticity of the west deliberately. They feel that west is superior to east. Said gives the reference to Derrida's differance and difference. Western would not get the identity of the occident. Occident is what orient is not. West gets their identity in the presence of east. Hence, Said creates dichotomy between 'self' and 'other.' Said quotes "Orient is eternal, uniform and incapable of defining itself" (9). Hence, there is a critique on non-western people's subjectivity. This shows that the subjectivity of the non-western people has been formed by the western people.

Western people are economically, technically and educationally powerful. So, their representation becomes truth from the perspective of Foucauldian notion. Truth is expressed in terms of binary oppositions. It has direct link with power if power, changes truth also changes. Whatever the image the west gives to the non-west becomes truth resulting in hierarchy.

Non-western are irrational, depraved and childlike. This concept depicts that orient has been identified by the west. It is suggestive that they are unable to comprehend the unique features of the non-west. They have their own peculiar culture and tradition. One culture can not be generalized and compared to another according to Said. Here, western people's generalization is false. In his *Orientalism* Said argues:

Orientalism has taken a further step than . . . that views the orient as something whose existence is not only displayed but has remained in time and place for the west. Orientalism been that entire periods of the orients cultural, political and social history are considered mere responses to the West. The West is the actor, the orient a passive reactor. The West is the spectator, the judge and jury of every facet of Oriental behavior. (108-9)

This above extract states that non-western people have been identified with stereotypical terms like passive, emotional, barbaric etc. whereas western people have been subjectified with positive terms such as active, ruler and masculine. Hence, the identity has been created by the west.

According to Foucault, where there is power there is resistance. Power is never monolithic. Regarding resistance Foucault, in his *The History of Sexuality* remarks:

Resistance can only exist in the strategic field of power relations. But this doesn't mean that they are only a reason or rebound, forming with respect to the basic domination and underside that is in the end always passive, doomed to perpetual defeat . . . somewhat similar to the way in which the state relies on the institutional integration of power relationships. (95-6)

Here, he rejects all modern theories that we see power to be anchored in macro structure or ruling classes and to be repressive in nature. He further develops new post- modern perspectives that interpret power as dispersed, indeterminate, subjectless and productive that constitutes individual's identities.

Power, for Foucault, operates not through physical forces or representation by law, but through the hegemony of norms and political technologies. Power is rational that is exercised at innumerate points and indeterminate in character. Power is never something acquired, seized or shared. There is no source or center of power to contest, nor are there any

subjects holding it. Power is purely structural activity for which subjects are anonymous by products. He conceives power as purely fragmentary and indeterminate. His subjectivity is nothing but a construct of domination.

For Foucault, the term 'discourse' refers not to the language or social interaction but to relatively well-bounded areas of social knowledge. Thus, for Foucault, a discourse is a strongly bounded area of a social knowledge. To him discourse is inseparable from power because it is the governing and ordering medium of every institution.

Therefore, in Foucault's opinion, discourse is both the means of oppressing and the means of resistance with multiple discourses rather than a discourse. This notion sees such discourses as contradicting with each other and as a result there is no harmony and oneness in the society. It happens because every discourse consists of power which is produced out of network of representation and truth.

Chapter III

Subjectivity Formation in V. S. Naipaul's *The Mystic Masseur*

V.S. Naipaul's autobiographical novel *The Mystic Masseur* is set in East Indian Trinidad Community that brings a group of different people from both non-western and western backgrounds. In the context of novel, the protagonist Ganesh's East Indian culture is different in terms of fooding, marriage, clothing, politics and education system form western dominant culture. As for instance, Ganesh dresses *dhoti, kurta, toupee*; eats *roti* and *dal*; obeys parents but when he moves into Queen's Royal College, his identity is governed by western mechanism of power by giving up his own distinct culture. For instance, Ganesh goes to cocktail parties of government house; disobeys his father and drinks lemonade wearing dinner jacket. Throughout the novel he changes his identities from Masseur to teacher, from teacher to writer and writer to politician. Hence, Ganesh becomes puppet within the western dominant society. And western dominant culture functions as a hegemonic force to construct the Ganesh's subjectivity which is not static.

During colonization, there was power struggle between western and non-western people. There was no authenticity and originality of power between them since both groups were in the process of 'becoming'. Within colonization, there can be seen inter-racial and intra-racial conflicts, ambivalent feelings of colonizer and colonized. Western values and norms play dominant role over non-western culture. Power operates in such situation. As Foucault says power is inorganic, despersion, horizontal, etc. The subjectivity is in process and not complete. In this chain, Ganesh is entrapped by western discourse but goes on changing his profession from beginning to the end of the novel.

