

Chapter I

Sri Lankan Civil War

Since time immemorial human civilization has witnessed a bloody account of human deeds, social practices and clash of civilization and class struggle. The developed societies' progress has also traveled through once very barbaric and vicious circle. They have finally managed to define themselves as civilized and decent. Those societies, nations and systems, which have traveled through the unending uncivilized path to the so-called advanced and civilized level, tend to view the rest of the societies or nations which are still languishing or plagued with ethnic conflicts, political instability and civil war as barbaric and have apparently taken the situation of those troubled nations as the West's burden or responsibility to establish system which, however, appears otherwise.

Michael Ondaatje's *Anil's Ghost* is a novel written during the Civil War in Sri Lanka which started in 1983 and is still going on without abatement. In this particular novel, Anil, the protagonist, who represents Western perspective, comes to judge and find out the truth about terrorism and human right violation and gets herself stranded or ensnared in the net of indecision and confusion to find out the truth of the Civil War and human right violation during the civil war. Her representation to find out the truth from the blue print of West which views "WE are good and THEY Are EVILS", is an irony in the context of conflict-torn countries like Sri Lanka, which is reminiscent of Western colony and, which due to the colonial debris, is undergoing a turbulent path of history.

When the European powers colonized the globe, they modified or replaced native governments and customs. They also redrew map boundaries to suit their narrow interests. When colonization was more or less abandoned between the 1850s and 1950s,

the European rulers often left a power vacuum resulting in ethnic violence as old ways tried to re-assert themselves.

The Civil War in Sri Lanka, begun in 1983, is yet another example of the leftovers of colonialism. The island of Ceylon, located off the coast of India, traditionally was home to two ethnic groups, the Sinhalese and the Tamils. The Sinhalese call their country Sri Lanka, and the Tamils call theirs Tamil Eelam. The British took control of Ceylon in the early 1800s, and when they left in 1948, they installed a form of government that essentially gave the Sinhalese control of the entire island.

The Tamils claim that the Sinhalese are engaged in harassment, persecution, and even torture. A group called the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) started a Civil War in 1983 which continues till today. The advantage in the war has changed several times, with one side gaining and later the other side recovering.

More than 60,000 people are estimated to have been killed in the war. The government has imposed strict censorship on media coverage of the war.

The Sri Lankan Tamil minority, however, forms majority in the Northern and Eastern provinces of Sri Lanka. They have dominant position in the public services that were professions during the British colonial rule and even after its independence. But they found their position encroached by the Sinhalese in the 1950s. Mainly after the Sinhalese's language was made the only official language in 1956, the Tamils have been fighting for their fundamental rights such as citizenship and voting rights which were largely ignored by the Sinhalese-dominated government. The Tamil minority has been complaining that they are grossly undermined and their rights are massively infringed by the Sinhalese mainly in education and employment sectors.

Why Civil War? Is it Fight for Freedom or Terrorism?

Almost every nation has minority groups, religious plurality, and ideological divisions, but not all plunge into Civil War. Sociologists have long searched for what variables trigger civil wars. In the modern world most civil wars occur in nations that are poor, autocratic, and regionally divided. However, the United States was one of the wealthiest and most democratic countries in the world at the time of its bloody civil war.

Some models to explain the occurrences of civil wars stress the importance of change and transition. According to one such line of reasoning, the American Civil War was caused by the growing economic power of the North relative to the South; the Lebanese Civil War by the upsetting of the delicate demographic balance by the increase in the Shiite population; the English Civil War by the growing power of the middle class and merchants at the expense of the aristocracy. Competition for resources and wealth within a society is seen as a frequent cause for civil wars, however economic gain is rarely the justification espoused by the participants. Marxist historians stress economic and class factors arguing that civil wars are caused by imperialist rulers battling each other for greater power, and using tools such as nationalism and religion to delude people into joining them. Also, recent evidence proved that the violence observed in civil war can come from spurious reasons. Not only are the causes of civil wars widely studied and debated, but their persistence is also seen as an important issue. Many civil wars have proved especially intractable, dragging on for many decades. One contributing factor is that civil wars often become proxy wars for outside powers that fund their partisans and thus encourage further violence.

