

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Dispersal of Power-relationship in
V. S. Naipaul's *Guerillas*

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

Pustak Kumar Verma

Central Department of English

Kritipur, Kathmandu

August 2008

Tribhuvan University

Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Mr./ Mrs.....has completed
his/her thesis entitled"
....." under my supervision. He/she carried out his/
her research from (A.D.) to.....(A.D.). I hereby
recommend his thesis be submitted for viva voice.

Puspha Raj Acharya

Supervisor

Date:-----

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

This thesis entitled "Dispersal of Power-relationship in V. S. Naipaul's *Guerillas*" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Pustak Kumar Verma has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head/ Co-ordinator

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I am highly indebted to Mr. Pushpa Raj Acharya, my respected supervisor, the lecturer of Central Department of English for his scholarly guidance, stimulating encouragement and invaluable suggestions despite his busy life. Without his constant supervision and intellectual guidance, this dissertation would never have been in its present form. So, I express my sincere gratitude to him.

I am very much grateful to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, the Head of the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, for approval of this dissertation in its present shape. I would like to express my sincere thanks to my respected teachers Dr. Sanjiv Upreti, Dr. Arun Gupta, Mr. Saroj Ghimire, Mr. Ghanshyam Bhandari, Mr. Raju Baral, Mr. Sadanraj Adhikari, and to other teachers who taught and showed me the right way to materialize my dream as a student of Master's degree.

I am equally thankful to my cardiac friend Mr. Maheshwar Acharya for his constructive comments, precious suggestions and valuable materials. I am highly grateful to my dearest friend Mr. Govind Pahari who helped me for computer service on time.

I am also very grateful to my distinguished brother Mr. M. K. Verma and my family members for their continual encouragement, supports, co-operation, love and blessing without which my dream to be a research student could never have been possible. Finally, I would like to remember all my friends K.R. Pahari, B.R. Verma, B. Bhattari, H. Budhathoki, D.R. Paudel, I. Ahmad, B. Paudel for their co-operation and encouragement and to other who helped me knowingly and unknowingly for completion of this research work.

August 2008

Pustak Kumar Verma

Abstract

The present dissertation makes an intensive study of V.S. Naipaul's *Guerillas*. It tries to show how the Foucauldian concept of discourse had affected on the actions of the natives in their struggle against the domination of the former British colonial agents in Caribbean island which results in the dispersal of power-relationship among the people. The events of the novel, *Guerillas* move around the effect of Black Power Movement. The novel has become such a document which is presented as a mirror of post-colonial Trinidadian community with inter-racial and intra-racial conflicts among the people. Blacks are discarded by the colonial rulers where Jimmy, the black power leader faces trauma for the blacks' racial identity. Then, they start the struggle against the British colonials but they can not achieve success due to inorganicity among them. On the other hand, the colonial workers are too found in dilemma. Even, the white ladies are found in supporting the Black Power Movement which consequently results in inorganicity and multiplicity of power. Thus, it portrays the working of horizontal and marginality of power among the people in post-colonial Trinidadian community.

Contents

Acknowledgement	iii
Abstract	iv
I. Naipaul's Literary Career and his novel <i>Guerillas</i>	1
An Outline of the Dissertation	9
II. Foucault's influence on Postcolonial Theory	11
Power and Resistance	16
Power and Institutions	22
Discourse and Ideology	25
Power-relations in Post-colonial world	32
III. Pervasive Power-relationship in <i>Guerillas</i>	36
IV. Conclusion	61
Works cited	64

I. Naipaul's Literary Career and his novel *Guerillas*

This research attempts to study Nobel Laureate Sir Vidiadhar Naipaul's seventh novel *Guerillas* as a representation of dispersal of power- relationship among the people. The novel tries to give the most graphic, vivid and realistic account of the post colonial Trinidadian communities where there was not any authentic internal source of power due to inorganic and radically divided societies. Instead, power is dispersed everywhere in each and every corner of the society. A mood of loss permeates *Guerillas*, in which everybody, is a wonderer in one way or another.

Naipaul's *Guerillas* is set in a drought-ridden racially mixed Caribbean island where people feel the sense of lost. The whites are moving forward for their purposes in their own way without caring what the blacks are doing where as blacks with their leaders marching ahead. This situation has been a little more problematic because of lack of compromise which results in inter-racial and intra-racial conflicts among the people. Sometimes, the agents of colonizers feel that what are doing is not good. It is only their duty. This ambivalent feelings and their unfair behavior upon blacks has made a wide gap between the colonial whites and the native blacks. Everyone living in island including Roche, Jane and the black power leader Jimmy Ahmad are at the margins of the power. Power, therefore, is found everywhere having no any authenticity, organicity and centrality.

Acknowledged as the finest writer of the English sentence, Naipaul was born on 17th August, 1932 of a diasporic Indian parentage in Trinidad. He moved to London when he won a scholarship at Oxford University at the age of seventeen. After completing the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1953, he continued to live in England where he started his

career as a novel writer. Presently, he lives in Wiltshire, England. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in literature in 2001.

Naipaul is the most compelling literary figure of last fifty years. Producing uniquely masterpieces of both fiction and non-fiction, he is a gift born of a forceful visionary impulse with great feeling or his formidable body of work and exclusive access to his private papers and personal recollections. He has spent a great deal of time travelling Asia, Africa and America. He has been praised for his creative use of autobiography in his travel narrative and for converting autobiographical material into poignant fiction and he has been accused of projecting his own neurosis onto his narrators and characters. Even the clarity and elegance of his prose, universally admired, have been treated by his detractors as mere sophistic devices for promulgating his views. From 1954 to 1956, Naipaul was a broadcaster for BBC's Caribbean voices, and between the years 1957 and 1961, he was a regular fiction reviewer for the news paper *New Statesman*. About his career and subject matter of his works, Edward Said opines 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 illusions and cruelties of independent state, and the new true believers, was a 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 is significant.

Naipaul's early novels and short stories are based on his own experiences growing up in Trinidad dealing with the themes of individual rootlessness and cultural deprivation due to effects of colonial history where as his later novels, historical essays and social commentaries continue to explore the relation of colonization to the loss of cultural identity. Most of his writings including fiction and non-fiction are regarded to be the product of his travel to various parts of the world like India, Pakistan, Africa, America and other places during 60^s. These various writings helped him to achieve a great reputation among the English writers. About his career and reputation as a novelist, Rob Nixon writes: "By venturing into 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).

Naipaul's *Guerillas* as appeared in literary arena in 1975, accounts the impacts of the 'western colonialism upon the lives of those colonized countries. The accumulation of racial and colonial mentality has shaped the western mind from the Greek onward. 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.

Although most of the colonized countries became free from military power during the 50s and 60s of the twentieth century, 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 the other behaviors of the colonizers were deeply rooted in them. Regarding post-colonialism, Elleke 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 authority create ambivalent, fragmented and inorganic attitudes towards their linguistic and cultural values.

Naipaul, an Indian by descent, a Trinidadian by birth and a Britain by citizenship is trying to search for his own root through writing. Living in a metropolitan culture, he shows the problems of the cultural assimilation as Rushdie does in *Imaginary Homeland*. He faces the problems like belongingness, rootless and sense of loss among the English people. So, he attempts to turn his nostalgic past through his fictional works and through his fictional works and travel memoirs for identifying and creating his self. About identity politics, Wolfreys, Robbins and Womack write: "Identity politics refers to the ideologies of difference that characterize politically motivated movements and school of literary criticism such as multiculturalism, in which diversity or ethnicity functions as the principal issue of political debate"(43). Thus, the creating of identity separately is difficult in the post-colonial era as there is no authenticity, organicity and centrality rather multiplicity and inorganicity functions. This research work mainly throws light or how the post imperial Trinidadian community operates multiplicity of power or how pervasive

power rooted everywhere because of the racial, political and sexual tension in post-colonial Trinidad.

Guerillas is one of the Naipaul's most complex books; it is certainly his most suspenseful, a series of shocks, like a shroud slowly unwound from a bloody corpse, showing damaged –and familiar- face lost. It is a violent book in which little violence is explicit; and it is opposite of anonymous. It may surprise the casual readers of Naipaul's work, those who regret the absence of calypso in his West Indian books.

Since the time *Guerillas* appeared in literary horizon, in 1975, it has drawn the attention of many critics and literary men. As many critics have poured their critical sentimentalities on it, the criticism on the text are also varied owing to different perspectives. On the whole, the mood that haunts the novel is one of the existential despair. As Sashi Karma observes; "it is similar to existential absurdity: of anguish at living in an unrelated meaningless world: in a void"(27). It justifies how pessimism has become a central strain in Naipaul's novel. This reflects a major personal crisis in Naipaul's life and his disillusionment with India.

Naipaul's apocalyptic vision offers an extremely dismal view of the world. It envisions the post imperial world as falling apart. About the post imperial situation, Champa Rao Mohan opines:

The world contained in *Guerillas* is on the brink of extinction and this is evident in the Ridge, the city and the commune, all of which are described in terms of decay. The houses on the Ridge are not homes but 'concrete shells'. As Jane notes these houses would never become 'like family houses that had been lived in for two or three generations.(125)

This kind of vision points out the fact how there exist tension among the people in the post colonial era. Though he presents the extinctive vision of the world, he seems to have forgotten about the working of pervasive power which is the very basic purpose of the research work.

V.S. Naipaul's fictive study of the aggressive West Indian male's return home appears in his seventh novel *Guerillas*, where the protagonist, Jimmy Ahmad bases on the figure of Michel de Freitas. About his dystopic vision in relation to *Guerillas*, Brice Finch depicts:

The true dominance-lust (we have seen that it worked with Roche, who did not resent torture), had always involved Jimmy's vision of gang rape, when the victim 'thanked' the punisher who brought her the water. This is the great dystopian feature of this novel: as in 1984, when the wholly demoralized victim Winston Smith finally is grateful to Big Brother, so here the administration of merciful punishment gratifies the authority in that the ruined victim gives thanks. (40)

Like *Guerillas*, *A Bend in the River* is a fictional version of events Naipaul dealt with a journalist. The protagonist of the novel, Salim identifies his family with muslim but as "a special group [...] distinct from the Arabs and other muslims of the coast; in our customs and attitudes, we were closer to the Hindus of the north western India, from which we had originally come." (40)

The critic like Lillian Feder finds out the racial political and sexual violence in the novel as the novel is situated during the extinct time of the revolution. He opines: "*Guerillas* portrays the elaborate political and psychic stratagems devised to avoid the

truth of experience during a period of racial conflicts on an unidentified Caribbean island that bears a strong resemblance to Trinidad."(211) The novel lends Jimmy Ahmad, one of the three leading characters after Malik. His mother, like Malik's was black but his father was Chinese, a heritage even more problematic than Malik's producing not even conflict but only a void in cultural identity. Like Malik, he has fled from the law in London, but unlike Malik who was accompanied by his wife and children, Jimmy arrives alone. Rather his deepest erotic attraction is to one of the members of his commune, Bryant a poor uneducated young man.

