

I. State versus Individual in Jarrell's War Poems

The research work aims at exploring the issue of resistance against State violence from New Historicist perspective in Jarrell's Selected War Poems that have strong anti-war voices. Established himself as celebrated American postwar poet, Randall Jarrell focuses on the literal data of war, individual's traumatization in the hands of modern State which exercises excessive administrative power upon the innocent individuals. The consequences of degenerated World War I and the immediate outbreak of the World War II, provided him the plentiful materials in producing the war volumes in his later days.

He has used poetry as the platform to plant the seeds of resistance against the State power and violence for achieving political liberty among the individuals. Therefore, for him, poetry, a form of social action is closely associated with resistance to challenge the State violence. His war poetry can also be seen as resisting against the domination of the State upon the individuals. In this respect, his area is to interrogate the nature of how an individual is cajoled and forced to fight in the battlefield and how he or she is overlooked. Jarrell's poetic sensibility for the humanity, liberty and freedom generates wrath and hatred against the State violence which ultimately emerges as the powerful resource for resistance in his war poems.

The focus embedded in Jarrell's war poems on the warrior's relation with the State is the main target of this present research. Exposition of the individuals' traumatic conditions in the clutch of metallic State, their suffocation and inhuman treatment by this institutional power propagated by the technological bureaucratic State are some of the areas of the researcher. The poems Jarrell has written during the blow of World War II outpour and describe the hard heartedness, the greed, the lechery, the arrogance, the hypocrisy, the selfishness and the meanness of the State and its cruelty and exploitation. These poems are rich in delivering

resistance and public condemnation against the State power, which is the central area comes under this research.

Most of his poems focus on the literal date of war and as its consequence, the displacement of human values. M.L. Rosenthal, highlights the similar kind of assertion regarding Jarrell's war poetry. To quote him further:

[ordinarily Jarrell] resisted any obvious political rhetoric, his poem focuses on the literal data of war, their irreversible actuality, and the pity of human predicament implicit in that actuality. There is alienation of sensibility by modern war and the technological displacement of human values [...] and the emphasis on individual as victim. (249)

In this connection, Jarrell's war poems concentrate on the individuals' victimization at the time of war owing to the hyper exercise of the power propagated by the over smarting State.

Jarrell remained constant in his focus on the problems of warriors and their failure to realize freedom and equality. However, he adopted art (poetry) as a weapon to fight against the power holders who compelled individuals to be traumatized, and are force to be acted like the machine by putting their self aside. With the help of these war poems, he articulated ungroundable pity and domination. He wants poets to be truthful in articulating their woes, sorrows, pains, without forgetting their poetic flavor. He takes poetry as a means of weapon to resist against the State power. In this way, he attempts to empower the victimized soldiers with energy and vigor, especially of World War II.

He had a soft corner for depicting reality. Of course, realism in its broadest meaning must be adjunctive to all art: art depends on life. But realism as a literary dogma has long since been cast aside by serious artists. Jarrell, to select only one

example has hardly been concerned with the presentation of an accurate report of the war. W.S. Graham and Hayden Carruth in *Jarrell's Losses: Controversy* states:

The world of war which he has created in his poetry is one of which, I dare say, he, as a participating soldier war unaware, but working as a poet, he has constructed a world, and it is a true one of because, it is a logical metaphor spanning the desert of imagination between reality and ideality. (25)

In a way, his poems speak the freedom, right and justice for the soldiers, who are made just like a pawn to move on someone's interest. Therefore, his poems are the real voices of those individuals, who are used for State's interest.

The poetic sensibility of Randall Jarrell was established in 1945, while he was still servicing in the army (since 1942) with the publication of his second book, "Little friend, Little Friend" which bitterly and dramatically documents the intense fears and moral struggles of young soldiers. His sensitive, often tragic verse is collected in "Blood for a Stranger" (1942), "Little Friend Little Friend" (1945) and "Losses" (1948), all of which deal with subjects related to war and human suffering. In fact, latter two volumes deal with his own experience of World War II. Jarrell's poetry also often deals with loneliness and everyday struggle of people in an indifferent universe. His most famous collection of critical essays *Poetry and the Age* that indeed, is a picture of the age bespattered with blood and beset with terrible suffering in which he lives. While Jarrell himself never saw combat as a serviceman during World War II, those who died have found his war poems to be very true to life. He did see the suffering caused by war, and heard and felt it all.

Jarrell wrote beautiful poems in colloquial language of the American landscape with a broad humanism that enabled him to give voice to those who had been given none of their own. Therefore, he has become famous as poet of Second

World War. However, his works present lives of the civilian, middle class, moderately intelligent, those whom American politicians call the 'silent majority', who born and die in obvious oppression of the State holders. The war confirmed his doubt that the existing style was insufficient or inappropriate to express what he sensed must be communicated in poetry. The response of individuals being caught up in a vast machine of destruction swept up and then disposed of; "Six miles from earth, loosed from its dream of life" (3).

During World War II, he started to write poems about the warriors' condition in the warfare, and against the State power politics exercised by modern technological bureaucratic State; "I have suffered in a dream because of him" (16). He portrays the picture of the soldiers who were not only physically wounded but also psychologically agonized. His war poems in totality stage out the condemnation against the State power.

Most of his poems are marked by simplicity, however, has not marred the beauty of the poems. Instead, it has become one of the striking features of his poems. Beside being simple, poems are bold and expressive, and carry a deep vision to transform the socio – political structure so as to establish a 'just society'. Jarrell does not glorify war he denounces it. Perhaps, because of his noncombatant status, Jarrell's poems about war range widely. He did not hesitate to write in the voice of downed pilots, prisoners of war, concentration camp inmates, battlefield corpses, or refugee Jews. However, varied his personae may have been, the voice was sorrowing afflicted, and in clear opposition to conventional odes of glory. The World War II poem that remains the most famous, however, is "The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner" in which a fatally positioned gunner wakes to death before ever having had a chance at life; "I work to black flak and the nightmare fighters" (4). Goldenshon Lorrie, a critic on Randall Jarrell's war poetry views that Jarrell's war poetry focuses

on the heroic sacrifice of the soldiers and his poetry is about the boy pilots who were both victims and the maker of victims. He further posits:

Blind and helpless part child warrior, part neglected pet, he is the whelp of a cowed nature colonized by totalitarian politics from “The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner”, to the writing of “Losses” and “Eight Air Force”, Jarrell made a still bigger leap away from glorifying heroic sacrifice to projecting killers killed, and to writing about boy pilots who were both victims and maker of victims. (2-3)

These lines explore that the physically immature soldiers are colonized and overlooked by the totalitarian political exercise.

Similarly, his war poetry talks about American psyche of war, the unnecessary involvement of America in Vietnam War. He particularly speaks the pangs and traumas given to the soldiers by war are included in his war volumes. He says that his poetry is not about deeds or lands or about glory, honor and might, majesty, domination or power nor anything except war. For him, poetry is in the pity, all a poet can do today is in the pity. So, he requests all the poets to be truthful in the ground of projecting pity and pangs.

In the liked manner, his poems show the warriors state in warfare. The warriors seem to be totally alienated owing to the State’s treatment on them. They are taken as mere object, and feel themselves to have been used up and commodified crushing their sentiments; “I have suffered in dream because of him” (16).

Driven on the one hand by the large doubts about the ethics of 20th century war, and on the other seduced by the glitter of high heroic style, Jarrell in his war poetry stands pivotally between Wilfred Owen and Siegfried Sassoon, who came before him and the American poets of Vietnam War, who came after. Sassoon and Owen memorialized the Great War soldier by counterpointing his agony against the

callousness and indifference of the chateau generals who sacrificed him. As middle – level officers who had actually inhabited the No Man’s Land which, by policy, was emptied of the presence of high level command. Sassoon and Owen each, in his own way, stopped sort of any project to abort the military altogether. Finally, the earlier poets merely shifted glory away from the generals and on to the shoulders of the bloodied brotherhood of the combat soldier. Later poets like Bruce Weigh and Yusuf Komunyakka, veterans of the Vietnam War who dismantle glory, reported instead an a troubled soldier brotherhood bonding over rape, pillage and arson, as well as the pity and terror of combat.

In the Great War poetry, the soldier is a dominant victim hostage to the plans of others. He seems to be a ticket to be bought and sold. His contribution for the State gets no significant position. Jarrell puts forward his point that it is all the cruel mother figure, that is to say the ‘State’ which puts them in warfare and finishes them. Their feelings and sentiments are strangled by the State. Thus, the State claims to be the violence provoking agency.

Since entering into the battlefield, until they die, the warriors fight for the sake of country by putting their self aside. But when they die, the State holders, the violence producers, treat them as animals. They don’t appreciate their sacrifice. They wash them away as a butcher washes animal’s remainders after he cuts it out and takes all the flesh and blood. It is very much vivid in his poem entitled “The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner”; “When I died they washed me out of the turret with a hose” (5).

Soldiers in Jarrell’s war poetry are simple and innocent as Richard Feign points out: “through their wounds, they bled their innocence” (149). But the role of the State is antagonistic in his most of the poems. The soldiers are highly mobilized by the State till they have vigor and energy and are left without care if they are

thought to be worthless. Their life is really tragic thus the depiction of evils of State power and its ultimate condemnation by the individuals who were reluctantly pushed into the battlefield are the major boundaries in his war poetry. In his war poems, the protagonist seems to be seeking meaning in human existence and finding pain in the name of different civilized world. Impersonal State imposes dehumanizing army routine, pain and mechanized death on helpless individuals; “When we lasted long enough they gave us medals; / When we died they said, our casualties were low” (11-12).

The focus of this researcher rather is in the content than in the language. However, the language helps to add more emphasis on the content itself. The language: sentences, word and rhetoric help this research to explore the real condition of soldiers; the conflict between the warrior and the State at large.

The main objective of the present research is to locate Jarrell’s war poems in the particular postwar contexts in order to examine, explore and better understand the condemnation against the institutionalized violence embedded in his poems. Jarrell uses his poems as a discourse to register the resistance against the power politics. Therefore, his poems are not only beautiful pieces of literature but also the power politics of discursive practices. To materialize or concretize the objective, turn it into practice and to facilitate the project, the researcher has divided the whole research work in the three different chapters: Introduction carries the overall preamble of this present research: issues and its explanation. The researcher interprets Jarrell’s war poems in the light of New Historicism as a theoretical modality. Such attempt will explore the associative relationship between his poems and the political dimension of that time. All these things which are going to be taken into consideration for the final attempt of the present research, are to propose Jarrell not only a brilliant poet of World War II but also as a brilliant and the most eloquent political propagator and the

counter historian of ignored, neglected and traumatized people, especially during Second World War. To carry out this purpose, some of his war poems like “The Prince”, “The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner”, “Gunner”, “Lines”, “The Lullaby”, “Pilot from the Carrier”, “A War” etc. will be discussed. However, the support from the aforementioned theoretical modality in order to show the power that is internalized in the poems and some other criticism of renowned critics will remain as a constant support.

II. New Historicism as a Theory of Resistance

New Historicism, a postmodern theory, opens up the new avenues for cultural studies and cultural criticism by examining and redrawing the boundaries of power and ideology. It emerges as an approach for describing the renaissance culture in terms of its brutal underside and ideological conflicts involved in the world. New Historicism also appears as a theoretical perspective to literary criticism and literary theory based on the premise that a literary work should be considered a product of the time, place and circumstances of its composition rather than as an isolated creation. It had its root in reaction to the 'New criticism,' of formal analysis of works of literature, which was seen by a new generation of professional readers as taking place in a vacuum.