The novel *The Mystic Masseur* is placed entirely within the East Indian Community. Western people are dominant whereas non-western people are marginalized. Hence, it can be said that for western people, subjectivity is formed but non-western people's subjectivity is in

process. As Foucault says there is no stable identity. But non-western people want to represent their identity. As the narrator says:

The wider world has not learnt of Ganesh's early struggles and Trinidad resents this. I myself believe that the history of Ganesh is, in a way, the history of our times, and there may be people who will welcome this imperfect account of the man Ganesh. Ramsumair, Masseur, Mystic and since 1953, M. B. E. (8)

Through these lines, the narrator depicts that Ganesh, the hero of the novel, is a representative figure of the East Indians in Trinidad in their move towards city life and their subsequent creolization. Due to the west, non-western people cannot form their identity according to Edward Said. The novel *The Mystic Masseur* has been written during the colonization. And all non-western people want to create their identity in the western dominated society as Ganesh does. So the history of Ganesh is the history of all non-western people who are struggling to get their identity though it is not stable. Foucault says there is no stable formation of subject. The non-western people are not formed because west destabilizes the Foucauldian discourse. Foucauldian discourse operates a lot to create identity. In forming the subject as narrator further says:

Without Narayan's attacks Ganesh would never have taken up politician and he might have remained a mystic. With unfortunate results, Ganesh found himself a mystic when Trinidad was crying out for one. That time is now past. But some people have not realized it and today in odd corners of Trinidad there is still a backwash of penurious mystics. (193)

The narrator focuses on Ganesh's identity. Through interracial conflict, Ganesh gets his identity as a politician. Non-western people want to subvert hierarchy between East and West and want to create equal level. And through mimicry, they want to create their identity. Ganesh mimics western cultures when he studies in Queen's Royal College. He is entrapped within the dominated non-western culture and gives up non-western Indian culture. For

instance, in accordance with the traditional custom among the East Indians, Ganesh's father selects a bride for Ganesh and writes to him telling him that he should return home and get married. But Ganesh sends a negative reply. This time Ramsumair writes a strong letter giving Ganesh the ultimatum that "If Ganesh did not want to get married he must consider himself an orphan" (13). Even this threat does not make Ganesh change his mind. He does against the traditional custom as well as his father's wish. He mimics western culture where Foucauldian discourse of subjectivity is at work because discourse is related to power and power creates subjectivity though it is not static. Beharry designs the most famous poster of the election for Ganesh. He writes:

Ganesh is
Able
Nice
Energetic
Sincere
Holy. (188)

Through the poster of Ganesh, Beharry wants to create his subjectivity. He wants to form himself as a representative figure of mystic world of East. So he designs such poster with the view of being established himself.

Foucault says, power is inorganic, despersion and horizontal. The same thing happens in the above extract. Identity is considered both social and personal and it makes one person different from another. Non-western people are different from western due to their own distinct culture. Focusing their own identity and non-western culture, Beharry points out: "You must wear proper *dhoti* and *korrtah*. I was talking only last night to Leela about it when she come here to buy cooking-oil. She think is a good idea too" (113). These sentences describe the non-western peoples' identity. Because of west, east is hated and dehumanized. Non-western people want to represent western culture to form their subjectivity but they fail due to disillusionment. So, Beharry gives suggestion to Ganesh to follow non-western culture

in order to create his identity. When Ganesh gets an opportunity, the Great Belcher states him: “It have a long time now I studying you, Ganesh. You have the power all right . . . Ganesh, you have the power. I could see it in your hands, your eyes in the shape of your heed” (105).

Through power, an individual achieves identity. The Great Belcher also becomes hopeful in forming non-western identity because Ganesh is in power. About the protagonist Ganesh, Champa Rai Mohan says:

The source of Ganesh's cultural ambiguity is undoubtedly, the conflict between the non-western and western worlds in which Ganesh finds himself trapped. We see that Ganesh while being attracted, on the one hand, to western books – he buys many books and even writes books himself – is at the same time inclined to take up massaging. (28)

Through these lines, Champa Rai Mohan talks about the cultural ambiguity of the hero, Ganesh. He finds himself entrapped between the non-western and western worlds. Champa Rai fails to talk about how western dominant culture constructs the subjectivity of the non-western people. When he moves into the westerners’ Queen Royal College for higher education, he is mocked and dehumanized. In order to protect his identity from western dominant culture, Ganesh has to assert blindly by becoming their fans. Slowly and gradually he starts to undertake the ideology of the western people so much so that he even begins to state that westerners are superiors in different fields such as in the case of marriage, fooding, clothing, politics and education system. So he has to respect and follow western peoples’ norms and values.

In the novel, *The Mystic Masseur*, V. S. Naipaul discusses about the white westerners hegemony toward the subordinated people like protagonist Ganesh. He asserts the values and norms of the western dominant groups. Hence, his subjectivity is formed by the western

dominant people. For instance, towards the end of the novel after Ganesh shifts to Port of Spain, he discards the traditional attire and finally opts for modern western clothes. As narrator asserts: “He went to Port of Spain – his courage failed him at the last moment and he wore English clothes – to the Registrar – General’s Office in the Red House” (146).

Through mimicry, Ganesh wants to create his identity but he fails due to disillusionment. There is a contradiction in the fact that while Ganesh follows the traditional profession of a Masseur and wears western clothes. There is identity crisis among the conversations:

Yes, Ganesh. Me and Surug Poopa been thinking a lot about you. We thinking that you must stop wearing trousers and a shirt. “It does not suit a mystic” Beharry said.