Guerillas is based on factual journalism republished as the "Killing in Trinidad", is set in a thinly discussed Trinidad on the brink of revolution. As the novel is set in the nameless country of Caribbean island populated by a mix of ethnics but dominated by the Post-colonial British during the Black Power Movement. The protagonist of the novel is a black power leader, Jimmy Ahmad, who is grown up in that country. Therefore, his remembrance of racial discrimination by whites in his childhood plays vital role in the development of the novel. Jimmy, the protagonist is accused of assault and rape in England and is moved from there. After arriving in Trinidad, he forms a commune for equality of the blacks. Roche, a South African resistance fighter is appointed as an agent of white colonizer as Sablich. Though he was white, he readily fought for the black men and even risked his life for apartheid. He was tortured by south African government and was sent in jail for sometime in Africa. Jane is Roche's English lover who along with Roche comes to visit Thrush cross Grange. As she arrives Thrush cross Grange, she is influenced by native blacks and their act of putting up hoarding boards and slogans for black right and justice.

Though the country became independent by white representatives, they were dominant even in the post independent era. The whole country was engulfed by the vampire of imperialism. There was racial, political and sexual tension everywhere. These tensions result pervasive power operating in post-independent Trinidadian communities where everyone seems guerillas fighting for his own little cause. The violence is found everywhere as no authentic power works. People are found burning liquor shops. It won't stop only damaging the things or property; rather it even kills Stephens and Jane. This created a kind of fear in the mind of whites. As the violence reaches to climax, curfew is announced and helicopters are flying over. Radio programmes and BBC news announce about current incident of the country. Thrush cross Grange has become a cover for the guerillas. Roche and other white colonizer agents realize their position in risk and start making passport to back for their own country.

Unfolding the novel on a former British colony in Caribbean during the 1970s, Naipaul shows the racial and economic tensions where islanders are said to "coexist in hysteria". This is inhabited with Asians, Africans, Americans and British colonials. Jimmy Ahmad is presented as a black power advocate, Roche as a writer and Jane as a neurotic lover in the novel. There is no honest relationship among these island exploiters. There is no authentic-internal source of power functioning in post independent Caribbean. Everyone seems to be a leader. Power is everywhere and everybody's hand roots in each and every nook and corner of the society. The major exchanges revolve around sex and politics but every encounter is marred by deceit.

Naipaul further heightens the divisions by making Ahmad a bisexual whose male lover, Bryant functions as the protagonist's alter ego. It is as though Ahmad's most

murderous instinct is deputized to Bryant. So that Bryant can live another kind of deceit that of seeming kindness, as his horrific project develops. Bryant, who is regarded as the most marginal character in the novel, who once asks a dollar from Jane, later on becomes a party on Jane's murder. This incident highlights the fact that in male dominated world, Jane's position as a woman is even more marginal than Bryant though she was a white. It justifies how pervasive power functions in the novel, which is the very purpose of this research work.

To sum up, *Guerillas* tries to project Naipaul's own personal experience on Caribbean island in the post independent period where he finds the local natives being dominated in different ways even after the independence of Caribbean island. Each and every economic activities were handled by the former colonizers where the natives were even denied from their own natural rights. This created the feeling of dislocation and alienation in their own country. Therefore, they fight for their right and justice and dismantle the vision of former British colonizers but due to intra-racial conflicts, they find themselves too at the marginality of power. About the popularity and success of the novel, *Guerillas*, Patrick French Writes; "*Guerillas* has proved an unexpected success in America, and Francis Ford Coppola wanted to turn it into a film."(390)

An Outline of the Dissertation

The present research work has been divided into four chapters. In the first chapter, it presents short introductory outline of the present study. It gives a Bird's eye view of the entire work. It also tries to discuss about V. S. Naipaul's historical background, his literary career, his literary texts in brief and his family background. For this purpose, some of his texts are taken as supporting materials and critical view points to justify how

dispersal of power-relationship operates in post-colonial Trinidadian communities, resulting social, political and sexual tensions in the novel.

The second chapter tries to explain the theoretical modality that is going to be applied in this research work. It provides a short introduction to the Foucauldian concept of discourse in relation to post-colonialism and discusses the terms: discourse, power, truth, representation, subjectivity, resistance, ideology and institutions which are going to be used frequently in this present study. The theoretical modality moves around Naipaul's text *Guerillas*. On the basis of theoretical modality outlined in the second chapter, the third chapter will analyze the text as evidence to prove how the power is dispersed in post-colonial Caribbean communities. This part serves as the core of this research work.

The fourth chapter is the conclusion of this research work. Based on the textual analysis in the third chapter, it would conclude the explanations and arguments put forward in preceding chapter and shows how the pervasive power runs in the post-independent Trinidadian communities in Naipaul's *Guerillas*. Thus, this research work will give a fair judgment on the basis of the study of Naipaul's novel *Guerillas*.

Summing up, Naipaul's *Guerillas* offers an extremely dismal view of the world locating in post-imperial Trinidadian communities which has no centre. Both the former colonizers as well as the colonized are at the margins of power but each identity the centre with the other. As there is not authentic internal source of power, pervasive power functions in the novel, which is the very core motif of this research work.

II. Foucault's influence on Post-colonial Theory

Foucault's influence in the literary theory has been strong among revisionist literary historians known as post-colonialist thinkers, who study the circulation of power throughout society. His theories have been concerned largely with concept of power, knowledge and discourse and his influence is clear in a great deal of Post-structuralist, Post-modernist, Feminist, Post-marxist and Post-colonial theorizing. He, thus, challenges the conditions of certain truth from his contemporary thinkers. He does not say that power is evil in itself rather his idea of power is related to productivity.

As being a political thinker, Foucault states that power is employed and exercised through nit-like organization. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads, they are always in position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its point of application. For him, resistance is more effective which always moves along with power.

Discourse is one of the most frequently used terms from Foucault's work and at the same time, it is one of the most contradictory. Foucault himself defines it in a number of different ways throughout his work, *The Archeology of Knowledge*. He says in *The Archeology of Knowledge* that he has used discourse to refer to "general domain of all statements", sometimes as "an individualizable group of statements", and sometimes as "a regulated practice that for a number of statements" (80). By the "general domain of all statements", he means that discourse can be used to refer to all utterances and statements which have meaning and which have some effect. Sometimes, he has used the term to refer to "individualizable group of statement" that is utterances which seems to form a grouping, such as the discourse of feminity or discourse of racism. At other times, he has

used the term 'discourse' to refer "the regulated practices that account for a number of statements", which is the unwritten rules and structures which produce particular utterances and statements.

Foucauldian concept of discourse has been widely used by the post-colonial theorists like Edward Said in his work, *Orientalism*. For Said, through discourse, the west exercise institutionalized power over the non-west. He follows the logic of Michel Foucault's theory and challenges the western discourse. According to Foucault, no discourse is fixed for all the time. They both are cause and effect. It not only wields power but also stimulus oppositions. The opposition of power is just like the other side of coin. It is natural for opposition to have a will to power. It can jump into no time, whenever it gets chance. The colonial discourse not only creates power to rule other, but also contains the possibility of resistance to it from the other. Edward Said expresses his ideas in his work *Orientalism* in the following ways: "I think Orientalism was itself a product of certain political forces and activities. Orientalism is a product certain political forces and activities"(203). It draws upon development in Marxist theories of power, especially the political philosophy of Italian intellectual Antonio Gramsci and Francis Michel Foucault. Here, Said examined how knowledge that the western imperial powers formed about their colonies helped continually to justify their subjection. Western nations like France and Britain, he argued, spent an immense amount of time producing knowledge about the locations they dominated.

Though Said following Foucauldian concept of discourse projects how the western colonial power of Britain and France represented North African and Middle Eastern lands in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In his work

Orientalism, he seems to forget about resistance by the colonized as he is to be believed, *Orientalism* moves in one direction from the active west to passive east. Furthermore, he ignores resistance within the west. He further states; "even European, in what he could say about totally ethnocentric"(204). This is certainly a sweeping statement. What about those within the west who opposed colonialism and was horrified by the treatment of colonized people?

It is important to grasp Said's argument that western views of the Orient are not based on what is observed to exist in Oriental lands, but often result from west's dreams, fantasies and assumptions about what this radically different, contrasting place contains. Orientalism is the first and foremost a fabricated construct, a series of images that come to stand as the Orient's 'reality' for those in the west. This contrived 'reality' in no way reflects what may or may not actually be there in the Orient itself; it does not exist outside of the reorientations made, a certain fashioning by those who presume to rule. So, Orientalism imposes upon the Orient specifically Western views of its reality. The Orient, writes Said, became an object:

Suitable for the study in the academy, for display in the museum, for reconstruction in the colonial office, for theoretical illustration in anthropological, biological, linguistic, racial and historical theses about mankind and the universe, for instances of economic and sociological theories of development, revolution, cultural personality, national religion Character. (7-8)

For Said, Orientalism is a general group of ideas impregnated with European superiority, racism and imperialism that are elaborated and distributed through a variety

of texts and practices. Orientalism is argued to be a system of representations that brought the Orient into western learning. While defining Orientalism in relation of institutions, Said states:

Taking the late eighteenth century as a very roughly defined starting point Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with Orient dealing with by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, reconstructing and having authority over the Orient.(3)

Following Foucauldian notion of discourse, he states that without examining Orientalism as a discourse one can not possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage- and even produce- the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically and imaginatively during the Post-Enlightenment period.

In *Culture and Imperialism*, Edward Said argues regarding the term imperialism and colonialism and states: "Imperialism' means the practice, the theory, and the attitudes of dominating metropolitan counter ruling a distant territory; 'Colonialism', which is almost always a consequence of imperialism, is the implanting of settlement on distant territory" (9). Thus, neither imperialism nor colonialism is a simple act of accumulation and aquisition. Both are supported and perhaps even impelled by impressive ideological formations that include notions that certain territories and people require and beseech domination, as well as forms of knowledge affiliated with domination.

Though most of the colonized countries became free from military power during the 50s and 60s of the twentieth century, the formation of solid representation and

national identity was very much difficult, as Said writes; "The very idea of natural identity has been openly contested for its insufficiencies"(38). It happens as the west dominates, reconstruct and have authority over orient through the medium of discourse. The loss of identity, root, cultural values and nostalgia to the past which always haunted the people were expressed through the medium of writings. About the problem of post-colonial nationalism, Elleke Boehmer notes down Franj Fanon's view:

A further problem of early post-colonialism has been its exclusive preoccupation with homogenous or monolithic national identities, a tendency that in recent years has led to the emergence of communist movements world wide and ethnic conflicts on a grand scale. The post independent nation state was simple inadequately sensitive to the multiple axes along which identity might be positioned and a long which it might fracture, if forced to confirm to a national image imposed from above.