New Historicism developed, primarily through the work of the critic Stephen Greenblatt, and gained widespread influence in the 1990s. It has turned towards history, culture, society, politics, institutions, class and gender conditions, the social context etc. in interpreting any given text. Being above the practice of interdisciplinary approach and ultimately emphasizing the 'Transdisciplinary' approach, it seeks to blur the generic boundaries between different disciplines.

As a method of reading and explicating literary texts, New Historicism arose in the United States vehemently refuting the then current text-based or formalistic criticism. It was argued that a New Historical approach was needed which would move beyond the narrowly formalities approach to literature which excluded the subtext, the existing social and political circumstances. It bears equal importance to both literary text and non literary texts without creating any dichotomies such as 'high' -'low', 'interesting' -'boring' etc. It also exhibits equal position to the narratives of the people who are in the status of 'center' and 'margin'. Lois Tyson in his *Critical Theory Today* remarks:

Indeed , we might say that in bringing to the foreground that suppressed historical narratives of marginalized groups –such as women, people of color, the poor, the working class, gay men and lesbians, prisoners, the inhabitants of mental institutions and so on- new historicism has deconstructed the white, male, Anglo-Europeans historical narratives to reveal its disturbing ,hidden subtexts :the experiences of these people it has oppressed in order to maintain the dominance that allowed it to control what most Americans know about history. (284)

In this connection, new historicism blurs the hierarchies of center/margin prevalent in almost all the domains created by the Anglo-European historical narratives. New historicists conceive of a literary text as ‘situated’ within the institutions, social practices and discourses. In *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, M.H Abrams posits that New Historicism focuses on the critical interpretations and the evaluations of literary texts. To quote him:

In the place of dealing with the texts in isolation from its historical context, new historicists attend primarily to the historical and cultural conditions of its production, its meanings, its effects and also of its latter critical interpretations and evaluations [...]. Instead, new historicists conceive of a literary text as “situated” within institutions, social practices, and discourses that constitute the overall culture of a particular time and place, and with which the literary texts interact as both a product and the producer of cultural energies and codes. (182-183)

Hence, New Historicism has subverted the notion that is purely objective and provide factual data, and literature is purely subjective and supply fictional data. Instead, for

them, both options--literary texts may provide factual data and history fictional—are possible. In this sense, no longer does history acts as the background to literary texts, and no longer are historical accounts considered reliable and unproblematic representation of what really went on during a particular time. Like any other discourses, a work of art is a discourse, is the negotiated product of a private creator and public practices of a given society. In this respect, viewing a work of art as a discourse, Habib points out the need to examine and re-examine any piece of literature; “within the broader contexts of its culture, in the context at other discourses ranging over politics, religion and aesthetics, as well as its economic context”(760).

Clearly, in its historicism and in its political interpretations, New Historicism owes something to Marxism. But, Marxism tends to see literature as a part of ‘superstructure’ in which the economic ‘base’ (i.e. materials relations of production) manifests itself. New Historicist thinkers tend to take a more nuanced view of power, seeing it not excessively as class- related but extending throughout the society. This view derives primarily from Michael Foucault. In its tendency to see society as consisting of texts relating to other texts, with no fixed literary value above and beyond the way specific societies read them in specific situations, New Historicism also owes something to ‘postmodernism’. However, New Historicists tend to exhibit less skepticism than postmodernists, and show more willingness to perform the ‘traditional’ tasks of literary criticism i.e. explaining the text in its context and trying to show what it meant to its first readers.

New Historicism shares many of same theories as with what is often called cultural studies; but cultural critics are even more likely to put emphasis on the present implications of their study and to position themselves in disagreement to current power structures, working to give power to traditionally disadvantaged groups. Cultural critics also downplay the distinction between 'high' and 'low' culture

and often focus predominately on the productions of 'popular culture'. New historicists analyze text with an eye to history with this in mind; It is not 'new'. Many of the critiques existed between the 1920s and the 1950s also focused on literature's historical content. These critics based their assumptions of literature on the connection between texts and their historical contexts.

Unlike most traditional historians, who believe that history is a series of events that have linear, causal relationship and we are perfectly capable of uncovering the facts about the particular historical events through objective analysis, new historicist argue:

Instead of body of indisputable, retrievable facts, history becomes textualized; that is, it becomes group of linguistic traces that can be recalled, but which are always mediated through the historian/interpreter. Objective history is therefore impossibility; every account is just that-- another text, and like any novel, play or poem, it is open to the same kind of critical interpretive scrutiny [...] History itself is a large amorphous text consisting of various and often disparate accounts. (Childers and Hentzi 207)

In this respect, new historicists posit the view that history is neither linear not progressive neither factual nor authentic. Instead, like any piece of literature, it is a constructed body to feet some ideological purposes, embedded in complex web of socio political networks. History itself is a text, an interpretation, and that there is no single history. Lois Tyson in his book *Critical Theory Today* emphasizes the new historical notion that "history is a matter of interpretation, not facts, and that interpretations always occur within a framework of social conventions" (286). The reciprocal relationship between history and literature is further highlighted by the off quoted phrase "historicity of texts and textuality of history" (Montrose 781).

New Historicism refuses to accord any kind of unity, homogeneity to history or culture as Louis Montrose in his famous article “New Historicisms” argues that “the various modes of what could be called poststructuralist historical criticism [...] Including New Historicism or cultural poetics, as well as modes of revisionist can be characterized by such a shift from history to histories” (411). Old or traditional historians focused on single monolithic and ‘unified’ narrative history which is taken for granted. In contrast, new historicists challenge such so- called ‘unified’ and ‘authentic’ narrative and advocate the idea of ‘histories’, not of ‘History’.

Montrose, a prominent new historicist, views literature and history as fully interdependent. He thinks ‘new historicism’ has been constituted as an academic site of ideological struggle between containment and subversion; “Within the context of the containment-subversion debate, my own position has been that a closed and static, monolithic and homogeneous notion of ideology must be replaced by one that is heterogeneous and unstable, permeable and processual” (404). He further argues that the key concern of new historicist critic is the ‘historicity of text’ and the ‘textuality of history’. He explains on what he means by the historicity of text and textuality of history:

All texts are embedded in specific historical social and material context. Literary texts too are the material products of specific historical conditions. Literary texts, therefore, must be treated along with its historical context. Likewise, by the textuality of history, he means that access to a full and authentic past is never possible. (410)

However, New Historicism does not view history the cause or the source of a work. Instead, it views the relationship between history and the work as a dialectic one: the literary text is interpreted as both product and producer, end and source, of history. Literature is shaped by history and in turn tries to create or guide history too.

This reciprocal influence of literature denies both the extremes, the autonomy of literature as well as its purely directive and propagandist role. To some extent, literature is free from outside factors; it is product of creative faculty of human mind but in the final analysis the creative and critical orientation of the writers themselves conditioned by the materiality of their life. Thus, New Historicism is a method of political interpretation of literature.

New Historicism is a later critical interpretation of the literary text. The questions asked by traditional historians and by the new historians seem quite contrastive because these two approaches to history are very different on the ground of what history is and how we can know it. Regarding the processes of acknowledging the history, traditional historians ask: “What happened?” and “What does the event tell us about history?” In contrast, new historicists ask “How has the event been interpreted?” and “What do the interpretations tell us about the interpreters?” (Tyson 278). Finally, traditional historians believe on the linear and progressive history that the human species is improving over the course of time, advancing in moral, cultural, and technological accomplishment. New Historicism emerges by dismantling such linear and fact based interpretation exercised by traditional historians. Rather it advocates of what such facts mean, of how they converse within the complex web of competing ideological and conflicting social political and cultural agendas of the time and place in which they accord is, for new historicists, strictly a matter of latter critical interpretation not fact. Hence, regarding this perspective, there is no such thing as presentation of facts; there is only interpretation. So, New Historicism faces a number of difficulties to produce reliable interpretations. Impossibility of objective analysis, complexity in history, heterogeneity in causality of event, dynamics of power etc are some of these difficulties.

Foucauldian Theorization of Power and Resistance

New Historicism frequently addresses the idea that the lowest common denominator for all human action is power. So, the New Historicist seeks to find how power is dispersed within the text. Power is a means through which the marginalized are controlled, and the thing that the marginalized (or other) seeks to gain. This relates back to the idea that literature is written by those who are privileged, there must be details in it, that shows the views of the common people. New Historicists seek to find a 'site of struggle' to identify just who is the group or entity with the most privileged.

Foucault's conception of power is neither reductive nor synonymous with domination. Rather he understands power as continually articulated on knowledge and knowledge on power. Nevertheless, his work in 1970s on prisons have been influential on the New Historicists. In these studies, Foucault examined shifts in the mechanisms of power in these institutional settings. His discussions of techniques included panopticon, a theoretical prison system developed by English philosopher Jeremy Bentham, and particularly used for New Historicism. Bentham stated that the perfect prison system would be a cylindrical shaped room that held prison cells on the outside walls. In the middle at this spherical room would be a large guard tower with a light that would shine in all the cells the prisoners thus would never know for certain whether they were being watched. So, they would effectively police themselves, and be as actors on a stage, giving the appearance of submission, even when they are probably not being watched.

Foucault included panopticon in his discussions on the technologies of power to illustrate the idea of lateral surveillance, or self policing, that occurs when those who are subject to these techniques of power believe they all being watched. His purpose was to show that these techniques of power go beyond mere force and could prompt different regimes of self – discipline among those subject to the exercise of

these visibility techniques. This often means that, in effect, prisoners would often fall into like whether or not there was an actual need to do so.

Following Foucault, in his assumptions, that ‘social relations are intrinsically, relations of power.’ It is probably not necessary to point out that power in this context does not refer to physical power and not even to coercion through pressure, although it is usually in a position to be backed up by the threat of physical violence. In this Foucauldian context, “power works through discourses and like ideology, gives the subject the impression that to comply with its dictates is the natural thing to do and thus a free autonomous decision” (Bertens 179). The awareness of the role that the discourses have played in shaping us and the possibility of letting opposed and competing discourses collide and thereby implode, may make room for relatively independent thought and action which can then have emancipatory effects in the present. The assumption here is that the resistance that is thus made possible is not a product of power, but is genuinely subversive. However, as Montrose suggests although, the possibility of political and institutional agency can not be based upon the illusion of an escape from ideology; an awareness of the omnipresence and power of ideology may give us some breathing space:

the very process of subjectively living the confrontation or contradictions with in or among ideologies make it possible to experience facets of our own subjection at shifting internal distances—to read ... one fragment of our ideological inscription by means of another. A reflexive knowledge so partial and unstable may, nevertheless provide subjects with a means of empowerment as agents. (Bertens 183)

In this connection, New Historicists argue that ‘man’ is the construct of social and historical circumstance and not an autonomous agent of historical change. There is

nothing essential about the actions of human beings; there is no such thing as 'human nature'. Instead, individuals undergo a process of 'subjectification' which on the one hand shapes them and on the other hand, places them in a social networks and cultural codes that exceeds their comprehension or controls. Since each individual's way of thinking is shaped by the process, it follows that the historian is the product of subjectification. Lois Tyson clarifies this idea as he points:

Like all human beings, historians live in a particular time and space, and their views of both current-past events are influenced in innumerable conscious and unconscious ways by their own experiences within their own culture. Historians may believe that they are being objective but their own view of what is right and wrong, what is civilized and uncivilized, what is important and unimportant and the like, will strongly influence the ways in which they interpret events. (279)

Power circulates through discourses which both influence and are influenced by socio- historical realities. Citing Foucault, Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffith and Helen Tiffin in their book *Key Concept in Post Colonial Studies* further explain that “ a discourse is strongly bounded area of social knowledge, a system of statements within which the world can be known” (70). Discourses provide a so- called vantage point to know the world. Indeed, discourses both influence and are influenced by socio- historical and cultural climate. As Tyson argues:

Discourse is a social language created by particular cultural conditions at a particular time and place, and it expresses a particular way of understanding human experience [...] from a new historical perspective, no discourse, by itself can adequately explain the complex cultural dynamics of social power. There is, instead, a

dynamic, interplay among discourses. No discourses are permanent.