You must wear proper dhoti and kurtah. I was talking only last night to Leela about it when she came here to buy cooking-oil she think is a good idea too.
(23)

In order to create non-western identity, the above conversation is valuable because western people dominate non-western people through their representation and create subjectivity which is not fixed.

The Mystic Masseur and the Hegemony

Hegemony is an exploitation of powerful country over powerless. The west exploits non-west and create the subjectivity according to their own wish and wants. As Antonio Gramsci defines “hegemony” as the willful consent to be ruled, in the novel, British hegemony can be seen in which Ganesh has been totally traumatized by the western culture. As the narrator says: “Ganesh never walked out again. He went to cocktail parties at Government House and drank lemonade. He wore a dinner jacket to official dinner” (207). Hegemony is a state within society whereby those who are dominated by others, take on

broad values and ideology of those who are in power and accept them as their own without force. Ganesh does the same things because he gives up his own culture and mimics western culture to create his identity but he gets failed and goes on changing his professions.

East Indians in Trinidad Community live under the shadow of Whites' superiority. They can neither express their suffering before the Whites nor can they protest strongly. They become just like puppets at the hands of the Whites. The protagonist of the novel is hegemonized by western people and religion. As he points out: "I does feel that these Americans is the most religious people in the world. Even more than Hindus" (148). Ganesh valorizes the western culture who lives under the shadow of white's superiority. He can neither express his suffering before the whites nor can protest strongly.

Ganesh's subjectivity is constructed by the Whites in manner of Foucauldian representation which has no stability. Further Ganesh is attracted toward western dominant culture where western discourse plays a great role to form non-western peoples' subjectivity. We can see the hegemonized mentality of the protagonist Ganesh as the narrator says: "The deputation sat down carefully on the morris chairs in the Verandah and Ganesh shouted for Leela to bring put some coca-cola" (155). Ganesh accepts western culture without resistance that shows that he has been hegemonized by them. To create his identity, he first mimics western culture but later he is entrapped within it. As Foucault argues representation becomes truth because it is made by those who are in power. Hence, his subjectivity is created by western people. Mr. Ramsumair, Ganesh's father, makes special preparations for the day Ganesh is to be enrolled into Queen's Royal College. Mr. Ramsumair has been also obsessed by western culture. As narrator remarks:

Mr. Ramsumair made a lot of noise about sending his son to the "town college," and the week before the term began he took Ganesh all over the district, showing him off to friends and acquaintances. He had Ganesh dressed

in a Khaki suit and Khaki toupee and many people said the boy looked like a little sahib. (9)

Ganesh's father Ramsumair valorizes the western education system. He sends his son to town college to create the equal identity as whites. Instead, he lives under the shadow of the white superiority. He willingly accepts western education system. The colonizer's culture has deeply influenced the Hindu's fashion. Ganesh in school life feels uncomfortable wearing *khaki* suit without cap- *khaki toupee*. In such case the colonized people are compelled to wear colonizer's suit. Ganesh's friend Beharry remarks: "The Americans is nice people. You must write this book for them" (64). It focuses the white supremacy. The concept of inferiority and superiority is clearly seen in the above citation. The subjectivity of the orient has been constructed by the western people. The same hegemony is exercised over Ganesh as he asserts: "Leela is a high time we realize that we living in a British country and I think we should not be shame to talk the people language good" (65). Here, Ganesh prefers English language and culture to his own culture. Ganesh takes western culture as his own without force. Further Beharry says: "That America, boy, is the place to live in" (67). He also appreciates western country which shows that he is hegemonized by the western culture as Beharry further points out: "It does just show you how backward this Trinidad is when you look at those American Magazines, you don't wish people in Trinidad could point like that?" (78). In hegemony, powerful country hegemonizes over powerless and constructs the subjectivity of the people of subordinate groups. Similarly, western culture dominates the powerless people of the Trinidad Community in the V. S. Naipaul's novel *The Mystic Masseur* in which the East Indian peoples' subjectivity is formed by the western British people.

Power and Resistance in *The Mystic Masseur*

Through resistance, non-western people try to create their identity. Foucault says power cannot exist without resistance. Non-western people resist to create their identity. By resisting the west, non-western people want to represent themselves in which Foucauldian representation functions. Through mimicry and resistance, colonized people want to create their identity but fail due to disillusionment that subjectivity is not fixed entity. Ganesh in *The Mystic Masseur* represents the Hindu culture in Trinidad who reflects the Hindu identity and history. He is obliged to be a member of British empire and does not follow rules and regulations of British school where he goes without wearing *toupee*. This becomes clear that he stands in opposition of the British culture. He frequently changes his job such as from masseur to teacher, teacher to author and author to politician in order to create his space. He is trying to create his stable identity so he goes on resisting one after another. Being author, he searches "somewhere" in articles and books, and being politician he wants to resist British rules and regulation so that he can create his space and identity. As the writer points out: "There is a gentleman of the opposition" (201). This case is attached with Foucauldian discourse. As Ganesh points out: "I have to go. But name of this nonsense about knife and fork for me, you hear. Going to eat with my fingers, as always, and I don't care what the governor or anybody else say" (194). Through these sentences, Ganesh resists against western culture in order to form his identity. Western people have formed their identity whereas non-western people are in the process of creating identity. Ganesh does not eat meat which is in opposition to western culture. Although, Ganesh is entrapped within western dominant culture but he resists it. When he is elected in a local politics he never goes to dinner party. As narrator writes: "He never went to a dinner there . He was always ready to present a petition to the governor. He exposed scandal after scandal" (201). Due to the west, non-west cannot form its own identity so he goes on resisting western culture.