(349)

It justifies the creation of independent nation and national identity is insufficient in the sense there is no authentic internal source of power in post-colonial era rather they find themselves lost in duality whether to follow the former colonizers' way which they think superior or to recreate their own separate identity from the former colonizers.

Race is another significant factor to identify themselves in front of other. But in post-colonial era, race loses its values and significance. As people lose their racial identity, they can not organize or unite themselves rather they find their racial identity is in crisis. The term 'race' is defined in various ways. Wolfreys, Robbins and Womack state: "Race refers to a family, tribe, people or nation sharing a set of common interests,

beliefs, habits or characteristics"(69). But in post-colonial world, racial imagery has relied on the assumptions that non-white people are 'raced' while white people supposedly are not, or do not see in racial terms, unless believing themselves to be threatened by racial difference. White people are just people, which is not far off from saying that whites are people where as others colors are something else. Colors thus become a visible sign of apparent racial identity. This created hierarchy among people where privileged terms were associated to those who were in power and unprivileged to latter one.

So, freedom from colonialism comes not just from the signing of declarations of independence and the lowering and raising of flags. There must be a change to the dominant ways of seeing. This is a challenge to those from both the colonizes and colonizing nations. People from all parts of the Empire need to refuse the dominant language of power that have divided them into master and slave and the ruler and ruled. Due to this dilemma among the people during the post-colonial era, they are lost in duality and temporariness.

Now I will briefly discuss some key issues in Foucauldian theory of Power and show their influence in Post-colonial theory.

Power and Resistance

In Volume I of *the History of Sexuality*, Foucault says that where there is power there is resistance. This is important and problematic statement for many reasons. It is productive in the sense it allows us to consider the relationship between those in struggles over power as not simply reducible to mater-slave relation or an oppressor-victim relationship. In order for there to be a relation where power is experienced, there has to

be someone who resists Foucault goes so far as to argue that where there is no resistance it is not, in effect, a power relation. During the post-colonial era, where neither of them, the former colonial agents or the natives are in position of power rather the local people are found resisting against colonial discourse to locate their own identity and cultural values. Thus, for him resistance is 'written in' to exercise of power.

Certain theorists have worked with Foucault's ideas of power and have tried to capture the capture the complexity of relations of resistance and flesh out Foucault's ideas more. For example, James Scott in *Domination of Arts of Renaissance* has concerned himself with the way that both the powerful and powerless are constrained in their behavior with power-relation. Scott asks:

How do we study power-relation when the powerless are often obliged to adopt a strategic pose in the presence of the powerful and when the powerful may have an interest in over dramatizing their reputation and mastery? If we take all of this at face, value we risk mistaking what may be a tactic for the whole story. (XII)

Thus, Scott suggests what need to add to the analysis of the behavior of powerless and powerful in each others' presence is an analysis of their behavior when they are with equals. There he suggests, they develop a 'hidden transcript'. The powerful also develop a hidden transcript which consists of the claims of their rule which can not be openly allowed in front of other people. Thus, Scott suggests that at the same time, for example, Black American slaves might obey their white masters and smile in their presence, among themselves they would critique that power in folk tales, gossips songs and in actions such as poaching, foot-dragging and so forth. Thus, in order to analyze a power-

relation, we must analyze a power relation; we must analyze the total relations of power, the hidden transcript as well as the public performance.

According to Foucault, power is nothing more and nothing less than the multiplicity of force relations within the social body. Powers' conditions of possibility actually consist of this moving substance of force relation: the struggles, confrontation, contradictions, inequalities, transformations and integrations of those force relations. In developing this new idea of power, Foucault is less concerned with power as an entity or process than with an interrogation of the material conditions which promote specific power relations. By laying interest not on the status of the truths but on the conditions necessary for the production of such truths he sets himself apart from all other contemporary social theorists.

In the same way, Foucault turns himself away from the 'repressive hypothesis' of power so as to attribute the productivity and creative potential to it. For Foucault, power is very different from traditional socio-political conception of it as he regards power as not just ruthless domination of the weaker by the stronger. In traditional notion, power is monolithic, hierarchical and clearly visible. This type of power is embedded in the law, is written down and is wholly negative. But in the last two centuries, new methods of power are ensured, 'not by right but by control'. This new form of power is much more subtle than our traditional notion. It is much easier to overlook and much harder to resist.

Foucault is interested to describe how along with power there is resistance. It is inherently part of relation. Power, therefore, works in relationship. Because if there is none in charge of power and none to blame then there will be no any power relations, because it would be simply a matter of obedience. So, resistance comes first and

resistance remains superior to the forces of the process. Power relations are obliged to change with the resistance. He believes that power exists only as exercised by some on others, only when, it is put into action. This also means that power is not a matter of consent.

Power, according to Foucault, is a creative source for positive value, and is practiced hegemonically. He says that the power is generated in society by providing the discourses, and by constructing truth. He takes any historical event as an exercise in exchange of power. In the question of where the power was posed regarding discourse with in an interview to Alessandro Fantana and Pasquale Pasquino, Foucault opines: "It is hard to see where, either on the right or the left, this problem of power could then have been posed. On the right, it was posed only in terms of constitution, sovereignty etc., that is in juridical terms; on the Marxist side, it was posed only in terms of the state apparatus" (57). Thus, he believes that power exists as it exercised by some on others. Foucault suggests that power is intelligible in terms of the techniques through which it is exercised. Many different forms of power exist in our society: legal, administrative, economic military and so forth. What they have in common is a shared reliance of certain techniques of method of applications and all draw some authority by referring to scientific truth.

In the collection of essays entitled *Power/Knowledge* (1980), Foucault explores the way that, in order for something to be established as a fact or as true, other equally valid statements have been discredited and denied. He asserts that the set of procedures which produce knowledge and keep knowledge in circulation can be termed an 'epitome'.

About Foucault's concept of power in relation to knowledge Wolfreys, Robbins and Womack state:

Power is causal, it is constitutive of knowledge, even while knowledge is, concomitantly, constitutive of power: knowledge gives one power : but one has the power in given circumstances to constitute bodies of knowledge, discourses and so on as valid or invalid, truthful or untruthful. Power serves in making the world both knowable and controllable. (65-66)

This justifies, in Foucault's view power implies knowledge and vice versa. He characterizes power/knowledge as an abstract force which determines what will be known, rather than assuming that individual thinkers develop ideas and knowledge.

Foucault's view of relationship between knowledge and power is not uncontested. In a very general way, we are aware that knowledge and power are related. Knowledge, for Foucault is the product of a certain discourse, which has embedded it to be formulated, and has novelty outside it. The truth of the human sciences is the effects of discourses of language. Their 'knowledge' does not derive from access to the real world, to authentic reality but from the rules of their discourses. Concerning Foucault's view of relation between power and knowledge, Hans Bertens writes: "Knowledge is enabled by the rules of certain discourse, which decide what qualifies knowledge and what does not, but ultimately in Foucault's scenario knowledge is produced by power, by the means that a discourse has at its dispersal to establish its credibility" (155-56). Since we all are extensions of discourses that we have internalized, we ourselves constantly reproduce their power even in our intimate relations.

In Foucault's view, there is equality in terms of power distributions. It is not hierarchical flowing from top to bottom and is used vertically to dominate the others. Foucauldian power does not adhere to the repressive hypothesis that sees power functioning in the form of chain which localizes it in a few hand. Power, for him, is not just the ruthless domination of the weaker by the stronger. This idea is akin to Nietzsche, who says that power is to be 'had' at all. In *The History of Sexuality* Vol-I, Foucault states about all-pervasive nature of power:

Power is everywhere, not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere [...] that is there is no binary opposition between rulers and ruled at the root of power relations [...] no such duality extending from the top down and recreating on more and more limited groups to the very depths of the social body.(93-94)

It clarifies that Foucault's main motif was to turn the negative conception of power upside down. In doing so, he owed more to Nietzsche, than to Karl Marx who like Foucault saw History in terms of power but defined power as something to be wielded by somebody upon the other. But Foucault saw power not simply as the repressive force that produce what happens in a society. Only this, he himself is caught and empowered by certain discourses and practices that constitute power. His concern with the productivity of power is all pervasive and deserve equal weight.

Foucault departs from both Marxist and Jurisdiction notion of power (especially in military forces) in which power is seen in terms of repression and violence. He blames both Marxism and Jurisdiction for any kind of negative view regarding power. This entails his rejection of Marxist reduction of power to economic terms (especially to mode

of production) He argues that power becomes negative when it is used politically. Rejecting hierarchical or vertical notion of power and found in Marxism, he says power is pervasive and horizontal and it lacks a locus. This notion of power is interrelated, with his notion of discourse in which believes that discourses are medium through which power is exercised in society. As discourses are multiple and rooted in every nooks and corners of society. Power too is dispersed everywhere. Thus, power is to be seen in its dispersion, not in centralization.

Moreover, knowledge of a particular space or time for him is shaped and determined by the power. Even knowledge for him is an expression of will to power. In a way, knowledge itself is power. As knowledge itself is power, people who are in powerful position create this knowledge. But in post colonial period, their discourse have been challenged as the native people move ahead in relocating their socio-cultural norms and values. Thus, they are not in position to form and circulate knowledge through power. Therefore, in concept of power, there is evolution. The evolution is capable of brings changes in every sphere of the society. Substituting all the established traditions, institutions, discourses, knowledge and so on. Thus, power is always dynamic.

Power and Institutions

Foucault's work is largely concerned with the relation between social structures and institutions and the individual. For him, it is in the relationship between the individual and the institution that finds power operating most clearly. Through out his career, in works, such as *The History of Sexuality* (1978), *Power/Knowledge* (1980), *The Birth of Clinic* (1973) and *Discipline and Punish*, he focused on the analysis of the effects of various institutions on groups of the people and the role that those people play in

affirming on resting those effects. Central to this concern with institutions is his analysis of power, his work is very critical of the notion that power is something which a group of people or an institution possesses and that power is only concerned with oppressing and constraining. What his work tries to do is move thinking about power beyond this view of power as repression of the powerless by the powerful to an examination of the way that power operates within everyday relations between people and institutions or from repressive colonial power to post-colonial pervasive power where power functions in multiple discursive practices. Rather than, simply viewing power in a negative way, he, in fact, views power as productive, giving rise to new forms of behavior rather than simply closing down or censoring certain forms of behaviors.

Foucault, unlike many earlier Marxist theorists, is less concerned with focusing on oppression, but rather in foregrounding resistance to power. He is also interested in the way that power operates through different forms of regime at particular historical periods. In his work *Discipline and Punish* (1977), he describes the way that power has been exercised in different eras in Europe and he also examines the way that discipline as a form of self-regulation encouraged by institutions permeated modern societies. He analyzes the way that regimes exercise power within a society through the use of a range of different mechanisms and techniques. He analyzes a range of different institutions such as the hospital, the clinic, the prison, and the university and sees a number of disciplinary practices which they seem to have in common.