(281)

Group of statements, discourses, exist, historically and get changed as their material conditions for their possibility change. Therefore, no discourse is final and permanent. Hence, discourses wield power which creates certain institution in the society, which propagates a so-called Truth. Foucault views that truth is a system of ordered principle for the operation at the statements. To quote him further:

Truth is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and the operations of the statement, Michael Foucault Power. Truth is linked in a circular relation with systems of power that produce and sustain it induces and which extends it a “regime” of truth. (132)

However, Michel Foucault, one of the major post-structuralists, views that “the discourses including the texts are the embodiment of power” (qtd. in Selden 100). This is to say that the text can not be free from social and political sphere of an era. Foucault therefore endeavors to make a link between the text and the external world or context. An often quoted phrase that describes the new historicist’s reciprocal concern with ‘historicity of the text and textuality of history’ seems to have emerged from M.H Abrams’s clarification of Foucault’s notion, which calls text “a discourse which although it may seem to present, or reflect an external reality, in fact consists of what are called representations” (183). A text in Foucault’s views speaks of ‘history’ but not as it is described by traditional historicists and Marxists. It, within itself buries the ‘situatedness’ of institutions, social practices including their working amidst the power relations and hierarchies.

Now the question arises: how does Foucault influence those who believe in the history of sexuality? As he is always aware of the fact that a historian can not

escape the 'situatedness' of his time. Foucault takes a historian to be 'embedded' in the social practices. It is by logic, clear that history is also written from the perspective of the historian. The position, a historian occupies in society, determines the history he writes.

Foucault's idea of counter- history avoids the primary to the ideas of individuals and of subjectively. Alec MC Haul and Wendy Grace in *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject* observe, "Foucault thought of human subject itself as an effect of, to some extent subjection. Subjection refers to particular, historically located disciplinary processes and the concepts, which enables us to consider ourselves as an individual subjects and which constrain us from thinking otherwise" (3). This also means that power is not a matter of consent in itself, it is not a renunciation of freedom, a transfer of rights, or power of each and all delegated to a few (which does not prevent the possibility that consent may be a condition for the existence or the maintenance of power relation

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault maps out in impressive detail the genealogical history of crime, criminals, discipline, punishment, normality in modern western culture, we are told by Foucault that modern power is a 'network of relations' that is 'micro power'. Power according to Foucault is now manifested not so much in the sweeping degree of the monarch as much as by small, local forms of control in which we all share complicity. Furthermore, Foucault maintains that "modern power's unique expression is through a particular mode of a immediate hold on the body: they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks to perform ceremonies, to emit signs" (*Discipline* 25). Power is therefore, a 'mastery of (the body's) forces.'

This mastery of forces means that modern power relations are not altogether repressive or prohibitive; but are actually productive; they produce certain types of behavior, certain types of bodies, and most important knowledge and truth. Foucault

makes clear that what constitutes truth and knowledge in a society does not stand outside of power relations, but is the consequent of dominant discourses. It follows that the 'naturalness' of anything associated with us as individuals now become suspicious thanks to Foucault's revelation of modern power's productive capabilities.

In modern culture, power relation's primary mode of control has been in the form of discipline. Essentially 'productive' discipline is motivated by the intent to create certain realities, manifested and in calculated thorough many specific and detailed techniques. Notable is Foucault's contention that nearly identical disciplinary tactics are directed toward soldiers in the military, criminals in prisons, workers in factories, and students in school. One particular disciplinary tactic Foucault addresses that is used in most social institutions is the careful significance given to specialized location; bodies are located in specific spaces complete with measured distances and the possibility for isolation. Individualized spaces are created allowing for the supervision of the conduct of each, according to Foucault, in order to "assess it, to judge it to calculate in qualities or merits" (*Discipline* 143).

Extensive disciplinary control consistently imposed makes certain types of individuals. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault cites the example of the soldier:

By the late eighteenth century, the soldier has become something that can be made: out of formless clay, an inapt body; the machine required can be constructed; posture is gradually corrected; a calculated constraint runs slowly through each part of the body, mastering it, making it pliable ready at all times, turning silently into the automatism of habit. (135)

How are the tactics and techniques of modern disciplinary power implemented, and thus control maintained? Foucault explains it is through surveillance, as well as through a system of reward and punishment. Surveillance ensures that disciplinary

power constantly holds the subjects, assures the hold of power that is exercised over them, “producing the ‘obedient’ subject the individuals subjected to habits, rules, orders, an authority that is exercised continually around him and upon him, and which he must allow to function automatically in him” (*Discipline* 128-129).

The resulting outcome on a societal level of such intense molding is the thoroughly modern notions of normal and abnormal. Foucault explains that disciplinary power “hierarchizes in terms of values and abilities, the level, the ‘nature’ of individuals” (*Discipline* 183). He adds:

It introduces, through his “value giving” measure, the constraint of conformity that must be achieved [...] The perpetual penalty that traverses all points and supervises every instant in the disciplinary institutions compares, differentiates, hierarchizes, homogenizes, excludes, it normalizes. (183)

Obviously, the establishing of power relations does not exclude the use of violence anymore than it does the obtaining of consent; no doubt the exercise of power can never do without one or the other, often both at the same time, but even though consent and violence are instruments or results, they do not constitute the principle or basic nature of power.

In this regard, Foucauldian analysis of power believes on the radical subversion of monolithic, total and closed concepts of internalizing the power. So, Louis Montrose in his seminal essay “New Historicisms” forwards his view:

Foucault's flexible conception of power relations may accommodate local instances of a subversion that is produced for containment, but it also acknowledges revolutionary social transformations and other possible modalities of power and resistance. If, on the one hand ideological dominance can never be monolithic, total and closed, than

the other hand, revolutionary upheavals occur relatively rarely; modes and instances of resistances – subversion, constations, transgressions, appropriations – tend to be local and dispersed in their occurrences, variable and limited in their consequences. (404)

These lines clarify the idea that Foucauldian power is never monolithic; and power relations always imply multiple sites not only of power but also of resistance. It depends on multiplicity of points of rejection which has the target of adversary and resistance embedded in the power circulation through institutions.

Thus critical analysis and investigation of new historicism, ‘discourse’ and ‘power’ bear important positions. ‘Discourse’ and ‘power’ give a certain stance to the critical practice of New Historicism. Indeed, New Historicism owes much to Foucault for the concept of ‘discourse’ and ‘power’ by which it has strengthened its own critical stance. For Foucault, “discourses are coherent self-referential bodies of statements that produce an account of reality by generating ‘knowledge’ about particular objects or concepts” (Childs and Hentzi 840).

Besides, New Historicists explore how the given piece serves or opposes the certain discourses of time and place. To maintain dominance, control and power or to oppose them various discourses are circulated. Among them literature is one. In this regard, Habib, in his book *A History of Literary Criticism from Plato to Present* points out: “New Historicists have been profoundly concerned not only with situating literary texts, within power structures, but also with seeing them as crucially participating in conflicts of power between various forms of social and political authority” (762). By this, he points up that literary texts not carry certain ideological needs of certain socio-political authority but also involve in the conflict between them. In the same book, citing Louis Montrose, Habib further highlights the issue that

“New Historicists variously recognize the ability of literature to challenge social and political authority” (762).

Then, Foucault develops a theory of discourse in relation to power structures operating in society. His main thesis is that discourse is involved to power. For him, power and knowledge are joined together. He views that discourses are rooted in social ‘institutions’ and than social and political power get operated through discourse. The discourse, therefore, is inseparable form power because discourse is ordering force that governs every institution. This enables institutions to exercise power. Those who possess the authority to define discourse exclude other who are not in power. Discourses can be of informative and of misinformative, which inform us of the state of affairs. Discourses also tell us about the propriety or impropriety, rightness and wrongness, of something and consequently influence our attitude, opinion and behavior. The exclusive function of discourse is to serve as a transparent representation of things and ideas standing outside it. Therefore, it is directive too. M. H Abrams in *A Glossary of Literary Terms* writes:

Discourse has become the focal term among critics who oppose the deconstructive concept of “a general text” that functions independently of particular historical conditions. Instead, they conceive of discourse as social parlance, or language-in –use, and consider it to be both the product and manifestation not of timeless linguistic system, but of particular social conditions, class structures, and power- relationships that alter in course of history. (241)

Discourses are produced with in a real world of power struggle. Discourse is taken as a means to obtain or sometimes even to subvert power. For Foucault, discourse is a central human activity. So he is in retested in the process how discursive practices change overtime. Discourses, according to Foucault, are produced in which concepts

of madness, criminality, sexual abnormality, and so on are defined in relation to sanity, justice and sexual normality. Such discursive formations massively determine and constrain the forms of knowledge, the types of normality and nature of subjectivity, which prevail in a particular period. Foucault argues that the rules and procedures, which determine what is considered normal and rational, have the power to silence what they exclude. Hence, there is always 'oppressor' versus 'oppressed' relationship in power politics. Individuals get dominated on the footing of less power by the one who have the most power.

Similarly, Foucault advocates that discourses are produced in the society according to the change in system, but these systems may be or may not be true. In "Truth and Power", Foucault admits his principle interest in "how power diffuses itself in system of authority and how effects of truth are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false" (qtd. in Adams 1134).

In the same essay, Foucault revisits the major theoretical trends and questions of his career. Foucault spends much of his career tracing the threads of truth and power as they intertwine with the history of human experience. He specially loves to study asylums and prisons because they are closed to encapsulated power structure. Using techniques gathered from psychology, politics, anthropology and archaeology, Foucault presents the analysis of the flow of power and power relations.

For Foucault, systems of knowledge establish rules and procedures governing the particular epoch by exclusion and regulation. He regards the nature of discourse as an event in time since it is not only that which represent struggles or systems of domination, but the object thorough which and with which we struggle, the power we seek to possess. Every instance of discourse embodies power struggle, as Foucault argues: "discourse is a violence that we do to thing" (qtd. in Selden 60). Truth itself becomes not an unchanging universal essence but a perpetual object of appropriation

and domination. This implies that a discourse is always in a process of formulation, correlation and transformation, which takes place after a certain epoch.

Discourses are the embodiment of power. To have knowledge of the other and to describe them in discourse or in imaginative texts is to exercise power over other. The representation of the other nations and other people is directed to validate the self by excluding and subordinating them. Knowledge thus implies taking sides and texts become the instrument of power, the vehicle of imperial rule in colonial or post colonial scenario.

Every action and every historical event, according to Foucault is an exercise in the exchange of power as he analyses the ebb and flow of power in different situations and with relevance to different aspects of human life structures organize and broaden the web of power. The overall volume of power rises with each individual involved in the play. The society is a huge web, and much of power tends to be concentrated towards the higher authority. Foucault sees the exchange of power in very active terms, 'Isn't power simply a form of war like domination?' It is difficult to sort out just who is fighting the war. Since Foucault seems to lean towards the war of all against all notions. Power flows simultaneously in different directions and in different volumes according to the various terms of 'power relations' in the network of power exchange. Regarding power and truth, Foucault says: "Now I believe that the problem doesn't consist in drawing the line between that in a discourse which falls under the category of scientific truth and that which comes under some other category" (qtd. in Adams 1139). He further states that power is not merely repression, it is something positive:

In defining the effect of the power as repression, one adopts purely juridical conception at such power, one identifies power with a law which says no power is taken above all as carrying the force of

prohibition [...] what makes power hold good, what makes it accepted is simply the fact that it does not only weigh on us as a force that says no, but it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms of knowledge, produces discourse. (1136)

It shows that power is the principle source of creating discourse that ultimately constructs the institutions through which individuals get captivated; “All discourse including history”, according to Foucault, “Are produced within a real world of power struggle [...] claims to objectivity made on behalf of specific discourses are always spurious: there are no absolutely ‘true’ discourses, only more or less powerful ones” (qtd. in Selden 102).