The Research related to the democratic peace theory has studied civil wars and democracy. It shows that the most democratic and the most authoritarian states have few civil wars, and intermediate regimes the most. The probability for a civil war is also increased by political change, regardless whether toward greater democracy or greater autocracy. Intermediate regimes continue to be the most prone to civil war, regardless of the time since the political change. In the long run, since intermediate regimes are less stable than autocracies, which in turn are less stable than democracies, durable democracy is the most probable end-point of the process of democratization. The fall of Communism and the increase in the number of democratic states were accompanied by a sudden and dramatic decline in total warfare, interstate wars, ethnic wars, revolutionary wars, and the number of refugees and displaced persons.

Similarly, a nation is formed of different communities of people sharing a common history, language and culture living in a particular territory under central government. In other words, it can be said that a nation is formed of a large community sharing common history, culture and language. Of course, a nation is formed of different groups sharing, indeed, the common politics but uncommon cultures and languages. In the run of history, there can be different communities of people with uncommon characteristics. In this sense, there can be different ethnic groups of which a nation is formed. Most states survive with numerous significant ethnic groups, yet such nations usually face demands from ethnic groups that remain unfulfilled.

Uncommonalities between them consist of history, culture and language. If a group of people differs in history, culture and language from another group of people, that is ethnicity. The term ethnicity relates broadly to the perceived shared

characteristics of a social or cultural group, while the idea of religious particularity is that a group regards itself as distinctive because of its religious identity. In this sense, it can be said ethnicity is uncommonalities between and amongst the groups of people. Ethnicity is concerned with the perceived shared characteristics of a racial or cultural group. A group's religion may be one of its particular characteristics: other characteristics include language, race, territory and / or culture. While talking more about ethnic group and minority which Tamil represents in Sri Lanka, *The World Book Encyclopedia* says:

Ethnic group is a group of people with characteristics in common that distinguishes them from most other people of the same society. Most ethnic groups are minority groups with at least some values and institutions that differ from those of larger society. Since ancient time ethnic groups have resulted from migrations, wars, slavery, changed political boundaries and other significant movements of people. (372)

Ethnicity can be studied more by associating it with minority groups since they are almost the same. Most of the ethnic groups are minority groups and vice versa. The same book about minority group in this Manner:

Minority group of people who differ in some ways from the principal group in society. Members of the minority group may differ from the principal group, also called dominant group in speech, appearance and in cultural practices. The dominant group also has greater political and economic power than the minority group. In many cases, the dominant group discriminates against minorities that it treats them unfairly. (608)

For this reason the ethnic and minority groups are almost the same. This applies to Tamils who are underprivileged, deprived of land and social privileges, political and social power which the majority Sinhalese enjoy in Sri Lanka. The dominant group, which enjoys most of the share of the whole nation more than the minority, causes frustration and humiliation among the minority. Consequently, the Tamils seek to reciprocate the same which they are deprived of. The dominant groups suppress the ethnic groups since the latter are in minority in many cases like the representation in the government, less or no participation in development process, and no social recognition in society at all.

From this sense, the minorities who are fighting for their rights, might appear outrageous, and to some extent the Sinhalese dominated Sri Lankan government is likely to brand them as terrorists. In the similar case, the West disregarding the pursuit of the struggle carried out by the minorities is more likely to deal with it as a terrorist campaign. At this crossroad, it would be unfair and problematic to deal with the situation and making decision from the Eurocentric point of view or judgement under the auspice of United Nations and under the UDHR can cause a problem.

Ondaatje as a Novelist

Sri Lanka's native Michael Ondaatje is a literary phenomenon: a best-selling writer, one whose work is a stunning fusion of jazz rhythms, film montage technique, and profoundly beautiful language. Although he is best known as a novelist, Ondaatje's work also encompasses memoir, poetry, and film, and reveals a passion for defying conventional form. In his landmark novel, *The English Patient* which was adopted into an Academy Award-winning film, he explores the history of people intersecting four diverse

lives at the end of World War II. Ondaatje, himself is an interesting intersection of cultures. Born in the former Ceylon of Dutch/Indian ancestry, he was raised in London, and is now a Canadian citizen. From the memoir of his childhood, *Running in the Family*, to his Governor-General's award-winning book of poetry, *There's a Trick With a Knife I'm Learning To Do*, to his classic novel, *The English Patient*, Michael Ondaatje casts a spell over his readers. And having won the British Commonwealth's highest honor - the Booker Prize - Ondaatje has taken his rightful place as a contemporary literary treasure.