V. S. Naipaul's *The Mystic Masseur*, when seen through theories such as Foucauldian discourse of subjectivity, can be studied as the depiction of power as exercised in its own terrain which draws a contaminated in the relation between the east Indian people and the western people. Due to the discourses of the western people, the East Indian characters are highly governed by the western people. Throughout the novel, the colonized's identity is constructed by the colonizer. Ganesh is entrapped within the western representation. Ganesh has great ambitions to obtain dominant culture of British and gives up his own Indian culture which can be seen in the case of marriage, fooding, clothing, politics and education system.

In the case of marriage, Ganesh is governed by the western dominant culture and gives up non-western Indian culture. As for instance, Ganesh's father selects a bride for Ganesh and writes him telling that he should return home and get married. But Ganesh sends a negative reply. The narrator points out: "Ganesh wrote back that he had no intention of getting married" (12). This statement shows that Ganesh goes against the traditional custom as well as his father's wish. Foucauldian discourse of subjectivity is at work because discourse is related with power and it creates subjectivity of any individual. Ganesh does so when he leaves home to study in Queen's Royal College. Western dominant culture constructs his identity. Supporting this context, Ganesh's father-in-law states: "Remember, your promise, Sahib. Eat, boy; eat, son; eat sahib, eat, pandit Sahib. I beg you, eat" (45). Here, Ramlogan tries to avoid the traditional kedgerie eating ceremony during Ganesh's marriage in order to escape from having to pay Ganesh a dowry. Here, it can be inferred that it is due to western culture that affects Ganesh's psyche.

Likewise, in the case of education too, western dominant culture forms the identity of the non-western people. As for instance, at the end of Ganesh's training in the teachers training college, he is sent to a school in the east end of Port of Spain. In the very outset the headmaster of the school briefs Ganesh on the purpose of education. He pints out:

The headmaster laughed and Ganesh felt he had to laugh too; but as soon as he did so the headmaster became stern and said, Mr. Ramsumair, I do not know what views you have about educating the young, but I want to let you know might a way, before we ever start that the purpose of this school is to form, not to inform. Everything is planned. (14)

The hero is entrapped within the rule and regulation of the western education system that he cannot escape from. Orientalists would appear as teachers, researchers and administrators, travelers, pilgrims and traders who were engaged in constructing the identity of the non-western people. The same context can be seen in the above extract. The attitude of whites behave very negatively to that non-west boy. In this case, the Foucauldian representation highly justified in the novel. Westerners use their discourse to interpret non-western people and valorizes their culture and education system, as the headmaster praises about western students and parents. He further states: “Now don’t quote me. Don’t quote me at all. But this is how I look at it. If you leave the boys alone, they leave you alone. They is good boys, but the parents – God so when Miller come back, you have to take leep class” (15). Orient is considered differently as dull, passive, lazy sensual, uncivilized, barbaric, sadistic etc. The concept of inferiority and superiority is clearly seen in the above detail. Western headmaster creates the subjectivity of the non-west people Ganesh. In the above extract western boy Miller is highlighted whereas Ganesh is dehumanized and insulted by the headmaster because of the western representation in educational system. Hence, non-western people's identity is formed by western people and is treated as a puppet. Furthermore, Miller becomes angry with Ganesh blaming him that students learnt nothing new. Miller points out:

‘I leave a good good class’ Miller said. ‘The boys was going on all right. Eh, eh, I turned my back for a week-well, two three months-and when I turned round again, what I see? The boys and them ain't learnt nothing new and they

even forget what I spend so much time trying to teach them. This teaching is a art, but I have all sort of people who think they could come up from the cane-field and start teaching in Port of Spain. (15)

Through these lines, it can be seen that Miller becomes superior to Ganesh in terms of education. To Miller, non-western people do not know how to teach the students. So, he becomes angry with Ganesh. In the above mentioned paragraph, Miller dehumanizes Ganesh as inferior object as if he does not have his own mind and knowledge, in order to claim that it is their burden to civilize them.

Similarly, Foucauldian discourse of subjectivity is at work in the case of clothing. When the boy narrator is taken to Ganesh to get his leg cured, the latter is still a struggling Masseur. And the first thing the narrator notices is about his dress. “He was dressed in the ordinary way, trouser and vest and I did not think he looked particularly holy. He was not wearing the dhoti, kurtha and turban I had expected” (22). There is contradiction in the fact that while Ganesh follows the traditional profession of a Masseur but wears western cloths. Here, Ganesh is highly influenced by the western culture. If Ganesh were not influenced by the colonizer's costume, he would not imitate the English clothes such as trousers and shirt. He would rather wear *Doothi* and *Koortah*.