According to Foucault, every discourse is meant to obtain power. In other words, every discourse is the construct of power politics. Discourse is a means of achieving power, which governs every institution. The social, moral and religious disciplines always control human behavior directly by means of discourse.

The discursive formations have enabled ‘institutions’ to wield power and domination by defining and excluding the other. Such discursive formations determine and constrain the forms of knowledge and types of normality of particular period. These discursive practices do have possessed the power within themselves. Discursive practices not only wield power to the authority, they also stimulate opposition to that power. Lois Tyson in his book *Critical Theory Today* highlights the same issue:

This is one reason why new historicists believe that the relationship between individual identity and society is mutually constitutive: on the whole, human beings are never merely victims of oppressive society, for they can find various ways to oppose authority in there personal and public life. (281-282)

Discourses are created through the embodiment of power. Power creates certain institutions in the given society, in which the individuals are compelled to come under these systems. Discourse enables institutions to exercise power. Those who possess the authority to define discursive practices, dominate the ones who are not in power. As discourse is used as a means to gain or sometimes to go against the institutional power propagated by the State; there is always a check and balance in power. Hence, the resistance and rejection can be stimulated. So discourses are also created in order to register the rejection or resistance against the authority who exercises the institutionalized state power upon the individuals who have not possessed power and get neglected in the eye of modern technological bureaucratic State.

To put in nutshell, as Michael Foucault and other poststructuralists argue that a discourse is determined by the socio-political scenario and a literary text and authorship as the discourse is also controlled by the dominant power system existing in the society. Similar case we do find even in Jarrell's poems that do not only expose the trauma of war violence but demonstrates the possibility of resistance of the individuals against the dominant power or ideology propagated by the modern State.

III. Resistance against State Violence in Jarrell's War Poems

The analysis explores how Jarrell's poems predominantly focus on the theme of war showing the domination of State's power system and the possibility of resistance against such hegemony. Manifesting the predicament of individuals who are forcefully dragged in to the battlefield and portraying their traumatized conditions owing to the excessive exercise of power by the modern technological State has been raised as the central thematic concerns of his war volumes. By projecting the picture of those victimized individuals, Jarrell exposes the institutionalized State violence and registers his condemnation against that power propagated by the State. Owing to the unfair treatment towards the warriors, their individuality is killed; they feel themselves to have been used up as mere commodities crushing their sentiments.

Constantly confronted by the maze of experience, which is permanently threatening his people are the common and helpless victims of war and if they strive for awareness of their plight, they are usually left only with a frustrating self – knowledge. To the persons in Jarrell's world, experience is like a dream, the world is a place where they are lost like frightened children. It is this theme of entrapment, this perennial and wistful sense of unfulfillment, of being lost, which dominates the characters of his poetry. The detachment of the individual experience of war from the public slogans and the isolation of the private suffering from what the State demands and history acknowledges produce for the persons of Jarrell's poetry and unrelenting and usually helpless to exposure to the realities of war and enforce the awareness that the ragged activities of war are knitted to the soiled fabric of overall experience.

Unlike the other war poets, Jarrell served entirely in a noncombatant capacity, mostly as a stateside fight instructor. Mute on wartime sexuality but articulates on military cruelty, Jarrell wrote about both shame and glory in to his views of his mates. Perhaps, only an airman with an outlook both cerebral and idiosyncratic would

maintain the contrary measure at distance and intimacy to the soldier clans that would produce Jarrell's tender celebrations of murderous innocence.

In the poems such as "Siegfried", "Losses," "The Sick Naught", "Pilots, Man Your Planes", and "The Learner", Jarrell takes a soldier through wounds, fears, deaths in order that the soldier will know that he has undergone some basic suffering because of which he can no longer deny not only the horrors and bitterness of war but the harshness of human personality and culture as well. Through their wound, they bleed innocence. Yet it is a striking paradox of Jarrell's poetry, and probably an expression of his own ultimately sardonic conception of freedom and human effort, that despite those poems which persist in a confrontation of the realities, all that awareness comes up within the end is the knowledge of its own ineffectuality, the knowledge that perceives the blind alley in which it groups. This theme of ultimate frustration is most obviously dramatized in the poems about war prisoners and the war dead and suffuses those poems in which Jarrell expresses pity and sympathy for all the human flotsam and jetsam drenched in war.

His nearly fifty war poems do not come smoothly or evenly to Randall Jarrell. The least successful poems most directly approach battle, in dramatist settings concentrating not on character but on dilemma. In "A Pilot from the Carrier", and "Pilots Man, Your Planes", the idea of frustrated movement is dramatized in one of the recurrent situations of disaster, the flier's inability to return to the home base. These poems are about pilots who are shutdown and can not return to their carrier and in 'A front', the bombers crashes while trying to land at the fogbound air base. The inability to return home takes on extended meaning in the poetry, as do other situations of war.

Then maze of "Blood for a Stranger" metamorphoses in to the network of death and violence of the later war poetry. The war itself in Jarrell's poetry becomes

the situation which speaks for the larger plight of man helpless in this world, torn from any secure footing. The war becomes a violent extension of the maze through which we continually stumble.

“The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner” is a compact verse supplement to Jarrell’s prose criticism of Marinara Moore’s “In Distrust of Merits” which he considers a mistaken notion of the heroism of war, war being less fighting than ‘passive misery’. Jarrell shows the condition of the gunner’s life as an insecure dream from which one awakens to ‘stormy visions’ of strife with ‘phantoms’. The gunner’s ending is almost literally his beginning. He is flushed out his wastes on his going as on his entrance. He goes from nothing to nothing or on more accurately, from one blob to another. And the masculine hose accents the poet’s striking an appropriate unity of beginning and ending. The poem seems to be bath in amniotic fluid. In a note on the poem, Jarrell remarks that the gunner in the turret hunched upside down in his little sphere looked like the fetus in the womb. Overall, this poem condemns the dehumanizing, institutionalized power of the State.

“Eight Air Force” like “The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner” is a poem that contains a number of themes prevalent in Jarrell’s war poetry. But the themes take on a unique role in Eight Air Force, for here the man returns to the air base, here they seeks and finds some release in dreams, and here, even though it is clear that the men are the inevitable practitioners of the State’s will, the poet neither expropriates their consciousness nor indulges in the theme of entrapment, nor unduly immerses himself in the bleakness of self knowledge. Yet the poem is no less forthright in the dilemmas and burdens it perceives and dramatizes.

Jarrell’s war poetry talks about American psyche of war, the unnecessary involvement of America in Vietnam War. The experience of war is nothing more than fruitless ‘nightmares’. His poems depict the bitter experience of war’s deterioration

of civilization by war, and protest in against of human rights violence. The imposition of army upon people by the State, people are forced to involve in the war which is against of their fundamental right.

Some of the poems like “Lines”, “ The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner”, “Lullaby”, “Eight Air Force”, “Losses”, “Soldier”, “ War”, “ Eight Air Force”, “ The Gunner”, “Pilot Man Your Plane” etc. overtly are embedded with war experiences, and about the traumatization of individuals owing to the bureaucratic exercise of State power. Some of the aforementioned poems will come under my investigation.

“Gunner” written during post war second stands out as one of the Jarrell’s finest war poems because it powerfully captures the pains and sorrows, woes and wounds of the warriors during Second World War time. Through the uses of various rhetorical questions, the poem very boldly depicts the loneliness, weariness and alienation of a warrior caused by the modern technological bureaucratic State. In this respect, the poem clearly takes an anti State power stance and its circulation through literary means, and thereby undermines the power politics exercised by the State which puts the innocent soldiers at the margin of the socio-political position. As a result, they, as the speaker in the poem do feel frustrated and victimized.

The poem is notable for its deep meditation on Second World War, which helps to capture the complexities of soldiers during 1940s and 1950s. This poem carries the experiences of the warriors in the warfare, telling of survival and transcendence in the hostile world. The State sends the warriors without their interests alienating themselves from their family members and their wives:

Did they send me away from my cat and my wife

To a doctor who poked me and counted my teeth,

To a line on a plain, to store in a tent?

Did I nod-in the flies of the school? (1-4)

The speaker feels the trials and tribulations of the State very much. He is very much
socked when he is isolated from his wife and compelled to wage war for the sake of
the nation. They have to fight in the battlefield until they have vigor and energy and
the State on the other hand, waits for the death of those soldiers:

And the fighters rolled in to the tracer like rabbits,
The blood froze over my splints like a scab –
Did I snore, all still and grey in the turret,
Till the palms rose out the sea with my death? (5-8)

Due to such the suppressive features of the State, the warriors were socially
marginalized, politically excluded, economically suppressed, physically wounded and
psychologically agonized. They were at the bottom of the political position; prestige
was a myth for them. In such a deadly condition, exhaustion and loneliness overtook
them. They feel terribly troubled as the speaker in the poem:

And the world ends here, in the sand of grave,
All my wars over, ... It was easy at that
Has my wife a pension of so many mice?
Did the medals go home to my cats. (9-12)

In these lines, Jarrell's use images like mice and cats is very interesting for their
connotative meanings. These indicate the helplessness and powerlessness conditions
of the warriors during warfare. This poem in totality exposes the extreme troublesome
condition of gunner, thus leaving him vulnerable to the 'State'. And that words suggest
a powerful and impersonal institution that considers its citizen to be expendable
means toward achieving larger goals.

The poem is denunciation of insensitive, dehumanizing power of the political
State. The poet shares a common sense of the army and the State fusing to produce an
inherently totalitarian institution; "All the fighters rolled in to the tracer like the

rabbits” (5). Within it, individual identity and moral agency are torn away by mass crowding within narrow space, demanding labor, institutional clothing, and control by command hierarchy indistinguishable from prison, also on experience of fixed service. Within such a prison, a terrible longing grows the wakened beyond the nightmare term, only then to feel disconsolately that the endless doldrums of the military sentence makes civilian life the dream into which one escapes from the army.

Jarrell in the present poem portrays the helpless and part-neglected soldier, he fits with predetermined case within the antimilitarist recognition that industrial, mechanized warfare returns the soldiers to a child’s fatal dependency. In the army’s rigid hierarchy, the tiny log moves within the wheels of a giant engine, itself only remotely if murderously, connected to the field operations. The passive suffering figures that rise from Jarrell’s poems are first, orphans within the family, then orphans within the bowels of the army. Eventually, however, even such a child, so negligently reared must awaken to the consequences of his own moral choices.

The present poem “Gunner” like “The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner” is one of the earliest postmodern elegies because of the placement of poem’s speaker and because of the peculiar relation of the speaker to the figure being mourned. The essential concept of mourning is a ‘painful and protected struggle’ to acknowledge the reality of loss; “Till the palms rose out of the sea with my death’s?” (8). In Jarrell’s poems mourning seems impossible and grief is suppressed in the face of death so shocking but so quickly dismissed that it remains impossible to progress emotionally. The ‘gunner’ remains the only sentient being left to witness or acknowledge the reality of a death that the rest of the world has simply washed away. He lingers still a disembodied survivor whose voice hovers tentatively, while his existence and his

death have equally been denied. The voice that is telling us the story of his death –life is a testimony of how the State regarded his life – death.