He momentarily clutches his Asian heritage and spins it off into an excellent story. His imagination can encompass the maximum of ideas into a style.

Similarly, *The Wall Street Journal* commends Ondaatje as one of North America's finest novelists.

Ondaatje taught for many years at York University in Toronto, Canada. The author of ten collections of poetry including *Handwriting* (1999) and four books of fiction like *The English Patient*, *In the Skin of the Lion*, *Coming Through Slaughter* and *Anil's Ghost*, and his wife, Linda Spalding, live in Toronto and edit the literary journal, *Brick*. Michael Ondaatje explores the nature of love and betrayal in wartime in the *English Patient*. His fourth novel *Anil's Ghost* is also set during a war, but unlike in World War II, it is difficult to identify the enemy in the bloody sectarian upheaval that ripped Sri Lanka apart in the 1980s and '90s.

In the novel *Anil's Ghost*, the protagonist, Anil Tissera, a native Sri Lankan, leaves her homeland at 18 and returns to it 15 years later only as a part of an international human rights fact-finding mission. In the intervening years, she has become a forensic anthropologist--a career that has landed her in the killing fields of Central America,

digging up the victims of Guatemala's dirty war. Now she's come to Sri Lanka on a similar quest. Soon she, however, learns, there are fundamental differences between her previous assignment and this one:

The bodies turn up weekly now. The height of the terror was 'eighty-eight and 'eighty-nine, but of course it was going on long before that. Every side was killing and hiding the evidence. This is an unofficial war, no one wants to alienate the foreign powers. So it's secret gangs and squads. Not like Central America. The government was not the only one doing the killing.

(29)

In such a situation, it is difficult to know who to trust. Anil's colleague is Sarath Diyasena, a Sri Lankan archaeologist whose political affiliations, if any, are murky. Together they uncover evidence of a government-sponsored murder in the shape of a skeleton they nickname Sailor. But as Anil begins her investigation into the events surrounding Sailor's death, she finds herself caught in a web of politics, paranoia, and tragedy.

Like its predecessor, the novel explores that territory where the personal and the political intersect in the fulcrum of war. Its style, however, is more straightforward and less densely poetical. While many of Ondaatje's literary trademarks are present--frequent shifts in time, almost hallucinatory imagery, the gradual interweaving of characters' pasts with the present--the prose here is more accessible. This is not to say that the author has forgotten his poetic roots; subtle, evocative images abound. Consider, for example, this description of Anil at the end of the day, standing in a pool of water, her toes among the white petals, her arms folded as she undressed the day, removing layers of events and

incidents so they would no longer be within her. In *Anil's Ghost* Michael Ondaatje has crafted both a brutal examination of internecine warfare and an enduring meditation on identity, loyalty, and the unbreakable hold the past exerts over the present.

Though most of his literary career he developed in Canada, Sri Lanka born Ondaatje has chosen to set his powerful and resonant new novel in that country during its gruesome civil war in the mid-1980s. Written in his usual cryptic, elliptical style, much of the story is told in flashbacks, with Ondaatje hinting at secrets even as he divulges facts, revealing his characters' motivations through their desperate or passionate behavior and, most of all, conveying the essence of a people, a country and its history via individual stories etched against a background of natural beauty and human brutality. Anil Tissera, a 33-year-old native SriLankan who left her country 15 years ago, is a forensic pathologist sent by the U.N. human rights commission to investigate reports of mass murders on the island. Atrocities are being committed by three groups: the government, anti-government insurgents, and separatist guerrillas. Working secretly, these warring forces are decimating a population paralyzed by pervasive fear. Taciturn archeologist Sarath Diyasena is assigned by the government to be Anil's partner; at 49, he is emotionally withdrawn from the chaotic contemporary world, reserving his passion for the prehistoric shards of his profession. Together, Anil and Sarath discover that a skeleton interred among ancient bones in a government-protected sanctuary is that of a recently killed young man. Anil defiantly sets out to document this murder by identifying the victim and then making an official report. Throughout their combined forensic and archaeological investigation, detailed by Ondaatje with the meticulous accuracy, readers will remember from descriptions of the bomb sapper's procedures in *The English Patient*,