The disciplinary norms within western cultures are not necessarily experienced as originating from institutions so thoroughly have they been internalized by individuals. Paul Patton suggests that this view of discipline has interesting implications for the analysis of

the way that capitalism works: "It is not perhaps capitalist production which is autocratic and hierarchised, but disciplinary production which is capitalist. We know after all that but disciplinary organization of the work force persists even when production is no longer strictly speaking capitalist" (124). This can clearly be seen to be the case in the forms of disciplinary structures developed with in the soviet system under communism, where the society as a whole was subject to the most extreme of disciplinary regimes, in which it is important to analyze carefully the relation between communism and extreme forms of restriction of individual liberty.

Foucault attempts to shift the emphasis of analysis away from a simple analysis of institutions as oppressive. He argues in an article entitled "Truth and Power" that "the state for all the omnipotence of its actual power relations" (Power122). Thus, relations between parents and children, lovers, employers and employees- in short , all relations between people –are power relations.

Foucault analyses the relations between the individual and the wider society without assuming that the individual is powerless in relation to institutions or to the state. He does not minimize the restrictions placed on individuals by institutions; in much of his work he is precisely focused on the way institution and act upon individuals. However, by analyzing the way that power is dispersed throughout society, Foucault enables one to see power as enacted in every interaction and hence as a subject to resistance in each of those interactions. In this way, his analysis of power has set in motion an entirely new way of examining power relations in society, focusing more on resistance than simple passive oppression.

Thus, Foucault is keenly aware of the role of institutions in the shaping of individuals, although he does not wish to see the relations between institutions and individuals as being one only of oppression and constraint. Rather, he led to a focus with in much critical theory on the resistance which is possible in power relations as his intention was to show how power is dispersed from the certain location of institutions to the hands of masses in the post-colonial world.

Discourse and Ideology

Discourse is a term widely used in analyzing literary and non-literary texts. It has become a common currency in a variety of disciplines: critical theory, sociology, linguistics, philosophy, social psychology and many others. In post-colonial era, colonial discourses are not found in authentic situation in creating truth for natives and circulating colonial power, as the countries have been decolonized from military power. Foucault has used widely the term 'discourse' in his discussion of power, knowledge and truth. In *History of Sexuality*, Vol.I, Foucault states that:

We must make allowances for the complex and unstable process whereby discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling block, a point of resistance a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines it and exposes it, renders it fragile and make it possible to thwart it. (100-101)

The reason that many people find the term 'discourse' to be of use is that Foucault stresses that discourse is associated with relation of power. Many Marxist theorists have used the term 'ideology' to indicate that certain statements and ideas are authorized by institutions

and may have some influence in relation to individual's ideas. In Marxist theorizing, ideology is always assumed to be negative and constraining, a set of false belief about something; whereas Foucault is arguing that discourse is both the means of oppressing and the means of resistance.

Discourse, for Foucault is important in the sense it joins knowledge and power. Discourses in societies are created through various act of representation by people who are in power. Thus, in a way, discourse means an authoritative way of interpreting or representing something. And whatever is represented with in a discourse, propped by the power and time, becomes truth about certain things in the world. This truth later on becomes subject of knowledge for the people. Thus, a discourse is a tightly bounded area of knowledge or a system of statements with in which the world can be known. This view varies from the traditional meaning of 'discourse' which simply refers to any kind of speaking, talk or conversation.

Regarding the term 'discourse', we must remember that it is not equivalent of language, nor should we assume that there is a simple relation between discourse and reality. Discourse does not simply translate reality into language; rather discourse should be seen as a system which structures the way that we perceive reality. In his essay "The Order of Discourse", Foucault argues that : "We must not imagine that the world turns towards as a legible face which we would only have to decipherz the world is not the accomplice of our knowledge; there id not prediscursive providence which disposes the world in our favor" (67). Thus, the regularities which we perceive in reality should be seen as the result of the anonymous regularities of discourse which we impose on reality.

Foucault argues that, in fact, discourse should be seen as something which constrains our perceptions.

In modern cultural theory, the term 'discourse' has been widely used especially in association with the French historian Michel Foucault, simply denoting any extended use of speech or writing; or a formal exposition or dissertation. About Foucault's view of discourse, Chris Bakdick writes: "The term has been used to denote any coherent body of statements that produces a self-confining account of reality by defining an object of attention and generating concept with which to analyze it (eg. medical discourse, legal discourse, aesthetic discourse (68). By extension, the term discourse denotes language in an actual use within the social and ideological context and in institutionalized representations of the world called discourse practices. What interests Foucault in his analysis of discourse is the way that is regulated; in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selection organized and redistributed by a certain number of producers.

Foucault's use of the term discourse is that it is always related to concrete example of language being used in specific areas of knowledge. Regarding Foucauldian term 'discourse', Peck and Coyle argue: "Foucault maintains that specific discourses such as medicine, law and psychiatry serve specific interests, and that power and control of human subject are exercised in discourse. More particularly, discourse is a way of classifying and ordering" (142). We can see more clearly if we look, as Foucault does, at the history of madness and how knowledge is used as a power to control and define those who are then labeled as mad. The point here is that language operates in the interests of

the institutions of society to construct people in certain ways. It is not only power, however, but also resistance to power that is embedded in each discourse.

In term 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. What is clear is that Marxism and notion ideology were crucial for him in the development of the notion of discourse.

In general sense, ideology means the belief, concept, and ways of thinking, ideas and values that shape our thoughts and which we use to explain or understand the world. More precisely, we can define 'ideology' as the system of belief or ideas of an economic or political system. This second definition takes us towards Marxist criticism where the term ideology is central. Marxists argue that ideology is expression or the superstructure of the economic system, or base and that our beliefs and values, reflect in a complicated way, the economic/class system we live under. What this means, in effect, is that ideology serves the needs of the dominant class.

The question of ideology in contemporary literary criticism has been much influenced by the ideas of the French Marxist philosopher, Louis Althusser. About Althusser's view of ideology, Peck and Coyle write:

He argues that ideology is not just a set pf ideas that shape our thinking, but the common sense we learn when we learn language, so that it makes us the subjects we are [...] Althusser also argues that ideology is not just an abstract set of ideas but actually has a material existence in what he

calls the state apparatuses or the social institutions: the family, the church, the school, the law. (147)

It justifies it is ideology that constructs us and allows us to recognize our identity as individual. We are never in a position to choose ideology: in a sense it chooses us.

Althusser refuses to treat art as simply a form of ideology. In "A Letter on Art", he locates it somewhere between ideology and scientific knowledge. He defines ideology as a representation of imaginary relationship of individual to their real conditions of existence. The imaginary consciousness helps us to make sense of the world but also masks or represses our real relationship to it.

Foucault distinguishes discourse from ideology is the case of the creation of the subject. As his motif was to write about the history of ideas, he tried 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, distinct from others because it can think and reason. Sara Mills writes: "Foucault chose 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). However, discourse theory has far more difficulty in locating and describing for this individual subject who resists power. An ideological analysis may minimize the importance of the subject because of its concern with groups or classes of individuals and because of its interest in the construction of subjectivity through the action of institutions such a as the state.

Some Marxists believe that it is economic base that determines what can be said and thought at particular time. But Foucault saw the relation between economics, social structures and discourses as being a complex interaction with none of the terms of the

equation being dominant. As he was very aware of the importance of state control and power relations as primary but he tried to move the analysis of power relations with in capitalism on which Patton comments:

It is not perhaps capitalist in capitalism on which is autocratic and hierarchised, but disciplinary production which is capitalist. We know after all that disciplinary organization of the workforce persists even when production is no longer strictly speaking capitalist. (124)

Marxist theory generally uses the term 'ideology' to describe the means whereby oppressed people accept the view of the world which are not accurate. Ideology for Marxist theorists, therefore, is the imagery representation of the way things are in society, and this fictive version of the world serves the interest of those who are dominant in society. Foucault criticizes the view that power is also often seen as a possession – something which is held on to by those in power and which those who are powerless try to wrest from their control.

Some Marxist theorists have tried to see language as vehicle and people are forced to believe ideas which are not true or not in their interest. But with in discourse theory, language is the site where the struggles are acted out as Foucault states, "as history constantly teaches us, discourse is not a simply that which translates struggles or a systems of domination, but is the thing for which and by which there is struggle" (Order 52-53).

Foucault's view of power is directly counter to the conventional Marxist or early feminist model of power which sees power simply as a form of oppression or repression, what Foucault terms the 'repressive hypothesis'. For Marxists power is taken or seized

from others 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. Thus, in Marxist theorizing, ideology is always assumed to be negative and constraining, a set of false belief about something; whereas here Foucault is arguing that discourse is both the means of oppressing and the means of resistance.

Marxist theorists emphasize on the importance of the state in maintenance of power relations as they locate power as a possession within the hands of monolithic State. But besides institutional focus, Foucault clarifies: "I do not want to say that the State is not important; what I want to say is that relations of power [...] necessarily extend beyond the limits of the State"(Michel Foucault 38). This concept moves away from a fixation on the state to see power as a relation. This relation involves more possible model. He does not minimize the importance of power of the state, rather suggest that power operates around and through the networks which are generated around the institutions of the state. Foucault argues that resistance is already contained within the notion of power. Hence, Foucauldian concept of discourse here is important that sometimes stands to produce power and sometimes stands as standing point against it.

Foucault remarks it is education system that regulates the discourse rather than being seen as an enlightening institution where free inquiry after the truth is encouraged. Another internal regulator of discourse is the notion of the academic discipline. Due to academic discipline, philosophers, psychologists, linguists and semioticians who are all engaged in the study of the same subject language- may be largely unaware of each others work. It demarcates certain types of knowledge as belonging to particular domains and also leads to the construction of distinct methodologies for analysis.

Power-relations in Post-colonial world

Post-Colonial world is the time of great diversity where lots of changes take place in the society but those changes can not be totally established as authorized one. The facts keep on changes according to the expression of the people. Stephen Best and Douglas Kellner opine that Foucauldian discontinuity refers to the fact that in a transition from one historical era to another "things are no longer perceived, described, expressed, characterized, classified and known in the same way"(217). It shows that such kind of situation arises because of the boundaries of knowledge and nature of transitional period; there arises the discontinuity and historical breaks including some overlapping interaction between the old and the new. There is found a kind of shift in the science of labor, life and language where all go to establish their own ideas. Due to this fact, one faces difficulty in creating his/her own discourse.

People in the Post-colonial world tried to reestablish their own cultural values as they were confused by the culture imposed upon them by the colonizers. Those neglected and forgotten cultural values were again rediscovered. Moreover, the problem of identity emerges when people find themselves lost in dilemma. Such things happen when they are confused about the values of others. About the colonial aftermath, Leela Gandhi states: "It is marked by the range of ambivalent cultural moods of formations which accompany periods of transition and translations. It is, in the first place, a celebrated moment of arrival-charged with the rhetoric of independence and creative euphoria of self-invention"(5). During the creation of identity, if they remain valid up to the end they become powerful but it is not so easy to establish their own discourse with the support of others.