The tone of the speaker in “Gunner” indicates the depression or sadness. The warriors themselves identify the melancholy and misery as the major theme of the state’s excessive exercise of power; “The blood froze my splints like a scab” (6). According to the speaker, since the freedom is not granted through compromise and since it is not achieved being fearful, the ultimate way to embrace it is to stage resistance against those forces that hinders the exercise of the freedom. In this connection, the anti-force of freedom undoubtedly, is the power holding State which has been treating the individuals /soldiers as subordinated, secondary and even as non human. Therefore, these soldiers were painfully cut off from the exercise of freedom in every sector of life. They were heavily denied socio- political and cultural freedom. Therefore, in the present poem, for the concrete release from State power, Jarrell emphasizes the need of staging resistance against the institutionalized violence, and injustice. Even though the term ‘resistance’ has not been mentioned in the poem, it is implied, and thus taken as an alternative means of securing freedom and justice.

Throughout the war (World War Second), the soldiers were encouraged to go to war assuring that they would be awarded with medals and their names would be written on the pages of the histories. But in reality, they were always cut off from the realization of it. Therefore, the speaker in a very frustrated tone declares: “All my wars over? ... it was easy at that” (10). The speaker states that his all contributions went in vain, he was no more respected in the country. So, he would not fight for the next time. Since many generations of the soldiers lost their lives in the name of the State, the speaker is not ready to be fallen under same tradition. Instead, he emphasizes on individual freedom and justice. He argues that freedom after death means nothing: “And the world ends here, in the sand of grave [...]. Did the medals

go home to my cat” (11-12). It has a great value of individual freedom from the institutionalized violence. Therefore, the internalized demand of Jarrell’s present poem is the need of deliberate *résistance*.

The words used in the poem are simple, bold and straight forwarded and equally are potential to impart a sense of resistance in the minds of soldiers / gunners. Simplicity functions as an access to approach the common mass and deliver the message, a central idea. So, Jarrell has utilized the poem “Gunner” as a discourse, to register resistance against the State power, i.e. institutionalized violence. Hence, the poem “Gunner” includes resistance.

The poem “Losses” extremely moving and emotional in tone was written at the backdrop of 1940’s about World War Second, when the warriors were denied their freedom by the modern State. By using powerful allusions, vivid imagery, bold symbols and forceful metaphor, Jarrell changes his people with emotional appeal to keep their hands tight to plow of freedom, to materialize the dream of equality, liberty freedom. Jarrell, in this poem focuses on the warriors’ relation with all State. Individuals are put to the metallic State from their mother’s lap, they are suffocated in this trap and washed away inhumanly from this public mawkish (sentiments). They are given with no place for their contribution. The trap makes them realize their lot, which brings a kind of discrepancy from the State business. Realization of this sort of treatment of the State obliges individuals to exercise their anti State power discourse or resistance. In this respect, the poem sides against the power politics exercised by the State.

Jarrell further marks the problematic situation in the war-trodden areas, where individuals are deliberately getting pains and sufferings:

It was not dying; everybody died.

It was not dying; we had died before.

In the routine crashes- and our fields.

Called up the papers, wrote home to our folks.

And the rates rose all because of us.

We died on the wrong page of the almanac. (1-6)

This poem attempts to communicate the message of frequently suffered individuals who are used up painfully in the State's interest. The poem speaks from the perspectives of wounded soldiers, who desired to undermine the State power and bourgeois discourses. However, it attempts to circulate the anti-authoritarian and anti tyrannical discourses in order to transmit the spirit of revolution and resistance into the veins of subordinated soldiers for the achievement of their political goal of transforming the ordered society and the nation.

Jarrell's poem parallel with Gavin Edwain's "When a Beau Goes In" which is as Paul Fussell calls a typical "Second World War poetry in its laconic refusal to reach out for any myth" (57). Short choppy lines with a doggerel rhythm and use of slang seems to be little not just the mechanical slaughter house of modern war but men themselves:

When a beau goes in,

In to the drink,

In makes you think,

Because, you see, they always sink

But nobody says "poor lad"

or goes about too king sad

Because you see, its war,

It's the unalterable law.

Although it's perfectly certain

The pilot's gone for a Buston. (qtd. in Fussell 57-58)

Fussell remarks the utter irrelevance of theological or any other connotations and that the tone is like that of the opening of Jarrell's *Losses*; "It was not dying: everybody died" (1). Jarrell may be hard-eyed and emotionally, even morally engravated, but Ewart's is almost flippant. Jarrell's poems as in Ewart's, do convey a sense that these lives being lost are of no value whatsoever to anything – the 'State'? 'You' in the poem can be every body, the combatants and noncombatants alike the speaker, the reader alike.

The individuals in "Losses" frozen inside the State though they contributed for the progressive betterments of the nations they had to die like animals and other foreigners: "We died like ants or pets or foreigners" (10). Not only did the soldier do anything of note in his life, but also there was no opportunity for doing anything. Anyway, this is the common case for soldiers. What the gunner has lost is "the greatest single subject for the romantics, pure potentiality" (*Poetry and the Age* 98).

The poem celebrates the theme that the fighting soldier is doomed to go to war. He fights for the State, but he is no more respected. Even when they were killed, their bodies are placed in very derogative rank; "When we died they said / our casualties were low" (27).

The soldiers died for the sake of country to move their nations towards the progressive path, but when they died, their contribution has not been counted at the presence of bureaucratic State:

It was not dying; no, not ever dying;
But the night I died I dreamed that I was dead,
And the cities said to me: why are you dying?
We are satisfied if you are; but why did I die? (16-19)

The given stanza clearly depicts the bitter reality of the speaker who belongs to the subordinated class, in which he has to involve in to the warfare. As Jarrell presents

him as a representative character, the speaker carries the pain and pathos of hundreds and thousands of soldiers. He works all the time for the authority (boss), but ironically he has to face 'hand to mouth' problem every morning and every evening. Indeed, he is terribly victimized and crushed in a huge grind of power politics possessed by the State. In contrast to the chilling condition and pathetic expression, the life style of the State power holder is very much sophisticated, luxurious and comfortable. Whenever the speaker understands this real situation of the power holder, he starts condemning such insignificant power politics. So, the soldiers start destabilizing the State's physical properties such as burning the cities, breaking the bridges and so on in order to confront against the State power; "We burned the cities, we had learned about in school" (22-23).

By using the literary tools like juxtaposition and simple language, narration, and the imageries like ants, bombers, casualties etc., Jarrell intends the poem to be performative that is to appear to the warriors to embrace the resistance and revolution for the independence of those traumatized individuals. By exposing the intimacy between traumatized soldiers and the resistance, Jarrell emphasizes the need of revolution and the destabilization of the excessive exercise of State power. To Jarrell, deliberate resistance is inevitable and unavoidable means of bringing change in the life of those commodified soldiers who are putting their selves aside. Indeed, their lives were sorrowfully miserable, severally painful and chillingly unbearable owing to different forms of unfair activities and practices propagated by the modern institution, that is to say the 'State'.

Hence, by means of comparing and contrasting the lives of the workers and the boss, Jarrell clearly shows the unbridgeable gap between the power holders and the individuals who are always in service of them. The warriors fought for the State throughout their lives as they are persuaded of getting medals:

Till our lives wore out, our bodies lay among,

The people we had killed and never seen.

When we lasted long enough, they gave us medals;

When we died, they said, "our casualties were low." (24-27)

But in return, they receive domination and injustice, they are considered to be the ticket to be bought and sold. On the other hand, the power holders enjoy their lives basing on the labor of the warriors. Such an unequal and unjust political order is against the fundamental rights; 'life, liberty and pursuit of happiness' of individuals. Therefore, Jarrell views resistance against the bureaucratic State power as dynamic site to end such political upheavals and thereby to establish an equitable nation when every individual's life is aloof from any sorts of injustices.

To sum up, Jarrell employs simple language which works as an effective medium to circulate the message. The language he has employed, here can be characterized as a warrior's vernacular which he believes can have a political appeal. The philosophical and jargon loaded language, of course, can not capture the sentiments and the feelings of traumatized individuals. So, Jarrell in his present poem "Losses" also avoids such use of language and employs the language of victimized soldiers thereby to register the denunciation against the State power.

First published in 1945 (collected in *Litter Friend Little Friend* 1945), "The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner" is a brief hard-hitting poem about the waste of war, narrated by a dying soldier. This poem is an elegy written on the death of himself by a gunner who was flying a bomber plane in the World War Second. The poor soldier is suddenly shot by a powerful 'flak' and his badly smashed dead booby is washed out of the 'womb' of the State with a torrent of water. The poem ironically shows how the soldier survived the few moments in the womb of the State, after being forced out of the womb. Specially the State is the American State since the word is capitalized, and

generally it is the State/government of any country anywhere. Anyway, this poem addresses the alienating effects upon the individual of a mechanized and impersonal society.

The title is the subject of the poem, told from the point of view of the dead gunner. Jarrell has provided a note to the poem which explains the ball turret gunner's tiny womb like enclosure in the plane and the kind of 'hose' that would be turned on the place to clean it; he has also commented on the wet 'fur' as representing the inside of the gunner's jacket. The poem uses an image which is suggestive of abortion to comment on the waste of war. The young gunner, who comments that he has been compelled to serve the State; "From my mother's sleep I fell into the State" (1). He never awakes to life rather he 'hunched' in the belly of the plane, this is new. State provides death, womb, until he woke only to die, amidst the 'black flak' and the 'nightmare fighters'. His body was washed 'out of the turret with a hose'. Thus, the sleep of the childhood led directly to the sleep of death, and only with waking his realization of the imminence of that death. The image of the 'baby animal' suggested by the 'wet fur' in the mechanical body of the death machine, is hard for reader to escape.

The significant matter of fact statement entitled in the poem is the 'death' of a man a mere soldier, whom it keeps 'paid' to 'use' when – needed, and whose death is so common to the State. But to the human readers, not State, the blunt sober statement as, "The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner" strikes a stark grim tone. The phrase 'my mother's sleep' is the first indication of womb metaphor that persists throughout the poem. The word 'fell' hints the speaker's powerlessness to control his circumstances, thus leaving him vulnerable to the State And that word suggests the powerful and impersonal institution that considers its citizens to be expendable means towards achieving larger goals. The position of ball turret gunner parallels the position of a

child in the womb. But where a mother's womb is warm and protective, this womb of State is bitterly cold as suggested by the closing words 'my wet fur froze'.

The poem is a denunciation of the insensitive, dehumanizing power of the political State. This is accomplished most notably by the paradoxical use of 'birth imagery' If in reality the womb is considered to be a place of warmth and safety leading to the happiness of birth, in this poem it is cold and dangerous and leads to the gruesome death. The last line clearly suggests one of the common procedures for ejecting the fetus after abortion. The awakenings of the gunner in the bomber craft is an ironical awakening because it is awakening to the violence of gunner on the ground and to install, death rather than birth. The bomber had not believed that he would be shot down; his awakening is an ironic awakening into the futile existence between birth in to the State and his death at the hand of State. Thus, this poem functions as a discourse to register the resistance and condemnation against the institutionalized power.

In his poetry, Jarrell had an agenda of speaking of war. He particularly speaks the pity on war in his war volumes. Exposing the relationship between the individuals and the outer world is the central concern. The relationship between them is an explicit account of tragic consciousness of a soldier. The confusion and the displacement are crucial, though many of the implications are suppressed. There is the sense of universal sadness, betrayed vulnerability, an emptiness at the center of self in Jarrell's work. It can be illustrated in the following verse.