Likewise, in the case of food too there is a vital role of Foucauldian discourse of subjectivity to form the identity of the protagonist Ganesh. Western culture is the dominant culture in Trinidad Community. Ganesh instead of taking typically Hindu food like rice or *roti* and *dal*, he eats the cold egg, and cress and sandwich, which Mr. Stewart offers him. And he has no such hesitations when Ramlogan offers him fish with bread and butter. Further as the narrator says: “He went to cocktail parties at Government House and drank lemonade. He wore a dinner jacket to official dinners” (207).

In terms of politics, Ganesh has become a politician in order to fulfil his psychological need for identity. He follows western ideology thinking that it is superior. Due to this reason he cannot create his authentic identity but he is hegemonized by western dominant culture and tradition. In the past, people used to involve in politics to create his identity. So does Ganesh and participates in local politics. His political career is potentially a means by which he can satisfy his ego. As Naipaul asserts:

In the colonial official report on the Trinidad for 1949, Ganesh was described that as an important political leader. In 1950 he was sent by the British Government to do success and his defense of British colonial role is memorable. The Government of Trinidad, realizing that Ganesh stood little chance of being elected at the 1960s general elections, nominated him to the Legislative Council and arranged for him to be a member of the Executive that Ganesh Ramsumair has been made an M.B.E. (207)

Ganesh's political identity is constructed by the British governance. Ganesh Ramsumair represents the Hindu culture in Trinidad and reflects the Hindu identity and history. However he is greatly influenced by the British colonialism. He does not become an important political leader only but also a member of legislative council. He is elected as a M.B.E from M.L.C. Colonized people accepts the authority of the colonizer deliberately. They feel colonizer's culture is superior to them. Therefore, the protagonist Ganesh frequently changes his profession and involves in western culture and education system. Hence, western dominant culture hegemonizes the everywalk of Ganesh. In the novel, the protagonist Ganesh is powerless who is dominated by powerful colonial British government, and the subjectivity of Ganesh is formed by powerful British government.

In his *Orientalism*, Edward Said says that western people are economically, technologically and educationally powerful. Truth has direct link with power if power

changes truth also changes. Whatever the image west creates about the non-west becomes truth resulting in hierarchy. By supporting this concept, western form the subjectivity of the non-western Trinidadian people. As Ramlogan says: "It ain't dirty. It just look dirty, sit down, Sahib, sit down . . . on that bench against the wall and let we have a good chat. I is not a educated man, but I like to hear educated people talk" (23). This abstract indicates a strong aura toward western educational system by non-western people Ramlogan. He becomes ambitious to obtain the power as white have. He wants to create equal status with western people. Power creates identity which is not static. Western people have power in their hands so they create the identity of the non-western people. Mr. Stewart is an East Indian people who moves into western culture and changes his name. So, Mr. Stewart also is entrapped within the White dominated society and forgets to return home. As narrator says:

Mr. Stewart told Ganesh all about his life, his experiences in the first world war, his disillusionment, his rejection of christinity. Ganesh was entranced. Appart from the insistence that he was a Kashmiri Hindu, Mr. Stewart was as sane as any of the Masters at the Queen's Royal College: and as the afternoon wore on, his blue eyes ceased to be frightening and looked sad. (30)

Mr. Stewart has fought for his identity within western culture. To create his identity Mr. Stewart in the beginning mimics western dominant culture but fails due to disillusionment. Instead, his identity is constructed by western discourse. Thus, the entire novel is the network of controlling of power through various types of discourse. Mr. Stewart is an Indian who is also entrapped within White dominated society. Foucault says that identity emerges through discourse. So western discourse operates over non-western people Mr. Stewart and constructs his identity from the perspective of the western representation.

The Mystic Masseur focuses on the role played by the second world war in bringing about the disintegration of the East Indian Community. The cultural upheaval already set in

motion by the colonial education system, gained momentum through the modernizing forces unleashed by the second world war. With rapid organization acted as a hegemonic forces of disintegration, western people highlight their own culture and education system. In Edward Said's opinion, western people see negatively to the East. Bisson writes: "Oh, yes, American books. Preeety books. Nicebooks. Salesmanship. Fastest-Selling books I ever handle. Reason I sell them to your father. Last set he get. Lucky man, Ramlogan" (96). Here, through western power, Brisson creates discourse over Leela praising American books and education.

Foucault says the subject is always placed in a network of power, truth and representation. To subject an individual means to compel someone else to be under control or dependent and to tie a conscience or self knowledge to his own identity. The above detail shows that colonizer uses discourse in constructing the subjectivity of the colonized in the case of culture and education system. Ganesh's friend Beharry states: "But I feel the real trouble is that Trinidad just ain't ready for that sort of book. They ain't educated enough" (99). This shows that non-western people are totally constructed by western people so that they feel themselves inferior to western people.