Though most of the countries become decolonized after the Second World War, colonialisms' representation, reading practices and values are not easily dislodged. Is it possible to speak about 'post-colonial' era if colonialisms' various assumptions, opinions and knowledges remain unchallenged? About the relationship between colonialism and post-colonialism John Mcleod remarks:

The term 'post colonialism' is not the same as after colonialism, as if colonial values are no longer to be reckoned with. It does not define a radically new historical era, nor does it herald a brave new world where all the ills of the colonial past have been cured. Rather 'Post colonialism' recognizes both historical continuity and change. (33)

Thus, it acknowledges that the material realities and nodes of representation common to colonialism are still very much with us today even if the political map of the world has changed through decolonization. By this, it asserts the promise, the possibility and the continuing necessity of the change, while also recognizing that important challenges and changes have been achieved.

Contemporary American critic Prof. Samuel P. Huntington exploring the peoples' pursuit to identify themselves along the cultural lives opines: "In post-cold war world people are cultural people and various are attempting to answer the most basic question human can face: Who are we? They identify with cultural group [...] we know who we are not"(21). This justifies people in post world war period identify themselves in relation to culture, race and history.

Post-colonial period, which is also known as interregnum or the transitional period, is a time of formation of group of statements. It states how a succession of events

may, in the same order in which it is presented, become an object of discourse. It provides principle of its articulation over a chain of successive events. It is the time of flow where everything keeps on flowing according to movement and speed of time. If one does not like this change, then s/he does have to freeze oneself, not others. In *The Archeology of Knowledge*, Foucault states: "Archeology is much more willing than the history of ideas to speak of discontinuities, raptures, gaps, entirely new form of positivity and of sudden redistribution"(139). By this, he means transitional period is the source of opening all types of possibility, raptures and gaps among the people of society where all the people try to maintain their distance and moves forward for their betterment but the future of them is found uncertain.

Archeology, however, seems to treat history only to freeze it, it ignores the temporal relations that may be manifested in discursive formations. It seems rules that will be uniformity valid, in the same way, and at every case in time. But in post imperial world, sudden formation of discourses replaces the past ones and creates new perspectives and view for betterment (not totally new).

During the transitional period, various discourses are formed by the people for validating them as truth. The discourses of earlier system can not be totally ignored as they have been embedded in the mind of the people. In the same way, new discourses can not made affective instantly as they require power holders to be implemented. Therefore, during the time of the interregnum or transitional period, there is interplay of discourses of the old system and the would be system; the new can not get a complete shape and the old produces a morbid of symptoms as Gramsci claims.

In such position, both the people related to ex-power and the people of would be possible power go through dilemma and confusion. So, the characteristics of both the old system and the would be system can not be seen to be conflict. The people related to ex-power try to locate themselves in power at the beginning but when they realize that their discourses are disobeyed by the would be powerful people, they are destined to obey the discourses of the would be system for their existence. On the other way, as the would be powerful people are not accustomed to the new system or discourse hegemonically. This feelings of dilemma and confusion among ex-power people and the would be powerful people during the transitional period are very clearly portrayed in Naipaul's *Guerillas*, which is the very purpose of this research work.

Foucault's concept of pervasive power functions in Naipaul's *Guerillas* as the novel is set in the drought-ridden post-colonial Trinidadian Communities where none either people related to ex-power or the people of would be possible power are found dominant rather both of them are found at the marginality of power with confused perceptions.

In the next chapter, the researcher is going to study the discursive formations during Caribbean interregnum-transitional period between colonialism and post-colonialism –power relations between the former British colonizers and the natives during interregnum from new-historicist perspective especially focusing on foucauldian concept of discourse.

III. Pervasive Power-relationship in *Guerillas*

Confronting the ideology that power is vertical, *Guerrillas* manifests the multiple location of power which operates through inter-racial conflicts, gentle and ambivalent nature of colonial workers, male ideology and the working of marginality of power that result out of the past-colonial reality of Trinidad. *Guerrillas* does not cover only the fictional imagination of author but it has made a true history of human lives in post colonial era. It is not set in a fixed place so as to universalize the condition of all once colonized country people and to show how pervasive power functions in post-colonial Thrush Grange commune.

It would be fair to say that Naipaul at this stage of his literary career was not a political writer in any conscious sense. The same, however, can not be said about his later novels where there is a clear shift of focus to the post-imperial third world political scenario so much, so that individuals are reduced to political beings and the social situation as a whole is described in terms of power-politics. Every relationship, even the one between sexes is affected by it.

Set in a drought-ridden post-colonial Caribbean island, *Guerillas* brings a group of different people from various racial back grounds. As their racial background varied, they did have no sense of authenticity and originality, rather mixed and confused feelings are brought forward. Though the country became free from military colonization, it was still guided by linguistics, economics and cultural ones. On the other hand, the former British colonizers were trying to relocate their own position through creating their own discourses but they were found disobeyed/rejected by natives, so as to make living with in the country, they accept the discovers of natives. Thus, the novel not only shows the

working of marginality of power in every nook and corners of society but also résistance made by natives against the attempts of former colonial workers, as Foucault discloses in his work, *The History of Sexuality*.

Guerillas is set in an unnamed Caribbean island and the action centers around three major characters - Jimmy, Jane and Roche. The novel is based on the real life character of Michael X also known as Abdul Malik, whose story Naipaul has published in *Return*, his collection of articles. Naipaul, here, makes some changes in the cost in order to extend its thematic possibilities by introducing two new characters Roche, the white liberal and Bryant, a black homosexual youth - and transforms the original story in to a modern fable of power and marginality . Everyone living in island including Roche and Jane are at the margins of power.

Bryant, a part from being Jimmy's alter ego-adds a Fresh dimensions to theme of marginality of power. Being a slum youth who is physically deformed and barely articulate, one would think of him as the most marginal character in the novel. Jimmy as the narrator writes about Jane's visit to Thrush cross Grange when the black boy asks a dollar from her:

And the boy on the next bed said more loudly, and in an abrupt tone, not looking at her, his shinning face resting one side on his thin pillow, his close - set blood shot eyes fixed on the buck door way: "Give me a dollar"[...] she took out a purse from her shoulder bag and offered a red dollar - note, folded in four. Raising his arm, but not changing in position on the bed, still is not looking

at her, he took the note, let his hand fall in the bed and said "Thank you, white lady."(10-11)

Bryant's position seems the most marginal one as he extorts a dollar from her. It was clarified later that the black boy who asks a dollar was Bryant, through the conversation among Roche, Jane and Jimmy:

Roche said: "Did they ask you for money?"

'One of them asked me for a dollar.'

Jimmy said: "That was Bryant."

'A Boy with pigtailed, very black.'

'Bryant', Jimmy said. (13)

But later on, Bryant, one of the most marginal/more peripheral characters becomes a party to Jane's murder. As Jimmy offers her to him after having raped her anally. He kills her savagely because he hates her sexually and racially. After having raped her anally, Jimmy says:

Bryant the rat kill the rat!"

Bryant running, faltered.

"Your rat, Bryant your rat."

Her right hand was on her arm swelling around her neck, and it was on her right arm that Bryant made the first cut.

The first cut: the rest would follow. (247)

His killing Jane is a horrible act not because he a madman, but because it saves him at least temporarily from madness. More accurately, killing her allows him to repress the need he has felt to kill Jimmy. This killing of white lady by a physically deformed black

boy, the most marginal character states how the authenticity of power has been subverted and reached his the hands of marginal ones. Though the whites think they are in powerful position, it is subverted through resistance of natives. This incident highlights the fact that in a male dominated world, Jane's position as a woman, who is previously supposed to be superior as white by skin is even more marginal than Bryant.

Naipaul employs the third person omniscient narrator's perspectives and successfully dramatizes the degenerate politics of the post independence ex-colony as he moves in out of the consciousness of characters. The story-line of the novel runs this: Jimmy Ahmad just returned from London after involving himself in sexual assault. Therefore he is feared by every one. The government fears him because of his "English glamour" while the capitalistic firms like the Sablich, which have investments in the island fear him as black power man who can bring about revolution in the island. This involvement in rape shows his resistance against white's authenticity on the one hand and the fear created in the mind of the colonial workers indicates the inauthenticity of power position on the other. He states the story of the rape of a white girl in following words: "It was the story of the rape of a white girl at beach by a gang. The girl had bled and shrieked and fainted. One of the men had then run to a brackish creek in the coconut grove and have tried, using his cupped his hands alone to bring water to the girl" (60).

Jimmy, a black power man whose activities shock the colonial workers, knows his potential only too well. The affluent capitalists realize that in order to keep away Jimmy from creating trouble for them, they must harshness his latent energy and channalize it. He calls the commune "Thrushcross Grange" and leads the slum youth to bring about a revolution based on land.

The black leader, Jimmy has put an eye to look at whites and their activities. Blacks are not so simple as white people think they are. Now the blacks do not believe in whites. The blacks are always skeptic. How strongly Jimmy writes about Peter Roche, shows the inner feelings of oppressed people. The narrator remarks:

Still every body has their uses, even Mr. Peter Roche, I call him Massa but he does not see the joke. He is the great white revolutionary and torture hero of South Africa. He's written him book which I don't think you would know about, but over here of course he is a world shaking best selling author, and now he is working for one of our old imperialist firms Sablich's great slave traders in the old days, they now pretend that black is beautiful, and wait for it they employ Mr. Roche to prove it. (36)

The white people think that all black people believe what they pretend to show. The power holders think that the common people obey what they order. But the oppressed people try to find a way out of that situation. They try to compare their life in the past and present. That gives them the power to go further for their goals. Once Jimmy says to Jane; "You would find this hard to believe, but when I was a boy my ambition was to be a waiter in this hotel. They didn't allow black people" (66). Such examples of experiences of the natives who have been uprooted are highlighted in Naipaul's writing. The hero Jimmy on a dispossessed person not only tries to achieve his own position but also his whole racial status.

Though the colonialism was over, the different colonial institutions were being operated through out post-colonial era. Through these colonial institutions, they were exercising their power over native people where they are not given any type of

opportunity instead, they are not allowed to enter in those institutions. Rather, they are considered as objects and things of museum to watch them up. Jimmy opines:

When we were at school we used to come to play there some afternoons. Cricket and Football. The white people would watch us. And we would act up for them. When I was in England I met a girl who had been here as a girl. She passed through with her patents and they stayed at the Prince Albert. All she remember of the place were the little black boys playing football in the park outside the hotel. (67-68)

How the colonial institutions function during the transitional period, whereby through these restitutions they were operating power and creating truths for the natives. The local people are found in dilemma whether to follow colonial discourses or to relocate their positions in their own discourses separate from the former colonial workers.