From my mother's sleep. I fell in to the State

And I hunched in its belly, till my wet fur froze

Six miles from the earth, loosed from its dream of life

I woke to black flak and nightmare fighters

When I died, they washed me out of the turret with a hose. (1-5)

These lines sharply focus on the situation of a warrior. Though only five lines in length, the poem stands as one of the antiwar- poems ever written because the warrior is no more interested in warfare. Hence, there is the internalized level of resistance has been registered in the above mentioned poem.

The role of the 'State' is antagonistic in Jarrell's most of the poems. As the workers are highly used till they are capable and later they are thrown away as the worthless things in bourgeois society, the soldiers are highly mobilized by the State till they have vigor and energy and are left without care; "When I died, they washed me out of the turret with a hose" (5). This indicates that they are just taken as a commodity, and their contribution never gets counted. So the lives of the soldiers become tragic.

We see the life in the belly of the State being unnaturally cramped. The State has icy belly where the individual's existence is confined. The 'fur' refers to the fur collar of the jackets that fliers wear in battlefield. Here, he leads an animal like existence confined by this unfeeling foster parent, the State. Such existence is far from his dream of life but still he is 'hunched' in the turret like a baby in the womb. He awakens not to a rich fulfillment of the dream but a horrible reality that is like a nightmare. His awakening of birth is to a nightmarish reality and death.

It is not surprising but it is certainly horrifying that, in this world of impersonal State, one's life is numbed and destroyed. His body is flushed out of the 'turret' with a 'hose'. This is the third horrible release. The first is from the mother into the State; the second is from the belly of the State in to the belly of the airplane; and now in pieces from the belly of the State in to 'nothing'. From the beginning, he is moulded for only one purpose, and all that happens to him is for public usefulness. Here he is consumed for the evils of power politics and inevitably destroyed by the technological bureaucratic State as animal's stomach or throat. Such treatment of the

State towards individual, of course, increases horror. Thus, when individual realizes this commodified situation, he starts registering the denunciation against the State power. So, “The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner” functions as a discourse, resisting against the power politics. The simplicity of the last line, more effectively brings out the horror of the experience. About this issue, Richard Feign states:

In some ultimately stupid way, the gunner babbles out the nature of his narrow fate, his destiny as victim, and reaching of this understanding in his attainment of the nature of his doom. It is to reach to self awareness. People in Jarrell’s poetry awake to the dark knowledge of their death, their awareness of being caught in the grip of great forces. (157)

Some critics have viewed this as a poem dealing with the theme of individual in the modern world. This interpretation seems removed from the content of the poem, but we can see the line of reasoning which may lead to it: the gunner hunched in the belly of the State, which is also associated with the womb of his mother (he looked like a fetus in the womb); the transition is from the apparently prenatal life of dream to the waking ‘nightmare’ of the fighters, awaking which is simultaneous with death. Presumably critics have felt that his epiphanic awakening to the fatal horror of the State symbolizes the general power of the mechanized State to crush out the life of an individual, to press him in to dormancy.

Since, the poem was written when Second World War was bringing a lot of political turmoil, it exposes the violence created there. Through the intense imagery and profound metaphor of ‘death’, State, the poet claims that the soldiers in Second World War got victimized and traumatized owing to the unfair justice of the power holding State.

The voices of the poem advance the speaker as a helpless victim. Before his experience, the speaker seems helpless. The scene and the Speaker's tone affirm the gunner's victimized State. The basic figurative pattern of the poem is paradoxical. The death is represented in terms of birth. The 'belly' of the State- which is the name of B-17 of B-24 also represents the persona's State- condition or country. The gunner's birth trauma awakens him to the unnatural institutionalized life. Thus, the poem exhibits the condemnation of the insensitive dehumanizing power of the State. The poem reveals the State's total disregard and stunning brevity of the gunners waking life. The birth imagery also emphasizes the State's massacring efficiency towards warrior's feelings and emotions. It treats an individual as an animal in butcher's shop. The State exploits him till he is useful and washes out as animal remains 'with a hose'. He dies for the deliberate development and progressive betterment of the State, but, when he losses the vigor and energy, he is no more counted as a patriotic person. So, registering their condemnation against the State violence when these individuals come to know their commodification, profoundly highlighted in the present poem.

Similarly, highly political, moving and touching, the poem "Eight Air Force" very powerfully reflects the theme of entrapment, and profoundly depicts the awareness of the situation of the warriors during World War Second. As the poem is composed during Second World War, it certainly carries the theme of traumatization and eventually sides with anti State power and takes part in its circulation by undermining the power oriented discourse and accepts the discourse in the ground of resistance and obtaining the power by the ruled classes. The poem hints the man in war time to be the inevitable practitioner of the State's will. The poet reveals the state of entrapment in totality. The poem dramatizes dilemma of man's moral duality and

of the sensitive observer who is entangled in this awareness, war or no war, this is man's conflict. This poem comes as a kind of war awareness:

If an odd angle of the hutment,
A puppy laps the water from a can
Of flowers, and the drunk sergent shaving
Whistles O Paradiso! Shall I say that man
Is not as men have said: a wolf to man? (1-5)

This is a poem of forgiveness for man's murdered, and forgiveness remarks the image of man and succeeds in the attempt to place him above war and this is done perhaps so much because man deserves it as that he needs it and the poet needs to purge himself of the filth of war.

The dominant class, through hegemony – domination by consent-creates and imperative upon the consciousness or the whole way at social life, value systems beliefs, and attitudes. By doing so, it gets ink to write those values as general, common and indispensable social values which are constructed by power holder's discursive ethos and incentives. Here, the warrior's dilemma is the indeterminacy on whether to go against the State's will or not. He has a great burden in finding out which way is good or bad.

The war agent takes part in bellicosity even in the State of perplexment and confusion. The poem comes out in the pity of human condition. It suggests that people in war neglect peril and so they need to be relieved of guilt of murder in war. Here Jarrell avoids an over indulgent pathos or forced statement of knowledge. He allows consciousness to emerge from within the scene and evolves towards his own understanding:

This is war [...] But since these play, before they die,
Like puppies with their puppy; since, a man,

I did as these have done; but did not die,

I will content the people as I can

And give up these to them: Behold the man! (11-15)

The puppies play innocently, endearingly before they go to kill and be killed. The speaker's mission now is to content the people by giving them a scapegoat. As the last stanza indicates, these murderers are saviors. 'To behold the man' is to see him as a simple loving human soul and as murderers; as puppy and as a wolf; as savior and as a sinner; and finally as scapegoat for the guilt of other men – the rulers, the State holders. In the last stanza, Jarrell paraphrases the innocent people and says:

I have suffered in a dream, because of him

Many things; for this last savior, man,

I have lied as I lie now, but what is lying?

Men wash their hands, in blood as best they can

I find no fault in this just man. (16-20)

Even though the speaker of the poem has been facing a series of discriminatory practices, and suffering he does not see any fault on the individuals. Rather, it is the 'State' or rulers who compel individuals to be mere victims. The individuals (warriors) contribution for building the nation is neglected, ability is uncared and strength is unnoticed rather negatively presented. But through this poem, Jarrell powerfully counter veils such State power and registers the public condemnation against it.

In the poem, the word 'savior' bears paramount importance for it has deep connotative meaning rather than literal and denotative one. Here 'savior' can be taken as the 'unfair justice' and 'harshness of life created by the State holders. One does not get relief and freedom until and unless this last seriousness gets totally dismantled.

Jarrell in the present poem presents a warfare situation and individuals' utter sufferings because of its occurrence; "I have lied as I lie now, but what is lying? / men wash their hands in blood as best they can" (18-19). This line firmly advocates the powerlessness condition of the warriors and their vanquished nature in front of state. This poem carries the powerful, rebellious and subversive theme. It advocates how the extremist State power has always been deaf to the problems, pains and sufferings of the individuals who are compelled to undergo the norms and values made by the State. By exposing unjust, unfair and injustice practices of modern State, Jarrell is attempting to inject the seeds of resistance and denunciation in the minds of the soldiers who are forcefully pushed into the battlefield.

Through the lines given in the poem, Jarrell wants to convey his message effectively and thereby tries to achieve his powerful motive by revolutionizing the traumatized individuals to fight against the extremism and discriminatory practices of the State. In this sense, the poem takes an anti-extremist stance so as to undermine the discursive politics of the State.

Similarly, in the third stanza of the poem "Eight Air Force" is about the awareness created to the individuals who are fighting for the sake of the country, but inwardly they are just made the professional fighters, who sacrificed their life in State's interest. 'Behold the man' pulls the individuals towards the world of reality, where they would find themselves in the utter frustration, when they realize their real situation. Slowly, from the beginning, the poem receives the tone of rebellion, even of anger and ultimately resistance. Too much exploitation and suppression, undoubtedly are the root causes behind the rejection towards the power politics exercised by technological State.

Even though, the soldiers are right in their own stances, they are belied to be wrong and punished unfairly by pushing in to the battlefield reluctantly but

compulsorily. All the power possessed by the technological State blocks of individuals. Which does not do justice to the warriors even though they have right to be free and enjoyed in their own success. No matter how fair argument they raise, as the speaker of the poem raises: "Shall I say that man, is not as man has said: a wolf to man"? (4-5) Their argument is mis read and consequently they are made victimized. Hence, the poem brilliantly presents the fact that in every level of society, discrimination, domination, and hegemony are pervasive. Because of their injustices, individuals are not counted in the level of human beings as they are compelled to serve the State without paying attention to their personal benefits. These warriors are ultimately behaved like animals soon as they die.

The poem "Eight Air Force" however, tells the tale of subordination and perpetual domination of the State. In short, it narrates about the victimization of the individuals /warriors. Therefore, like in other war poems, Jarrell manifests the predicament of the individuals, who are reluctantly pushed in to the battlefield, hence get traumatized in the hand of modern power propagating State. By portraying the pictures of victimized individuals, who are not only physically wounded but also psychologically alienated, Jarrell exposes the institutionalized State violence and registers the condemnation against it.

Another poem "The Lines" written in 1955 stands out as one of Jarrell's finest war poems, deals with very deplorable condition of the warriors during Second World War. The poet exposes the warrior who is made to be metamorphosed into 'things' in order to be useful for the 'State' in war time, and as things they get used up. He portrays the picture of warriors who are physically wounded and psychologically isolated:

After the center's naked files, the basic line

Standing outside a building in the cold

Of the late or early darkness, waiting
For meals or mail, or salvage, or to wait
To form a line, to form a line to form a line;
After the things have learned that they are things,
Used up as things are, pieces of the plain
Flat object language of a child or states. (1-8)

Here the poet uses plenty of imageries and generalized images. Being the eyewitness of World War Second, Jarrell demonstrates the real traumatized situation and the deplorable condition of individual, their alienated feelings and sensibility as M.L Rosenthal states: "There is alienation of sensibility by modern war and technological displacement of human values, [...] and the emphasis on individual as their victim" (20). The warriors fight for the country until they die, they put their selves aside during the war. But as they die the State holders treat them as animal. Eventually they get objectified and become mere commodity. The poem explores that individuals are compelled to go to the battlefield, they might be forcefully dragged into the battle field. They had to fight against the enemies reluctantly but compulsorily. Those soldiers who are standing in "Lines" for a long time want to break, these lines "The lines bleak up, for good; and for a breath" (18). These people thus want to get freedom and register the violence against that State.

The poet plays over the words like 'flies' and 'rows' 'centers', and 'salvage' at fuller significance. The metaphors make men into lines, the psychology of line is simple; lines are things: they teach men to think of themselves as things or part of things, rather than individuals.

At the center of the poem, line 10, when the lines have become battle lines; "Where the things die as though they were not things" (10). Once they die, they lie as numbers the serial numbers inscribed on the crosses mark the lines of graves. Hence,

this poem exposes the traumatized condition of the warriors who fight not guided by their interest but they pass their life in the State's interest. In the war weary world State turns to be scornful, self-centered face towards the individuals, which they come to understand and feel alienated so they start registering their denunciation against the all powerful state.