Sarath remains a mysterious figure to Anil. Her confusion about his motives is reinforced when she meets his brother, Gamini, an emergency room doctor who is as intimately involved in his country's turmoil as Sarath refuses to be. The lives of these characters, and of others in their orbits, emerge circuitously, layer by layer. In the end, Anil's moral indignation and her innocence place her in exquisite danger, and Sarath is moved to a life-defining sacrifice. Here the narrative, whose revelations have been building with a quiet ferocity, assumes the tension of a thriller, its chilling insights augmented by the visceral emotional effects that masterful literature can provide. More effective than a documentary, Ondaatje's novel satisfies one of the most exalted purposes of fiction: to illuminate the human condition through pity and terror.

The present research work discusses the burning issue i.e., interpreting terrorism and its hypothesis is that the interpretation of terrorism from Western Perspective in the Nonwestern setting is an irony. The West itself has perpetrated violence, terrorism, and barbarism on the Non Western domains in the name of justice and war against terrorism. It is hoped that the study will be of importance for the readers and researchers, who are looking for the issue of terrorism and its interpretations in the world, where the same issue has been a major contention to thrash out an all-embracing model of peace.

Chapter II

Sociology of Terrorism

Terrorism has been defined from various forms and dimensions. Due to its infinite limitations and double standards of defining terrorism, it has been beyond devising a policy and strategy for sorting out this problem which is getting obviously more problematic and catastrophic to human being.

The sociology of terrorism has been understudy, even though considerable literatures on various forms of social conflict and violence have been produced over the years. However, Austin T. Turk has studied about the social origins and dynamics of sociological studies of terrorism as (a) the social construction of terrorism, (b) terrorism as political violence, (c) terrorism as communication, (d) organizing terrorism, (e) socializing terrorists, (f) social control of terrorism, and (g) theorizing terrorism (275-78)

Political violence encompasses overt state sponsored or tolerated violence in all of 'William's senses, (coercion or the threat of it, bodily harm, etc). But may also include actions taken or not by the state or its agents with the express intent of realizing certain social, ethnic, economic, and political goals in the realm of public affairs, especially affairs of the state or even of social life in general. These may be or may not be direct violence. For example, ferocity between Hutus and Tutsi in Rwanda and Burundi between Tamils and Sinhalese Sri Lanka between Ladinos and indigenous peoples in Guatemala between Israelis and Palestinians in Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza Strip or among Croats, Serbs, and Muslims in the Balkans. Insofar as it is tolerated or encouraged by state in order to create, justify, excuse, explain, or enforce hierarchies of difference and relations of inequality, are acts of state violence, even though states

themselves may not appear on the surface to be primary agents. Moreover, the deliberate acts of agents of the state in , for example, the Soviet Union in the 1930s, which caused mass starvation in the countryside and similar economic or political deeds elsewhere in the world that result in widespread deaths and often huge numbers of political refugees also qualify as political violence, terror , even genocide (Nagengast 114).

Terrorism could be described as the policy of using acts inspiring great fear as a method of ruling or of conducting political opposition, and may include violence in all of its senses including torture or its threat. It is not so much the exploitation of the others as much as the mere consciousness of the possibility of domination. Clearly the same must be even truer of torture. Torture-the very term evokes images of a distant, less civilized past, or dark cellars, of both the tortured and torturers radically different from ourselves (Simmel qtd. in Nagengast 114). Nonetheless, torture perpetrated by states and their agents is commonplace, documented in scores of countries around the world. As for terror, academics, politicians, and popular pundits usually reserve the label for political opposition movements or figures, only rarely applying it to states violence and terror are highly politicized terms embraced and elaborated by victims and denied by perpetrators, especially if the perpetrator is a state. In fact, state leaders everywhere claim respect for universal human rights and deny that their acts constitute torture, violence, or terror, preferring to characterize them as necessary measures to ensure order and respect for the law. Nonetheless, the state is often the instigator of cycles of violent human rights abuses as it seeks to suppress change and prevent opposition movements from undermining its legitimacy.