On the whole, the mood that haunts the novel is one of the existential despair. As Sashi Karma observes: "It's similar to existential obscurity: of anguish at living in an unrelated meaningless world: in a void"(27). Pessimism, a central strain take place in the novel as it projects the wasteland like world. This reflects a major personal crisis in Naipaul's life and his disillusionment with India. Though, Sashi Karma projects the mood of the novel as an existential despair, he seems to forget to talk about pervasive power operating in post-colonial Trinidadian Community.

Jane is Roche's girl friend, who has followed him to the island because she believes Roche to be 'an engaged doer'. However, it does not take long for her to realize that Roche's position in the island is no better than that of refugee. The narrator remarks:

"And Roche didn't occupy in it the position she thought he did. When it seemed so fresh [. . .] she saw that Roche was refuge on the island. He was an employee of his firm, he belonged to a place like the Ridge; he was half colonial" (45). Her ambivalent attitude toward Roche signifies the colonial workers do have no authenticity rather they are in dilemma. As they realize their discourses are being disobeyed by the natives, they begin to accept the discourses of the natives for a living. Her ambivalent feeling about her own race is further depicted as she says: "Colonial police are terrible." (89) Though she herself belongs to the colonizers' group - she is confused about her own norms and values. This shows her own nature towards the former British colonial workers.

There is ironic contrast between what the characters think and feel and what they say and do. This ironic contrast between their thinking and activities reveal the inauthenticity and disintegration among the colonial agents. As they are themselves disintegrated; they are not in position of power to rule, hierarchical power as Marxist theorists claim. In addition, we get into the psyche of the characters through it, and they are subjected to further assessment through their preparations about one another. Like wise, Roche's idea about Jane also undergoes a change after she joins him at the Ridge. When he had first met her in London he had considered her to be a coherent person with a point of view. But later he finds changed view in her.

Sometimes the agents of colonizers feel that what they are doing is not good. It is only their duty. Their unfair behavior upon blacks has made a wide gap between colonial whites and native blacks. The negative attitude towards their own race by the colonial workers themselves are further portrayed by Harry de Tenuja in discussion to Roche: "I must say I feel naked like hell sitting out here. The Americans shoot every body. They

are worse than South Americans"(196). The whites are found going forward for their purposes in their own way without caring what the blacks are doing where as blacks with their leaders are marching a head. This situation has been a little more problematic because of lack of compromise. Even the sense of dilemma is found in the colonial police themselves who do not know whom they are fighting for and why do they fight for. As Jane says; "I don't see how you can blame the police. They don't know who they fighting or who they are fighting for"(186).

Guerrillas is set in a racially mixed Caribbean island where the people sense they are lost. Cut off from the land, given independence by Britain, people feel overwhelmed by outside forces. But they find themselves dislocated in their own country. This sense of dislocation and alienation only leads to inter-racial and intra-racial conflicts among the people resulting pervasive power in the novel as the authenticity and integration among themselves have been rejected where along with power, there comes resistance. The resistance made by the natives is found in the very opening chapter. The hoarding board indicates:

THRUSH CROSS GRANGE

PEOPLE'S COMMUNE

FOR THE LAND AND THE REVOTUTION

Entry without prior permission strictly

Forbidden at all times

By the order of the High Command,

JIMMY AHMED(HAJI) (4).

Thrush cross Grange has been made the point of revolution. For the support of revolution, they have built up many boards. Thrush cross Grange is people's commune and no one can enter without permission. Jimmy is not only the person who wants to send the white people away from that place to make it their own land. He is the leading personality of that revolution. In dealing with Jane, Roche says; "As I understand it, a Haji is a Muslim who is made the pilgrimage to Mecca. Jimmy used it to mean "Mister" or 'Esquire'. When he remembers, that is"(4). Such hoarding boards are not only the way of revolution but are to raise the courage of rebels. Moreover, the sense of resistance made by the blacks is reflected through the slogans as well: "Basic Black, Don't note, Birth control is a Plot Against the Negro Race"(1). Blacks were aware of the plot created by the whites against them. They think if the number of population is controlled, they will be limited under the authority of the whites. During Roche & Jane's visit to Thrush cross Grange, Jane notices a poster on the wall, which projects the natives' resistance against the colonial workers.

The Narrator remarks:

On the wall above his bed she saw a poster: a pen drawing of Jimmy Ahmad that made him all hair, eyes moustache, and more Negroid than he was, with roughly lettered words below: 'I am nobody's slave or stallion, I am a warrior and Torch Bearer - Haji Jimmy Ahmad. (10)

By this, we mean that natives are not ready to accept that the colonial workers are in powerful position. They resist against the colonial agents to relocate their cultural values and equality but they themselves are too found in lost dilemma, therefore, inauthenticity occurs.

Not only this, there is intra-racial conflicts among both the white colonial agents and natives as well. In the very opening of the novel, when Bryant gets a dollar from Jane and goes to watch a movie. But while getting back to Thrush Cross Grange after watching the movie, he is being looted by a taxi driver who belongs to his own race. The narrator writes:

When they were out of the factory area the driver fumbled for something. On the floor of the car, next to the accelerator; and Bryant sitting on the back heard the sound and understand the signal [...] the driver didn't reply. He gave a little grunt; and he grunted again when some minutes later - Bryant saying, Here! Here, nuh! Where you going? - He set Bryant down and took his money. The headlights of the taxi swept on, the red tail - lights receded, and Bryant was left alone in the darkness. (13)

This portrays that blacks are not organized as well rather they do have inter-racial conflicts among themselves. A kind of hatred and conflict is found between Jimmy and Bryant as well though they belong to same race. Bryant has grown such a hatred against Jimmy that he desires to kill Jimmy: "In his anger, don't touch me, Jimmy" Bryant Screamed. "I will kill you if you touch me, Jimmy" (36). This signifies how blacks themselves are disintegrated. They don't have authenticity as well. They are not racially integrated rather they are divided in themselves. Besides, when the riots breaks out, Jimmy as a rejected leader is no longer in a powerful position to control it. Everyone seems to be a leader. Everyone is guerrillas-a privateer-fighting for his own little cause. He evaluates the situation when it seems almost out of control:

Things are desperate Roy, when the leader himself begins to yield to despair, things are bad. The whole place is going to blow up; I can't see how I control the revolution now. When everybody wants to fight, there is nothing to fight for. Everybody wants fight him own little war, everybody is guerrillas. (33)

The necessity of define situation to be a guerilla is not a fixed one. The people who fight for their inevitable rights and equality seem to be guerillas for others who are against them. When there is no other way for life, guerrilla war may be one of the easiest way. To be guerrillas is not anybody's interest. It's only the choice to live their lives. But on the other hand, those who are already in the power donot like their protest against them. They also want to destroy the leader of their revolution. The colonial agents regard blacks as guerrillas and say the whole Thrush cross Grange commune is full of guerrillas. In regard to conversation between Meredith and Roche, Meredith opines;" Did not you think, didn't it ever occur to you, that the Thrush cross Grange commune was a cover for the guerrillas?"(216). The covering up the commune by the guerrillas portrays that there is no authentic internal source of power rather the marginality power or pervasive power functions in Thrush Cross Grange commune where everyone seems guerrillas. Besides, white colonial agents are found using black boys against themselves for example, they use Stephens to kill Jimmy but unfortunately, he himself is killed by others when the riots grows in the commune,

Jimmy does have deep rooted anger against whites. When Jane goes to meet him, he takes her in a car to his house from the hotel Prince Albert. He wants to impress that blacks are not so simple and weak what the whites think about them. They can do very

hard work and are stranger than whites. To prove this, Jimmy exploits, Jane sexually. But Jane is afraid of white people though she praises black's power and therefore, she can't say so direct. Jimmy thinks sexual attack upon white is also one kind of resistance against them. The narrator remarks:

He put the telephone down and came across the scattered clothes to the bed. Jane, still face down and with her arms below her, was as if asleep. He put his hand on her hip. She didn't respond. He lay down beside her and she didn't move. He lay on the top of her and again had only the feeling of flesh below him again missed the sense of knowing the shape of her body. (75)

Jane realizes everything going on its own way. But Jimmy's dissatisfaction with white women and his deep rooted injustice against whites becomes strong. Therefore, he thinks that white women flesh their white thigh to mislead the native blacks. This thinking makes Jimmy wild against Jane and:

Sudden anger swept over him. He seized her shoulders, lifted himself off her and sought to enter her where she was smaller. She shouted 'no' and turned over so violently that she threw him off her elbow hitting him on the chin. He raised his hand to strike her, but then with closed eyes, she said strange words. She said "love, love". He lay upon her clumsily she was swallowed by her wide kiss; he entered her and said, 'I am not good; I'm not good, you know' (75).

Jimmy totally wants to exploit her sexually. This exploiting Jane sexually is a kind of resistance against white power. Jane is attracted by natives' power and their capacity.

Playing with Jimmy for Jane is like playing with fire. She herself thinks the plain dropping away behind her lower and lower. She says, "I have been playing with fire"(80). This shows that she already felt that Jimmy is not a simple man what the white colonial thinks.

It is not clear until the end, but Jimmy and his boys are the 'guerillas' and are part of the resistance movement. To resist against the colonial power, Jimmy sadomonizes her and brings her to Bryant who cuts "her right arm" (247) first and kills her as she goes to meet Jimmy to say good bye him. During the sexual act, Jimmy acts as a dominant male lover and he becomes aggressive in the relationship. The narrator remarks:" He covered her mouth with his, his lips widened and she made a strange sound; and then he spat in her mouth. She swallowed and he let her face go"(240). Observing the excitation of Jane in sexual act Jimmy's deeply rooted anger comes out. He returns her wonton kiss with one equally obscene: he spits into her mouth. He also achieves an erection by forcing Jane to submit to anal sex, an act she hates. He even taunts her loss of virginity since she had ever been so brutalized. Such type of brutalization of white lady by Jimmy suggest, it is not only whites who are in position to operate power but blacks are as well as they are in successful position to resist against colonial agents.

Ahmad too engages in act of sexual dominance, even rapes as a sexually divided man torn between his desire to be loved and to dominate. He is further heightened by bisexual whose male lover, Bryant, functions as the protagonist's alter ego. It is as though Ahmad's most murderous instincts are deputized to Bryant, so that Bryant can live another kind of deceit that of seeming kindness, as his horrific projects develop.

Another significant problem felt by the white colonials is the sense of fear, which reveals they are not in the position of authenticity. They are found in the marginality of power as well. It's the common problems of white people. Because of this instability, Harry's wife Marie Terese left him with out warning. The white colonials are not in the position to enjoy their authenticity of power. Absence of Harry's wife is not only the case. The outside circumstances also make, them feel such baseless and at the end of pleasure when Roche Jane is at Harry's beach house. The narrator remarks: "Something of this instability, order suddenly undermined, extended to the beach house, so that independently, both Jane and Roche understand they had come to the end of last pleasure, they shared on the island" (121). Due to this, instability on the outside circumstances, Harry's wife left the house with out any information. He further states:

Marie, Therese had left, but she hadn't gone for. The civil servant whose mistress she had become lived on the Ridge as well. Still she acknowledged certain duties towards Harry and visit their house two or three times a week to see that everything worked. (122)

The colonial agents in Thrush cross Grange do have some sort of fear and suspicion in their mind, which is the significant feature of the post imperial world where no discourses of the colonizers are accepted every where, rather their discourses are found in crisis. This kind of sense of suspicion grows up when Mrs. Grandlieu's father-in law died when he drank water in his estate house. They think blacks are serving only poisonous food for them. This led them towards dilemma and suspicion.