In his war poems, the protagonist seems to be seeking meaning in human existence and finds pain in the name of different civilized world. Impersonal State imposes dehumanizing army routine, pain and mechanized death on helpless individuals. Their effort for making State becomes meaningless. The soldier learns to fight for freedom of the State with the result that: "His dull torment mottles like a fly's / the lying amber of the histories" (11-12).

The individuals are captivated in the State's interest until their defeat. If they die, they die as numbers marked in their graves and if not they are again remanded put back to this prison like State, they have to fight again till their death. Everyone knows his situation finally. He learns to be a man again and fights for the freedom before being observed into other responsibilities and functions.

During war, individuals suffer a lot, as they are dehumanized by their powerful State; "Where some are salvaged for their State, but some 'Remanded' useless to the centers' files" (14-15). Their life passes meaningless in the State's interest and their individuality gets dismantled. So this poem "Lines" also focuses on the conflict between the State, which is much bureaucratic and inhuman, and the helpless warrior, who are captivated in the tradition, ritual of the history or of the State itself. The poet tries his best to present the whole reality of war, the nature of all State, the bellicosity and the commodified soldiers. The awareness of soldier being commodified creates ultimate tussle between the institutional State power and wounded soldiers.

The poem functions as a discourse created to register the condemnation against the power propagated by the modern State. The soldiers primarily are not conscious about their purpose of going in the battlefield. As a result, they are intolerably treated by the modern State. There can be seen the technological displacement of human values and the unbearable traumatization. Highlighting the issues in Randall Jarrell's war poetry, M.L. Rosenthal in *Poetry for Students* 1997, states:

[Ordinarily Jarrell] resisted any obvious political rhetoric. His poem focuses on the literal data of war, their irreversible actuality, and the pity of human predicament implicit in that actuality. There is alienation of sensibility by modern war and the technological displacement of human values [...] and the emphasis on the individual as victim. (249)

Along with the universal sadness and technological displacement of human values, the poem also attacks upon the dehumanizing State politics, which is always forwarding furious indignation towards the individuals, the individuals are deliberately taken as things; "After the things have learned that they are things" (6). When they start realizing their real situation they are being commodified, and their achievements are no more counted in the construction of the State, they (Soldiers) gradually begin to antagonize the State. So, resistance against the power politics, taken as burning issue in this poem.

The entire poem is manifesting the predicament and the warfare situation of the warriors, their vulnerability and undermining of State power which is responsible in deteriorating the human values. State functions as providing the fortune, as it guarantees the job to the individuals. In the names of that, the innocent people are pushed to the battlefield, and ultimately forced them to die. When they die their

contribution is immediately forgotten and they are no more counted as martyrs. They are considered to be one of the most insignificant persons in the world. When the soldiers understand that all, they start rejecting the norms and values propagated by the State. Thus individuals violate the state power in the war poems of Jarrell as discussed in "Lines". Hence, this poem includes discourse which profoundly carries the resistance against the powerful State.

Similar issue is also found in Jarrell's most anthologized poem "The Prince" composed during the Postwar Second that explores the childlike soldier's total situation in the hand of mechanic and impersonal State. Even though the poem does not address the political idea directly still it is suffused with clear cut political overtones. By highlighting the situation of a grown up military prisoner, the poem is trying to affirm the power of traumatized individual who were fearfully pushed in to the war fare. By using the simple unsophisticated sentences and childlike speech, Jarrell exposes the helplessness and powerlessness condition of the speaker. Moreover, his sentences are short and syntax simple, do have also great significance in order to register the denunciation against the state violence.

In the poem, the prince dreams of his dead brother or father. After his mother leaves him alone in the dark; "After the door shuts, and the footsteps die/ I call out, mother "No one answer" (1-2). He hunches: "beneath the covers, in my curled / Red ball of darkness and feels as every child has Someone [...] In the other darkness" (4-5). It is one who bends over the child's body. The dead person seems strangely to be the rabbit, as the 'prince' hears his fingers rasping, like fire paws / up through the dirt:

I hear him breathing slowly, as he bends

Above me, and I pull my eyes

Back into me, and shrink up like the rabbit

They gave me when he –Then he waits, I wait,

I hear his fingers raping, like five paws.

Up through the dirt, until I can not breathe

But inch my cold handout to his cold hand. (8-14)

Using rabbit as a forceful metaphor, Jarrell captures the helplessness and powerlessness situation of the warriors / soldiers during World War Second; "I pull my eyes/ Back into me and shrink up like a rabbit" (9-10). This line explores the pessimistic environment of the speaker. Things happen to this helpless warrior, as the verb indicates: he falls into the state; he is loosed from his dream; he is awakened. Throughout this poem, forces operate on him. The voice in the poem advances the speaker as a helpless victim. He mumbles like a child.

In the last stanza the dreamer returns to full consciousness and sits up. When he sees the starlight barring a window, he hears a sentry call out the sentry in appropriate kings court, as well as to a prison or any army camp:

Nothing, nothing! I throw off the furs

And sit up shaking; but their starlight bars.

A vague window, in the vacant dark

The sentry calls out something, like a song.

I start to weep because there are no ghosts

A man dies like a rabbit, for a use.

What will they pay me, when I die to die? (15-21)

The last two lines of the poem echo of an idea of Jarrell's war poems, that the soldiers are used up like commodities, by the State: "A man dies like a rabbit, for a use ?/ What will they pay me, When I die to die?"(20-21). When he dies, it will be for a small use. A rabbit dies for a use and a soldier dies in his numbers for State's use. In his death, the soldier finds nothing as a return and questions in his death. His sentences are short, and syntax simple are stung together in an unsophisticated

manner. This increases the sense of helplessness of the speaker. He crouches in his fear like frightened, defenseless creature. Thus, this poem shows the childlike soldier's total situation in the hand of mechanic and impersonal State. Their living is like an animal's living in the butcher's farm. The butcher takes out the animals, cuts them and uses the useful things and sweeps away the useless one. In the same manner, the State brings the soldiers in its metallic clutch: uses them as the commodities. The realization of this warfare situation brings them towards the track of denunciation. Hence, this poem internalizes the resistance embedded in it. So Jarrell's thematic concern in his war poems is to explore the institutionalized violence, or war which creates moral paradox, a condition in which acts repugnant to human nature become appropriate. L.M. Dawson in his *Randall Jarrell: The Explicator* highlights the similar kind of assertion:

Everything in war, is the state of institutionalized violence is reversed:
up is down, one ascends to die, life is merely a dream of earth,
awakening or realization is 'nightmare' for truth in horrible, birth
becomes death and death is the only reality and release. But more
importantly man becomes a paradox, because he enters in to abnormal
state where he must dress unnaturally and regressively and where
insensitivity becomes a sustaining virtue. Without peace, he is truly
'Lost in stormy visions and keeps / with phantoms and unprofitable
strife.' (21)

Jarrell, through the poem "The Prince" subtly raises the issues of individuals traumatization in the hand of modern State and highlights the need of deliberate resistance against that power politics, which compels the individuals suffer a lot and make them as mere passive receiver of pain and agony. The dreams and the desires of individuals in the warfare remained unfulfilled; they are falsified, suppressed and

denied for the state holders benefits. They are used up like commodities till they remained useful and then thrown carelessly without any 'humane feelings'. When such conditions are realized by the individuals, they remain aloof from the State's business. The soldiers are totally alienated from such activities. However, they are captivated somehow or other in State's belly, due to history, tradition or rituals of the society that they never can ignore.

After the recognition of the situation in modern technological bureaucratic State, a soldier finds death inevitable and the only way is to transform or transcend. He feels very much useless to be used up as commodities at the presence of impersonal State. This realization makes the soldiers bring back his heroically offered hand. He does not want to be used as pet rabbit it dies for a use; "A man die like a rabbit, for a use" (20).

Jarrell here emphasizes the great need of resistance for the socio- political transformation and for equality and liberty. Until and unless resistance is embraced, the bureaucratic State will continue to dominate, to suppress and to oppress. That means ugly and troubled face of individuals remains troubled forever. Therefore, through this poem he makes an earnest call to every traumatized individuals to involve in the great struggle by carrying the flames of resistance in their hands in their heads, in their hearts, with a sole purpose of achieving a world of justice, freedom and equality.

"A Lullaby" in the same way, celebrates the theme that the fighting soldier is destined to go to war. He fights for the State, but he is devalued and taken as the most insignificant person in the eye of the technological bureaucratic State. He advocates this feelings and sentiments are strangled by the State. Though he fights for the freedom of the State, he is ultimately smothered like a 'grave with dirt':

For wars his life and half a world away

The soldier sells his family and days

He learns to fight for freedom and the state;

He sleeps with seven men with in six feet. (1-4)

In the poem, Jarrell powerfully depicts the State's relation with the individual during the war, its nature and warrior's condition. It is rich in projecting the evil practices, effects and cruelties through the excruciating experiences of the war-victims. Such depiction out rightly helps to stimulate a sense of resistance in the hearts of people. The warriors who have undergone bitter experiences of torture, pain and intolerable suffering, ultimately reject the power politics exercised by the over smarting State. In the beginning, the soldier forgets his relatives, all kith and kin as he has leaned to fight for freedom and the State; "The soldier sells his family and days / he learns to fight for freedom and the State" (2-3).

Jeffery Walsh in *American Literature: 1914 Vietnam* puts forwards the idea: "Jarrell's inference here, of political power being shifted through social relationships into ritualized captivity, as in "A Camp in Pursian Forest" is reinforced every where" (167). He further quotes the lines from Jarrell's aforementioned poem; "Here men were drunk like water / Burnt like wood / the fat of good /And evil, the breast's start of hope were rendered in soap" (167).

The poem "A Lullaby" develops using a series of images supported by various rhythmical verse lines. In the second stanza, poet uses the images like matches, plates, beast, child, doges and sheep. Which stand for the powerlessness predicament of the warriors:

He picks up matches and cleans out plates;

Is lied to like a child, cursed like a beast.

They crop his head, his dog lags ring like sheep

As his stiff limbs shift wearily to sleep. (5-8)

Here the State is totally deserted in the human feelings. The warrior is lied to like a child, cursed like a beast'. His contribution counts no more in the State's business. As the individual finds captivated in the State's business there is always antagonistic relationship between them. This ritualized captivity after the warriors awareness of situation, creates utter frustration towards the State. Hence, individuals start condemning the state politics of creating troubles upon the patriotic individuals who want to sacrifice their lives for the progressive development of the State.

Jarrell, in his war poetry puts forward his point that the war which men fight, and inevitably lose is the war with the time and the indifferent world. Thinking sadly about a mimed Veteran, Jarrell asks:

How can I care about you much or pick you. Out from all the other,
other people loved. And sent away to die for them! You are a ticket
someone bought and lost on a stray animal: you have lost even the
right to be condemned. I see you looking helplessly about in histories.
Bewildered with your terrible companions, pains and death and
Empire. What have you understood to die? Were you worth, soldier,
all the people said to be spent to willingly? Surely your own theory, to
live, is nonsense to the practice of centuries. (144)

The war individuals fight in modern era is for power politics. But those who experience war in battlefield are like a machine. They become a pawn to move on someone's touch. They are treated as object; they become a ticket to be purchased and sold. But after the fulfillment of the objectives of the State, they are left as a stray animal. They don't find any place in the histories. They are always stricken by the pain, death and empire. This pain is the pain of life in bureaucratic technological State. The tyrannical nature of State makes them realize that it is better at death to squawk like chicken than to be aware of failure beforehand.