Foucauldian power functions in this context that non-western people have great obsession of power so that they can create their better identity. Instead they become just like a puppet in the light of the western discourse. When the protagonist Ganesh gets an opportunity, the Great Belcher states him: "It have a long time now I studying you, Ganesh. You have the power all right . . . Ganesh, you have the power. I could see it in your hands, your eyes in the shape of your hand" (10). The concept of subjectivity and identity are closely connected and virtually inseparable. It refers the condition of being that is the process which welcomes a person and makes people constituted as subject so, subjects are associated with persons. On the other hand, we take identity to be expressed through forms of representation which are a recognizable by ourselves and by others. For this reason,

subjectivity means searching for identity which is possible only through power. Power creates certain truths to form identity that ultimately becomes true to every one. The Great Belcher in the above extract becomes happy while seeing Ganesh in power because she thinks that he can create his own cultural identity and history, instead Ganesh is governed by British colonialism through their representation. Because of the west, non-western people cannot form their own identity but as the former always be deestablizes latter with the help of power according to Edward Said.

As Ganesh has got college education, he knows about the rights and duties of Indian diasporas. As an education figure, he becomes a teacher. His whole life is struggle for independence and freedom to live as a native in his own nation. In the novel, Ganesh discards his past professions when a new opportunity arises in life. Western power operates in his life because he is totally governed by their culture. For instance, when Ganesh clashes his hands after eating, he says: “Leela, take out my clothes – the English clothes” (121). Through mimicry, Ganesh wants to create his identity which is just like disillusionment to him. He changes from dhoti and kurtah to trousers and shirt. Before he left he says: “You knew, some times I glad I get a college education” (121). It shows that through western education, Ganesh wants to form his stable identity. So he goes to study in Queen's Royal College and wears western clothes. But he ultimately gets failed due to his disillusionment. Though he wears western clothes he sings Hindi filmy songs. This shows that western discourse operates over non-western people. So there is no any authenticity and originality due to the power relationship. Ganesh becomes hybrid because on the one hand he is infatuated by the western subjectivity and morals. On the other hand he is hallucinated by the traumatic experiences of homeland and nativity. But he is unable to forget the own culture. The narrator says:

He took as much interest in Christianity and Islam as in Hinduism. In the shrine, the old bedroom, he had pictures of Mary and Jesus next to Krishna

and Vishnu, a crescent and star represented iconoclastic Islam. “All the same God” he said. Christians liked him, Muslims liked him, and Hindus, willing as ever to risk prayers to new gods, did not object. (128)

By this, identity is in situation of insolidibility in *The Mystic Masseur*. Western people were in center where as non-western people were in margin.

Ganesh gets confused to create his identity. The concept of inferiority and superiority is clearly seen in the above citation. This shows western people's superior psyche. Hence, they construct the identity of the non-western people through what Foucauldian discourse contends as dynamic. During colonization, British colonial governance exploits East Indian Community so there can be seen both intra-racial and inter-racial conflict. In the case of inter-racial conflict, Ganesh and Narayan are from the same community but there is conflict between them. Ganesh becomes successful in his mystic profession. He is, then, criticized by everybody in the society due to his mystic profession. Supporting this context, The Great Balcher says:

Is why I come, boy, people talking about it. He call you the business man of God. But you mustn't get worried, Ganesh everybody know that Narayan, the man who edit it, just jealous you. He think he is a mystic too. . . . 'Is the thing about Indians here. They hate to see another Indian get on.' (140-41)

This above extract is a burning example of the interracial conflict among non-western people in order to form their identities. Foucauldian discourse is exercised by western community within the same community too. Power is everywhere and everybody's hand rooted each and every nook and corner of the society. To phase out the prestige or identity of the Ganesh, Narayan charges him as the businessman of God. The identity of Ganesh is not stable because he gives the profession of mystic and takes part in local politics.

Edward Said demonstrates Foucault's idea that power operates through the system of knowledge applied to the ways in which authority has been exercised in the colonial world. As the protagonist Ganesh moves to Port of Spain, he is traumatized there and gives up his own dress and wears English clothes. The narrator argues: "He went to Port of Spain – his courage failed to him at the last moment and he wore English clothes-to the Resistor – General Office in the red house. There he registered Ganesh publishing company limited" (146). Western discourse operates over Ganesh so he wears western clothes in order to create his own identity, he mimics English clothes and gives of his own dress. Hence, it seems that discourse constructs the identity of Ganesh. Like Ganesh, Swami has been governed by the British colonial governance. As he says:

We ain't come here to beat about the bush – you is the only man with authority among all Trinidad Indians to stand up to Narayan. We do not approve of the way Narayan attacking you. We come here today, Sahib-Swami become solemn – to work you to form your own association. We go make you president straightaway and – you ain't have to look very far- you have three Assistant-Presidents sitting down quiet quiet in front of you drinking Coca-Cola.' (158)

Swami talks about the identity of the non-western people. Through Ganesh, Swami is talking about his own identity. Power constructs identity so he is reinforced to take recourse to power and stand against Narayan. He focuses to form the Hindu association which depicts the non-western identity.

There are two strong people in the same Trinidadion Community – Ganesh and Narayan. To create the identity of Ganesh, Narayan has to be fallen away. As Ganesh remarks: "Remember, is only Narayan we fighting. Remember, is Hindu unity we fighting for. And before the gathering broke up he railed them with a cry, "Don't forget you have a

paper behind you” (176). Power operates even in the same race because power is everywhere and everybody's hand rooted in each and every nook and corner of the society. Power is inorganic, despersal, horizontal and so on. Inorganic power means one in counters a complex and intimate series of relations between programmes and techonologies of power. For instance, Ganesh encounters with power relationship within his 'own' world. On the other hand, he is entrapped in 'other' world. Therefore, power relation can be found within the same East Indian Community as well. Ganesh tries to create his own identity in the above extract by fighting against Narayan and Hindu unity. Here, this becomes clear that Ganesh is affected by western dominant culture.