Champa Rao Mohan in concern to Naipaul and his novel

Guerillas remarks:

Naipaul's apocalyptic vision offers an extremely dismal view of the world. It envisions the post-imperial world as falling apart [...] The world contained in *Guerrillas* is on the brink of existential and this is evident in Ridge, the city and the commune all of which are described in terms of decay. (125)

Though Rao Mohan projects serious and destructive view of Thrush cross Grange during the post-colonial world, he fails to decentre the power position of the colonial agents, where, in fact, the marginality of power is found functioning everywhere, which is the very motif of this research work.

One of the significant reasons, the natives are against the white is that Americans are taking away bauxite from that place. The raw materials of that place are not used for the local native people. "Harry said, 'but that's a hell of a thing you are telling us, Merry. This place could be paradise, man, if people really planned. We could have real industries. We don't have to let the Americans just take away our bauxite'"(137). This shows intra-racial conflicts among the colonial agents as according to him, the country can be made a place like heaven if people work properly and they use raw materials for local products. These reasons have made the native people fire so they behave like a mad people. This sense of exploiting that local products deeply rooted in them.

Some of the colonial agents think that white women in England give encouragement to Jimmy Ahmad. In Thrush cross Grange also they think white women encourage the Black Power movement. Harry thinks that Jane encourages the black movements as she is

influenced by the black power. The narrator remarks during the conversation among Harry, Roche Meredith and Jane:

She said, "You mean Jimmy Ahmad?"

He smiled at her. "At School I know him as Jimmy leung. Did you look into his eyes and understand the meaning of hate?"

She was puzzled.

"I was just quoting from an interview in one of the English papers. An interview by some women. When she wrote about Jimmy, she became all cunt." (138)

This projects how the white women like Jane is influenced by the black power leader, Jimmy Ahmad and supported in the Black Power movement. It signifies disintegration of power among colonial agents. Further more, Harry states:

But all and I saw then was a white women in a big house. She was arranging all the publicity and I sat down in that bag drawing room and watched that man behaving like one of those toys you wind up. And that tall woman with the flat hips was looking on, very very happy with her little Pekinese black. (139)

By this we mean how kindly the white woman behaves and supports the natives in the Black Power movement. Due to this, conflicts arise among them and the power is found dispersed everywhere. Everyone seems to be a leader. Adela, the house maid of Roche shows some signs to support the black movement. She is not found worried about the situation.

Peter Roche is a South African freedom fighter. Though he was white by skin, he readily fought for the black man and even risked his life for apartheid. Therefore, he had been tortured in South Africa for his involvement in the anti - apartheid cause. About his experience of South Africa Jimmy writes:

Still everybody has their uses, even Mr. Pater Roche, I call him Massa but he don't see the joke. He's the great white revolutionary and torture hero of South Africa. He's written this book which I don't think you would know about , but over here of cause he is a world shaking best selling author, and how he is working for one of our old imperialist firms Sablich's, great slave traders the old days, they now pretend that black is beautiful and wait for it, they employ Mr. Roche to prove it. (36)

He authorized a book about his experiences in South Africa. He was courted by South African government and was asked to recant his memoirs in a book: It was under these pretenses that he had met his mistress Jane. She was in the publishing business and used his book as an excuse to get to know him. As he is a white liberal who is saint like and gentle, he becomes unable to dominate over the natives. The colonial against like Roche's mild and gentle nature leads the natives to move ahead and resists against the colonial workers. Jane is portrayed as a character that lives through her men. She seems incomplete without a man. Further, it seems as if she is searching for a rich, powerful and handsome man, that could fiancé her life and makes her a complete person. When the novel begins, she has found this in Peter. But she later realizes his position as no more than a refugee, and she then, moves to Jimmy Ahmad and meets her gruesome end.

Like the quest for identity and freedom, Naipaul's characters search for power and also meet with failure as for Foucault, there is no authentic internal source of power operates in commune rather power moves along with resistance. Jimmy, the black power leader's search for authentic power ends in fiasco. The narrator states about him:

You people sent me back here to be nothing but I picked myself up, I must have surprised you, you must have read about me in papers, people have knew who I was, they knew what I had done ; they knew what I was offering them [...] these crazy black people started shouted for Israel and Africa, and I was a lost man , but I was always lost I knew that since I was a child, I know I was fooling my self. But I am a man Marjorie, it is what you made me, the pain you brought me, and you see how it's ending.

(233)

This shows how a man of action and very popular in letters and books, comes to lose his own dignity as the riots breaks out. He is not considered as a Black Power leader. He loses his dignity and personality and reaches in position of marginality of power. Jane, Roche's girl friend, too moves in search of a rich handsome and energetic man and her search for an energetic man for her physical satisfaction and power proves to be fatal. After sexual exploitation, the deeply rooted hatred against whites emerges in Jimmy and he offers Jane to Bryant. The narrator states: "Her right hand was on the arm swelling around her neck, and it was on her right arm that Bryant made the first cut"(247). Her desires to achieve powerful position by seeking an energetic and powerful person leads her to gruesome end. likewise, it is only Roche who just manages to escape from the island, and save himself. During the day of murder, later Roche comes to see Jimmy and

sees Jane's "Sahara" lighter. He immediately smells foul play and realizes that Jimmy or the boys has murdered Jane. He runs away and goes back to his home on the Ridge. In the phone conversation to Jimmy, Roche says:

"Do you understand? I'm learning you alone. That is the way it's going to be. We're leaving you alone. I am learning. I am going away. Jane and I are leaving tomorrow. Jane is in her room packing. We are leaving you here. Are you hearing me? Jimmy? "(259)

In order to get a powerful position, he works as a white agent but fails to runs their programs ahead. In order to keep his sanity, he must get rid of Jane. Her rejection of him is too much for him to handle. So, in away he welcomes Jane's murder as it allowed him to continue living. His desire to get marxist power ends in his escape.

Finally, it's Meredith, the colonial politician who becomes the minister. However, the events that lead to his becoming the minister are so vaguely presented that one can not derive any positive meaning out of it. About Meredith position as a politician, the narrator argues:

Meredith was about forty. He had been in polities and had briefly been a minister; but then he had fallen out with the party and reigned. He spoke to himself, and was spoken of, not as a rejected politician but as a political dropout; and this made him unusual, because politics here was often a man's only livelihood, and political failure was a kind of extinction. (32)

Though he becomes a minister, his position as a powerful is not presented in proper way rather, he is projected as rejected politician. He achieves the position of marginality. It only reiterates the unpredictable and chaotic nature of politics in the Third World.

The broadcaster is even more alarmed by Jimmy in his role as a community leader on the island. He warns Jane and Roche that their associate is a violent man, a top spinning out of control. Meredith expounds on Ahmad:

I regard him as one of the most dangerous men in their place [...] Any body can use that man and create chaos in this place. He can be programmed. He's the most suggestible man I know [...] There is a kind of dynamic about his condition that has to work itself out. In England, it ended with the rape and indecent assault. The same dynamic will take him to end here. (140)

There was a sense of fear in the mind of colonial agents. They regard Jimmy as the most dangerous man of Thrush cross Grange in the sense he has been leading the Black power movement. Yet, Meredith's premonition exile who house became decidedly suburban in his personal life as well as in his politics. However, by the novel's end, this same group will be wholly dependent on the former type for their very lives.

Roche, Jane and Harry de Tenuja face psychological problems. The Black power movement against white colonials has created a kind of fear and tension to Harry as he finds the life of his race in Thrush cross Grange in impermanence and uncertainties which is a shock to him and his race. When Roche and Jane are at Harry's beach house Harry says, "The doctor said: well, Harry boy, I don't know what to say, I fell it must be psychological" (120). His psychological problem is not only his private one. It is common of white people as the natives are creating violence in the commune.

Jimmy considers that he has created fears and tension in the mind of the colonial agents. He is very well aware of his condition how it was in the past and how is it now.

He regards that the whites have fallen in dilemma. He wants to justify that he is not enemy of anyone. He is not a simple politician who gives speech in the street for his own benefits. He further justifies about himself:

I'm not like the others. I'm not a street corner politician. I don't make any speeches. Nobody's going to throw me in jail because I am subversive.

I'm not subversive. I am the friend of every capitalist in the country. Every body is my friend. I am not going out on the streets to change the government. No body is going to shoot me down. I am here, and I stay here. If they want to kill me they have to come here. I carry no gun [...] I have no gun. I am no guerilla. (21)

He doesn't regard himself as a guerrilla as he does not carry any negative motive. He carries only racial purpose for the benefits of all. Wherever he goes he only wants his own right, he does not carry fight for any personal benefit as others politicians do. Therefore, he doesn't fear of any body and he says he carries no gun as he does not have any negative purpose.

The revolution had broken out everywhere and the sense of fear and tension starts growing in Roche's mind heavily. He is found waiting for Jane to leave the commune. He regards that he has built his life on sand which does not carry any meaning or a value. He finds himself failed in two ways. The narrator remarks about his failure:

In the morning Roche thought I've built my whole life on sand. He had thought of himself as a doer [...] the day's routine became awaited in those words [...] In his mind, the two failures were linked and ran together. He thought I have trapped myself. One failure by itself he could have

managed, but the two running together here, in this lost corner of the world, would overwhelm him. And he could neither act nor withdraw; he could only wait. (87)

Roche finds himself failed in his ambition. His desire was to be a powerful ruler who could dominate over the natives as Marxist theorists forwarded. But because of the recent events and the resistance made by the natives did not allow him to be support rather he finds his project failed due to oppositions' resistance and violence.

What Jane hears from others about Jimmy doesn't make any belief upon it. It indicates the ambivalent or unstable nature of colonial workers. Everyone talks of guerillas but Jane is surprised with the ideas of guerrillas. The narrator remarks:

There was strangeness and danger: the paths, actors gardens between houses [...] sometimes at night and in the early morning, there was the sound of gunfire. The news papers, the radios and the television spoke of guerrilla. (25)

Not only the people and medias are found talking of guerillas but the situation and landscape also shows the real deserted condition of that place. Draught has engulfed the land totally and fire is found everywhere. "The narrator further states: The hill had turned brown many clumps of the bamboo had caught fire; and the woodland on the Ridge had acquired something of the derelict quality of the city. Trees had been stripped; negotiation had generally dried and thinned"(40). This atmosphere created by revolution itself signifies there was no authenticity of power working in Thrush cross commune rather inorganicity is sprayed everywhere. As Foucault says power is dispersed, inorganic, pervasive and horizontal in the society.