Since the poem was written during the post war era, “A Lullaby” might be exploring the aftermath effects of Second World War and it participates in the anti State power discourse, in order to obtain freedom, equality and liberty. In the long troubled history of America during post war second, warriors used to be commodified and considered to be the most disrespected persons in the country.

For Jarrell, being fearful and submissive will not help to bring change in the society. Therefore, the only way of transforming the ugly face of power propagated by the society is to raise one’s mighty hand of resistance against the State’s domination and exploitation.

To wrap up, by presenting a very difficult and painful condition of victimized soldiers, with the help of his unsophisticated verse stanzas, and various imageries, Jarrell implicitly has made a call to American people who were directly and indirectly impacted by the World War Second, to raise a voice against the discriminatory practices, exercised by the modern state and to start their condemnation against that State violence.

Such a State violence can also be found in “Pilot from the Carrier” which powerfully reflects the complex and traumatized situation of the individuals manipulated by the State, and forcefully depicts the individual’s, alienating tendency from the State’s business. As the poem was written during post war era, it certainly captures the glimpses of World War Second and its impacts upon the individuals and the societies. It is the war, which planted the seeds of resistance upon individuals to destabilize the institutionalized State violence.

In the poem, the mother-ship for the plane is like the home base in “A Front” inaccessible, beyond the reach of pilot and the plane. This poem is about pilots who are shot down and can not return to the carrier, and in “A Front” the bomber crashes while trying to land at the fogbound air base. This inability to return home takes on

extended meaning in poetry, as do other situations of war. The poems “Pilot from the Carrier” and “Pilot Man Your Planes” are about deadly parental-child relationships, are variations of the plight which is also symbolically expressed in “A Front”, with the landing field out of reach of the plane or the parachuted pilot hanging helplessly over his carrier inadvertently shooting down its own pilot before it itself sinks. No matter what the situation is, in combat when the plane and base are out of touch, or in a family in which the mother cannot help or save the child, death is received from or can not be averted by precisely the object or person taken for support or security. The war itself in Jarrell’s poetry becomes the situation which speaks for the even larger plight of man helpless in this world, torn from any secure footing. The war becomes a violent extension of the maze through which we continually stumble.

The separation – from – mother theme or the mother’s inability to protect the child is recurrent in Jarrell’s war poetry:

Strapped at the center of the blazing wheel,
His flesh ice-white against the shattered mask,
He fears at the easy clasp, his sobbing breaths
Misting the fresh blood, lightening to flame. (1-4)

Of course, this theme is also a part of the world of frightening childhood which is familiar in modern literature, and children throughout Jarrell’s poetry are hunched in fear. Children in Jarrell’s war poetry not only confirm Jarrell’s general poetic presentation of childhood, but they inhabit a world in which their inability to control and understand, reflects how adults similarly feel in that same world.

In his poems fussy – over qualification even the nervous straining to get flight details and all the mechanics of carrier combat right can not destroy the sweep of the initial conception. That the pilot should be centered on that well, that the sky at that altitude is not lower but upper, that the clasp should be easy, the cycling precise by

which the blood lightens, fires, then smokes – all these touches do not manage to blunt the image, as the description finally clears and steadies:

A lonely eye reading a child's first scrawl, the carrier's wake

The traveling milk like circle of a miss

Beside the plant like genius of the smoke

That shades, on the little deck, the little blaze

Toy – like as the glitter of the wing – guns. (14-18)

Jarrell uses an image of airman fetus that gets born into the new life of death in to which danger, injury, as extremes of suffering have catapulted him. He shares the common sense of the army and the State fusing to produce an inherently totalitarian institution. The individuals in Jarrell's poems were the traumatized soldiers, who fought for the sake of the country but their contribution in building the nation is immediately forgotten and they were provided very subservient role and eventually, they were subordinated. The poet, through this poem condemns the institutionalized violence.

In the present poem, Jarrell adds the thought of an ultimately and absolute vulnerability in men a virtually fatal helplessness and blamelessness. The State takes over the child from his mother's womb into metallic one. The poet speaks not only about the pity and horror of war but also about the new peculiarity in twentieth century too. Men found themselves to be driven into the world of machine, insensitive and quite impersonal lacking morality and dignity. They are even taken as object; "Toy like as the glitter of the wing guns" (18). In such a case, the individuals participating in war had no way out; the only way was to realize the circumstances and be frustrated, hopeless and helpless. The feeling of brevity and optimism was a thing of mere worthlessness. They had only to be exploited and caught up from the impersonal, over smarting State; continuities of civilized life withered, and doubts

grew about the necessity or value of their sacrifice. The war which is the strategy of the State to lift itself. Skyward, betrays all optimism, operating from within a crucial deception about the nature of its politics. It is in a way an extension of politics by means of war.

Summing up, Jarrell in his war poetry points out the individual's condition in traumatic situation. The warrior's situation is manifested in other civilians of State too. The mother, children, common individual, poets, and other are endangered. During the warfare during this period the State practices the sheer negligence. Moreover, Jarrell, by portraying this pathetic situation of the warriors exposes the institutionalized State violence, and stages out the condemnation against the excessive power politics exercised by the State that considers its citizen as mere commodities.

IV. Conclusion

The researcher has analyzed the resistance against the power politics of State's violence in Jarrell's war poetry. As New Historicists argue that literary texts tell us something about the interplay of discourses of socio-political circumstances in which they are produced and written. For them a literary text is a product of power politics which shapes the historical reality. In the context of Randall Jarrell's war poems, they participate in the anti State and anti hegemonic discourses of 1940s and 1450s. However, the motive behind participating in those discourses has been to resist against the State violence. By challenging those discourses, Jarrell subverts the State power and violence.

In fact, the State power denied the socio-political freedom of these traumatized individuals. They were commodified, oppressed and exploited in every field of life. Here Jarrell sees the power propagated by the State as the root cause of individuals suffering and marginalization. Besides, he views bourgeois ideology and hegemony as other principle causes of the exploitation of warriors. Therefore, using his poetry as a dynamic site, Jarrell attempts to pump the fuel of resistance in to the veins of those warriors to subvert and upside down the State violence and the hegemonic world order.

In this way, Jarrell appears as a strong advocate for individual's liberation and freedom and also the freedom and liberation of working class or subordinated social strata. Indeed, Jarrell is strongly committed to the use of poetry as an effective weapon for social justice and change. Therefore, his attempts through poetry are to create a world of freedom and equality from all sorts of power exercise of the modern States.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Noido: Harcourt. Inc., 2008.
- Ashcroft, Bill and et al., eds. *Key Concept in Post- Colonial Studies*. New York: Rutledge, 2004.
- Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory: The Basics*. London: Rutledge, 2001.
- Childres, Joseph and Hentzi, Gary. *The Columbia Dictionary of Modern Literary and Cultural Criticism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- Dawson, Leven M. "Jarrell's The Death of he Ball Turret Gunner." *Explicator* 31 (1972): 29-30.
- Edward, Gavin. "When a Beau Goes In". *The Poetry of War*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.
- Feign, Richard. "Randall Jarrell's World of War." *Analects* 1, 2 (Spring 1961): 14-23.
- Ferguson, Suzanne, ed. *Critical Essays on Randall Jarrell*. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1983.
- . *The Poetry of Randall Jarrell*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1971.
- Foucault, Michael. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*. Alan Sherida. New York: Vintage, 1979.
- . "Truth and Power". *Critical Theory since Plato*. Eds. Hazard Adams. Florida: Jovanovich College Publishers. 1992.1134.
- Fussell, Paul. *The Norton Book of Modern War*. London: Norton, 1991.
- Graham, W.S. and Haydes Carruth. *Jarrell's "Losses": A Controversy Poetry*. London : Cambridge University Press, 1948.
- Habib, M.A.R. *A History of Literary Criticism from Plato to Present*. Malden: Blackwel Publishers Inc., 2005.
- Jarrell, Randall. *Poetry and the Age*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953.
- . *The Complete Poems*. New York: Farrar, 1969.

---. *Selected Poems*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

Montrose, Louis. "New Historicism." *Redrawing the Boundaries : The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: The Modern Language Association, 1992. 392-418.

Rosenthal, M.L. "The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner". *Poetry for Students*, 1997.

---. *The Modern Poets: A Critical Introduction*. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Selden, Raman. *A Readers Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. 2nd ed. New York: Harvester. 1985.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999.

Walsh, Jeffery, *American War Literature: 1914 to Vietnam*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982.

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

**Denunciation of Institutionalized Violence: A Critical Reading on
Randall Jarrell's War Poems**

A Thesis Submitted to

Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts in English

By

Pradip Panta

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

November, 2008

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Pradip Panta has completed his thesis entitled “Denunciation of Institutionalized Violence: A Critical Reading on Randall Jarrell’s War Poems” under my supervision. He carried out his research from 27th, June 2008 AD to 26th, November, 2008 A.D. I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted for Viva Voce.

Mr. Pam Bahadur Gurung

Supervisor

Date: -----

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Science

This thesis entitled “Denunciation of Institutionalized Violence: A Critical Reading on Randall Jarrell’s War Poems,” submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Pradip Panta, has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

_____	_____
_____	Internal Examiner
_____	_____
_____	External Examiner
_____	_____
_____	Head
_____	Central Department of English
_____	_____
_____	_____

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I am very much delighted to express my most heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Mr. Pam Bahdadur Gurung for his scholarly guidance, genuine suggestions, warm response and, of course, for his constant encouragement for bringing this thesis into its present form.

I am equally grateful to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, the Head of the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, for his kind cooperation, advice and encouragement to keep my work going. I am indebted to Dr. Birendra Pandey for his valuable suggestions. Likewise, I would like to record my debt to Mr. Badri Acharya for providing me scholarly suggestions, genuine guidance as well as invaluable materials for accomplishing this thesis.

I am thankful to my teacher Mr. Shankar Subedi, Puspa Acharya, Deepak Giri and Saadan Adhikari for their inspiration and encouragement. I am very much thankful to my teacher, Saroj Ghimire, for his valuable suggestions and persistent encouragement to carry out the task.

I also like to thank my friends Ranjan Kurmar Khatri, Kamal Kharel, Partap Paudel, Mukti Shrestha and Kamal Acharya for their support and encouragement. I can not forget the deliberate inspiration of my senior brothers Bhim Shrish and Pritam Gurung. A similar vote of thanks goes to Bhisma Raj Paudel for excellently typing this thesis. Ultimately, I am most grateful and deeply indebted to all my family members, especially my sister Suja Pant for her deep inspiration, unflagging support and greater emotional encouragement not only for accomplishing this thesis but also for my whole study.

November, 2008

Pradip Panta

Abstract

The research entitled “Denunciation of Institutionalized Violence: A Critical Reading on Randall Jarrell’s War Poems” explores the resistance against power politics of State violence in Jarrell’s war poems in the light of New Historicism. His poems are impregnated with the conscience of condemnation, revolt and resistance for the liberation and freedom of individuals who are forcefully pushed in to the battlefield owing to the excessive administrative power exercised by modern technological bureaucratic State. Hence, his poems function to awake consciousness of resistance in the mind of the soldiers who are physically wounded and psychologically agonized in order to resist the State violence. Therefore, Jarrell has employed poetry as a dynamic location for staging condemnation against the most oppressive features of modern hegemonic State. However, his resistance carries a deep political vision that is to achieve liberation, freedom and justice for the victimized warriors or individuals.

Contents

Letter of Recommendation	i
Approval Letter	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
I: State versus Individual in Jarrell's War Poems	1-8
II: New Historicism as a Theory of Resistance	9-27
Foucauldian Theorization of Power and Resistance	15
III: Resistance against State Violence in Jarrell's War Poems	28-61
IV. Conclusion	62
Works Cited	