As Foucault says that the “subjectivity” is a discursive production which is dynamic. The protagonist Ganesh’s identity also goes on changing in the White dominated society where power exercise can be found between the western and non-western society. The narrator points out: "Here it might be well pause a while and consider the circumstances of Ganesh's rise, from teacher to masseur, form masseur to mystic and from mystic to M.L.C. In his autobiography, *The Years of Guilt* which he began writing at this time, Ganesh attributes his success to God" (193). This highlights the rise of Ganesh but analyzes that his identity goes on changing from one profession to another. In Foucault's opinion subjectivity is a discursive production which is inseparable from power and is not fixed entity. Ganesh's identity is not static. Foucault says no discourse is fixed for all time. By teaching in western schools, publishing magazines, writing books, taking part in local politics, the East Indian representative figure Ganesh wants to form his subjectivity. But his identity is not stable due to the western representation.

Western people create the identity of the non-western people to whom they treat as a puppet. As the narrator writes: “The Chief Treasurer, the guardian of the blue exercise book, a splendid figure in orange turban and silk Kortah, said that Indians were bad people, and

Hindu particularly bad” (183). The western Chief Treasurer creates the subjectivity of the non-western people with negative epithets. He attacks Indian people, religion on their negative characteristics. This shows that colonizer creates the identity of the colonized through their representation. As Said says orientalism as a discourse is a means of exploitation in which western people make the representation of non-western people through their own representation. Therefore, representation is mis-representation according to Edward Said. For this reason, the Chief Treasurer sees non-western people negatively. As western people think that non-western people are irrational, emotional, barbaric etc. and try to create their identity.

Foucault says that subjectivity means the discursive productions. Ganesh's identity emerges through western discourse. To obtain his stable identity, he gives up, many professions frequently. Thus, it becomes clear that British colonial governance form the identity of Ganesh. When Ganesh becomes M.B.E from M.L.C, then British colonial governance appreciates him in creating his identity. Western people made a calypso about Ganesh. As the Naipaul asserts:

*There is a gentlemen of the opposition
suffering a sort of legislative constipation.
Everybody moving – bills for so,
but with this gentleman nothing can go. (201)*

westerners who sing a Carribean song valorize and highlight East Indian hero Ganesh. Due to the influence of British colonialism, the Trinidadian Hindu culture has marginalized condition in terms of the colonizer's culture. In the beginning, Ganesh reflects Hindu religion and philosophy then he is elected as the president of Hindu Association. He becomes a member of Legislative parliament and then is compelled to be a supporter of British Empire lastly. This shows that power creates subjectivity of any individual. According to Foucault,

power works through discourses and discursive formations. Hence, it becomes clear that Ganesh's subjectivity is constructed by the British colonial governance.

Being resistantive, Ganesh ekes out his own individual dimensionality in the midst of western cosmopolitan world. He ruins their but equally escapes from these nooses of the world of despair. He searches identity where his identity is already become a chimera. But nonetheless he succeeds on dealing with the shockingly curious and curiously shocking eccoterics of life. Power is hegemonized in his everyday life. He never escapes from these cohesive hegemony. Resistance comes in failure. He is compelled to locate in 'other' world because he was dislocated in his 'own' world. Thus, non western identity crashed and he is formed where he was formed already.

Chapter IV

Conclusion

V. S. Naipaul's first novel *The Mystic Masseur* has been divided into twelve different parts having central issue as formation of subjectivity. During the time of Naipaul, Trinidad was under the period of British colonization and the American imperialism, where East Indian people had to suffer a lot due to their identity crisis from the western representation. Naipaul's protagonist Ganesh is the representative figure of the East Indian Trinidad community who becomes just like puppet in the light of the Foucauldian discourse of subjectivity. Regarding Ganesh, rest of the East Indian characters are also treated as puppets by western dominant culture. The orient is considered differently as dull, passive, lazy, sensual, barbaric, emotional and so on by western whites who keep themselves at the top and hurl the East Indian at bay.

Throughout the novel, Ganesh's subjectivity is in flux. It is difficult to assume which one identity stands for real Ganesh. Ganesh himself cannot conclude which and where his position remains. Western hegemony in marriage, fooding, clothing politics and education system hegemonizes everyday life of Ganesh making him a split subject. Through mimicry and resistance, he wants to form his identity but fails due to disillusionment. So, he belongs neither to East Indians nor to western culture. A man cannot exist without proper identity. Identity gives meaning to one's life. If one's identity is in flux, the existence is also in flux. Such is the situation of the protagonist Ganesh in the novel. Since Ganesh has already left his original culture and failed to adopt a new culture in western society, where he is displaced and encounters the lack of cultural originality. As a result, his subjectivity is formed by British dominant culture.