The movement against the white is found rising higher and higher in Thrush cross Grange commune. Harry's beach is empty on the cliff. Darkness is falling on the Ridge. Those all incidents indicates the pervasive nature of power operating in the post colonial Caribbean Island as there is no hierarchical power where the weaker accepts the stronger' voices and cultural values. Harry informs Jane:

They are burning a few liquor shops. They take out another procession this morning. The man, Jimmy Ahmad, nuh. You know I hear they chase Meredith. The police too dam frighten now to shoot 'look, Jane. I think we should telephone regular intervals. Just in case, nuh. I hear the government about to resign. One or two of the guys fly out already. (182)

Jane is informed about the emergency in the country. In the street, people are found burning some liquor shops. Some colonial workers have already fled away from that place. Everywhere fire is burning, radios are broadcasting news. This terrifying situation is dreadful to colonial workers who previously used to consider themselves in powerful position. As the revolution reaches its optimum point, Roche realizes that he can do nothing good there. He can not dominate over blacks. He becomes unable to run his hierarchical power over the natives rather everyone seems to be a leader. Instead, everywhere and in everybody's hand, power is found. Power is sprayed and dispersed in each and every nook and corner of the commune.

After anal exploitation of Jane by the black power leader Jimmy, the narrator presents the biblical allusion which signifies the nature of the former colonial workers and the natives. The narrator writes:

Ant's nests, of dried mud, were like black, veins on the white trunks of softwood trees. The wild banana was in flower: a solid spray of spray of spear-heads of orange and yellow that never turned to fruit, emerging sticky with mauve gum and slime from the heart of the tree.(246)

Through several allusions such as 'ant's nest', 'dried mud', and 'blacks veins on the white trunks of softwood trees, the narrator reveals the inconstant and changeable evil nature of the former colonial workers who been outwardly white by their color or skin but inwardly very cruel and selfish. The narrator associates the cruelty and selfish nature of white colonials with the natural allusions. Furthermore, Jimmy puts forward a proverb reminding Jane, the white lady about the revolutionary nature of blacks. He states; "they say there is always a snake at the bottom of that tree. So, be careful. See but never touch. It is the golden rule of the bush"(245). He informs all the colonial workers through this that 'a snake' or an evil force always lies at the heart of black people as they have had rooted the racial discrimination in their heart, which emerges out as get chance. So, he says to be careful to white lady like Jane, while involving with black power leader like Jimmy. Because, at any time, this evil deeply rooted in the heart of natives can come out and destroy them. This golden rule of the bush cast castration among white colonials.

Considering the novel as a story of violence and betrayal, Patrick French, in his recently published book *The World is what it is. The Authorized Biography of V.S. Naipaul* states: "Guerrillas is a story of violence and betrayal that ends with Roche packing his suitcases and telling Jimmy over the telephone that Jane is in her room packing, although he knows that Jimmy has murdered her" (347). This picks up of the life as he is living in the novel, is now at a very serious level. How knowingly he accepts the

murder of Jane is very much significant. As Patrick French's motif was to publish authorized biography by of V. S. Naipaul, he seems to forget about the power relationship among the people where no one is found in dominant position of power rather power is found along with resistance. By this, we mean the gentle nature of the colonial workers who accept the murder of his girlfriend as it allows him to make a living. These colonial workers like Roche acceptance and natives' resistance against the white colonial workers forward the working of pervasive power in post colonial Trinidad.

It's clear that in an inorganic and fragmented societies like Thrush cross commune can't have an authentic integral source of power. This means post-imperial world does not have centre or hierarchical notion of power where the powerless or weaker accepts the stronger. Both the colonial workers and the colonized ones are at the margins of power. Power is found in each and every nook and corner of society, instead of organic and hierarchical notion of power. Even characters like Jimmy Ahmad who seems to lead guerrilla movements are at the margins of power and ends up pathetically. The inauthenticity of Jimmy's so called guerilla movement reflected in the interior decoration of Jimmy's house, which mimics English middle class suburbia.

IV. Conclusion

In *Guerrillas*, Naipaul presents the vivid sceneries of post- imperial Caribbean Island where pervasive power is found functioning everywhere so that both the former colonial workers and the colonized natives are found at the marginality of power. The novel reveals the circumstances for dispersed power-relations among people creating inter-racial and intra-racial conflicts among them. Jimmy Ahmad, educated in England, finds himself dislocated with in his own country and his race's identity in crisis. Therefore, he resists for his own little cause and is considered as a guerrilla. People in post colonial era try to reestablish their own cultural values and they are confused by the culture imposed upon them by the colonizers. As they don't find their racial rights in their Thrush cross Grange commune, they resist to relocate their racial location. But due to post colonial era, people are found lost in dilemma, confusion and so forth. So, the authenticity, originality and unity do not function rather inorganicity is found among people where pervasive power operates in different forms. The white people, the agents of colonial workers are spying over blacks and their activities to suppress blacks' movement against them. They do not think of black racial identity. The colonial agent, Roche is always working to suppress and divert the blacks' movement. In England also, Jimmy and other blacks are not taken as human beings where he was accused of a rape and assault. The foreign rulers in their own country are not tolerable for natives. Therefore, they resist against the foreign rulers. Moreover, those natives are not allowed to go to good schools and colleges and good hotels like Albert Price Hotel where only whites are allowed to go. Though they carry the dream to be a waiter and work in the hotel. For

example, Jimmy has great ambition to be a waiter in Prince Albert Hotel but those natives are left behind in out side deserted and suburb areas.

Guerillas projects a series of shocks and suspenseful events by locating it in a drought ridden-post imperial nameless country which is under controlled by the former British colonizers. The place does not look very good. It looks decayed like Eliot's *Waste land*. There are old remains of colonial industries. As the fertile and city areas are under control of the colonial workers, native people in the village area are making organization and putting up hoarding boards with rebellious slogans and drawings. On the one hand, the Americans are taking away the natural resources like Bauxite from that place, on the other, they pretend that they love and safeguard the natives. But natives have been tired of being belief on the colonizer's statements. Therefore, they resist against the foreign British colonial power as Foucault states "Where there in power, there is resistance" in his work, *The History of Sexuality*. Power can not exist without resistance. It's inherently related to power. This doesn't mean that blacks are in powerful position. They too lack authenticity as the white colonials use some black boys against blacks. For example, they use Stephens to kill Jimmy Ahmad but unfortunately, he himself in killed by the others. In the same way, while getting back from movie, Bryant is looted by a taxi driver who belongs to his own race. By this, we mean, there was intra-racial conflicts among the natives and so is the case found among white colonial workers as well. They find their discourses disobeyed by the natives through which they desired to operate power over natives. So, they accept the discourses of the local people to make a living. Thus, pervasive nature of power operates or functions every where in the Thrush Cross Grange commune.

Ahmad, who is considered as a Black leader, leading the Black Power Movement in the Caribbean Island, is not in the state of powerful position as well. When the riots break out, Jimmy as a rejected leader is no longer in a position to control it. Not only this, even police themselves are in dilemma and confusion; they don't know who they fighting for. Everyone seems to be leader. Ultimately, it is Americans who impose order to protect their own mercenary interest in the Island's bauxite.

In an inorganic and racially divided societies like Caribbean, there can be no authentic internal source of power as the Marxist theorists have claimed that there operates the master-slave relationship. In such a society like the once depicted in novel, everyone is Guerrilla - a privateer - fighting for his one little cause. In *Guerrillas*, we meet, Roche, Jane, Jimmy and the boys at the commune - are derelicts who have no sense of purpose in life and just 'carry-on'. This reveals the operation of dispersal of power-relationship in Post-colonial commune like Thrush Cross Grange.

The events of the novel, *Guerrillas* moves around the Black Power Movement as the novel is set in the nameless Caribbean Island in the Post- imperial period. The Post-colonial native people are found aware of their racial identity and cultural values. Therefore, they resist against the foreign colonial workers as Foucault states along with power there operates resistance. But due to influence of post-imperial world, they are found lost in dilemma, confusion and others. Instead, the intra-racial functions creating racial disintegration among them which results in horizontal and inauthenticity of power. At last, the natives resistance, manifests in the Black Power Movement against the foreign colonial workers in the novel *Guerrillas*.

Works Cited

- Baldick, Chris. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. New York: Oxford UP, 2001.
- Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory: The Basic*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Boehmer, Elleke. "Post Colonialism." *Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. New York: Vintage, 1994.
- Brice-finch, Jscqueline. "V.S. Naipaul's Dystopic Vision in Guerillas."
- < <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/proof?naipaul-guerillas>.>
- Feder, Lillian. *Naipaul's Truth: The Making of a Writer*. New Delhi: Indialog Publications, 2001.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archeology of Knowledge*. Trans. A. M. Smith. London: Routledge, 1972.
- - - . "Truth and Power." *Power/ Knowledge*. Ed. C. Gordon. Brighton: Harvester, 1980.
- - - . *The History of Sexuality*. Trans. Robert Hurley. Vol. I. London: Penguin, 1998.
- - - . "The Order of Discourse." *Unlying the Text: A Post Structuralist Reader*. Ed. R. Young. London: Routledge, 1981.
- - - . " Truth and Power." *Foucault Reader Vol. I*. Ed. Paul Rainbow. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.
- French, Patrick. *The World is What it is : The Authorized Biography of V.S. Naipaul*. London: Picador, 2008.

- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Delhi: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking the World Order*.
New York: Viking, 1992.
- Karma, Sashi. *The Novels of V.S. Naipaul*. New Delhi: Prestige, 1990.
- McLeod, John. *Beginning Post Colonialism*. New York. Manchester, 2007.
- Mills, Sara. *Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Mohan, Champa Rao. *Postcolonial Situation in V.S. Naipaul*. New Delhi: Atlantic,
2001.
- Nixon, Rob. *London Calling : V.S. Naipaul Postcolonial Mandarin*. New York: OUP,
1992.
- Naipaul, V. S. *Guerillas*. Delhi : Picador, 1975
- - - . *A Bend in the River*. London: Deutsch, 1961
- Patton, P. " Of Power and Prisons." *Michel Foucault: Power/ Truth/ Strategy*. Eds. M.
Morris and P. Patton. Sydney: Feral Publications, 1979.
- Peck, John and Coyyle, Martin. *Literary Term and Criticism*. 2nd ed. London:
Macmillian Press, 1993.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism* . New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2001. 3-209
- - - . *Represntation of the Intellectual*. New York . Vintage, 1994.
- - - . *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- Scott, J. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcript*. New Heaven and
London: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Van Doren, Charles. *A History of Knowledge: Past, Present and Future*. New York:
Ballantine Books, 1991. 287

Wolfreys, Julian, Ruth Robbin and Kenneth Womack. *Key Concept in Literary Theory*.

New Delhi: Atlantic, 2005.