For most of the people, their culture becomes the medium of their identity. When they feel themselves lost in to the ditch of various cultures their target remains to exist there with

their own beliefs and ideas. Ganesh is not free from this assumption. Identity provides meaning to his life. The culture, living environment and the totality of existence strengthen one's identity. Identity thus is the sum total of human life. Ganesh in the novel seems restless as his identity is in flux and attempts for the formation of stable identity but gets failed by virtue of western representation.

Culture is the source of identity in which the history, religion and society are integrated. V. S. Naipaul discloses how the East Indian people have lost their own Hindu identities and have been constructed by western representation. Power plays a crucial role to form truth or identity. Foucault says power works through discourses and discursive formations. It was the colonial impact of British Empire that colonizer's culture was dominant and colonized culture was dominated. Ganesh fails as a Mystic Masseur, and pays his attention to creative writing and publication and eventually is obliged to be a supporter of British Empire. This becomes clear that the East Indian people are marginalized and dominated by British people. With great attempts, Ganesh wants to create his stable identity but does not remain the same due to western hegemony. He further gets mentally tormented and physically exhausted in the attempt of finding his subjectivity.

The whites deliberately create different types of discourses in order to exhibit their superiority and seniority over non-western Trinidad people. Through, western discourses, East Indians are understood as "others." They are supposed to be barbaric, savage and irrational. By the means of these discourses the whites establish the system of privilege in terms of subjectivity. And East Indian representative figure Ganesh is just like a puppet in the eyes of western discourses.

Naipaul's first novel *The Mystic Masseur* is a piece of literary art which gives us a message that in forming identity Foucauldian power plays a vital role. Ganesh throughout the novel, is struggling to create his own identity as well as the identity of the Trinidad

Community by going beyond the non-western culture and struggling in the White dominated society.

The novelist deliberately designates the protagonist Ganesh as ambiguous toward the western dominant culture where White power structure invariably overshadows the identities of East Indian people in British colonial government. Ganesh becomes ambiguous figure in order to get his identity but gets failed. He continually struggles to fulfill his psychological needs. Foucault says power can not exist without resistance. So, it is Ganesh who frequently gives up his job from one to another such as from masseur to teacher, from teacher to author, from author to politician which shows his resistance toward western dominant society. To create his space and identity, he resists giving up his job frequently.

In nutshell, by providing the East Indian representative figure Ganesh who is entrapped by the western dominant culture and is like a puppet, V. S. Naipaul is successful in his mission that is formation of subjectivity within the White dominated society in which the protagonist Ganesh gives up his own non-western culture and adopts western dominant culture. But he goes on changing his professions frequently from one another such as from masseur to teacher, as a teacher to author, and as an author to politician. Thus, it becomes clear that his subjectivity is constructed by the hegemonic force of the western dominant culture though it is not fixed.

Works Cited

- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." *Mapping Ideology*. Ed. Slavoj Zizek. New York: Verso, 1999. 113-131. iv
- Boehmer, Elleke. "Post Colonialism." *Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. New York: Vintage, 1994. 340-41.
- Feder, Lillian. *Naipaul's Truth*. New Delhi: Indialog publication, 2001. 168-69.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1979. 46-48.
- . *History of Sexuality Vol 1*. Trans. Robert Herley, New York: Vintage books, 1980. 93-96.
- . *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon, 1980. 98.
- . "Truth and Power." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Rev. ed Florida: Hourcourt, 1992. 1132-38.
- Ferredo, William. *Reading and Writing*. New York: OUP, 1998. 41.
- Franza, Fanon. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Trans. Constance Farrington. Harmondsworth, Eng: Penguin, 1969. 200-1.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Eds. Hoare, Quintin and Novelsmith, Geoffrey. London: Lawrence and Wishort, 1971. 116.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Trans. Leon Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1982. 5-7.
- Lacan, Jacques. "The Mirror Stage." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams Rev. ed. Florida: Hourcourt, 1992. 898-99.
- Mansfield, Nick. *Subjectivity: Theories of the Self from Freud to Haraway*. New York: New York UP, 2000. 55-6.

- Mc Donald, Bruce F. "Symbolic Action in Three of V. S. Naipaul's Novels." *Critical Perspectives*, Ed. Hammer. 3.
- Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. London: Earthsun, 1990. 3-5.
- Milla, Sara. *Discourse*. New York: Routledge, 2004. 30.
- Mohan, Champa Rao. *Post colonial Situation in the Novel of V. S. Naipaul*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publisher, 2004. 25-7.
- Naipaul, V. S. *The Mystic Masseur*. London: Penguins books, 1964.
- Nixon, Rob. *London Calling: V. S. Naipaul Post Colonial Mandarin*. New York: OUP, 1992. 4-5.
- Patton, P. "Of Power and Prisons". *Michel Foucault, Power Truth Strategy*. Ed. M. Morris and P. Patton. Sydney: Feral Publication, 1979. 124-5.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Penguin books, 2001. 108-9.
- - - . *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vantage Books, 1993. 40-41.
- Van Doren, Charles. *A History of Knowledge: Past, Present and Future*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1991. 287-88.
- William, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 1977. 112-13.