Discussion and explanations of torture, other violence, and terrorism within state society center on the purported need of societies to modernize quickly at all costs, to coordinate knowledge with systems of social control, and to legitimate the rule of the state. Legitimacy is always a central concern in the sense that violence is only violence by definition if the perpetrators fail to establish the legitimacy of their acts against claims of others that are as illegitimate.

States as well as political opposition moments also take this instrumental view as justification for tactical preemption in which they gain advantage over opponents by forestalling with violent measures possible action by opponents or by taking revenge for acts completed. They present their actions as both unavoidable and necessary to prevent what would otherwise be inevitable and unavoidable deeds of their targets . For the most part, the public has learned to find such official measures justified, that is to say, legitimate by definition. But the public doesn't accept as readily the structurally similar acts of foreign nationals targeting civilian centers or vigilante justice of the sort meted out to the alleged sodomizer (Nagengast 116).

Analyzing terrorism and counter-terrorism within a framework of communication is another way of studying terrorism. This analytic framework views violence as a form of communication that interacts with other forms of social and political communication, whether by non-state actors or state actors. By looking at how terrorism and counter-terrorism fit into the wider context of social and political life, both at the national and the international level, the analyst can better understand how terrorism emerges from other social or political activity, how it can evolve into legal or nonviolent action, and how it can be but one tool in a political or social struggle that includes both violent and

nonviolent tactics. By including counter-terrorism and the array of control institutions used to battle terrorism and related phenomena, the model forces a degree of self-reflectivity and self-awareness upon the analyst, who must examine societal, state and international institutions and forms of social control alongside strategies and tactics of protest and political agitation. In a post-11 September world, this analytic task is all the more challenging.

Whether alternative descriptions and interpretations of terrorists and terrorism should be disseminated is a major issue in debates over counterterrorism policies. Reminiscent of the idea that collective violence (Food, riots, strikes, ethnic and racial classes, etc.) signals authorities that something is amiss, terrorism has been analyzed as communications through violence that problem exists (Schmid & deGraaf and Turk qtd. on Turk 275). The usual assumption is that peaceful methods of seeing the redress of grievances have failed, so that violence is left as the only way in which to force attention to the aggrieved.

Governmental and other organizational authorities are predisposed to minimize the risk of either public sympathy for terrorist or public fear of terrorism. Accordingly, the inclination in counterterrorism policymaking is to deny legitimacy to oppositional violence and to discourage the media from granting too public a voice to those who resort to or sympathize with terrorism. A complicating factor is that a satiation effect has been noted as a contributor to terrorism, in that acts of terrorism must be ever more horrendous in order to overcome the tendency for newsmakers and their publics to become inured to “ordinary” violence (Turk 275).

Most of what is known about terrorist organization is now outdated. Even distinction such as “ international” and “ domestic” terrorism are decreasingly meaningful because technological advances (electronic communications, transportations network) and corporate globalization facilitate more complex and flexible ways to organize terrorist activities, frequently involving cooperation among various “ international” and “domestic” parties.

The classic model of the terrorist organization is a tightly organized hierarchy comprised of small, insolated cells whose members have little if any knowledge of planning and organization above and outside their cell. They are disciplined by blend of social isolation from outsiders (especially family and former friends), blackmailed after crimes demonstrating their commitment, physical threat, and indoctrination without access to other sources of ideas and information. The aims of such organizations have historically been relatively simple: to overthrow an oppressive regime of system or to drive an alien force from their land. The financial resources needed to sustain terrorist organizations were obtained form donations by sympathizers and sometimes supplemented by criminal acts (e.g., kidnapping for ransom, bank robbery, or protection racketeering) (Turk 276).

As the last century ran its course, the motives and organization of terrorism became less simple and local. Nationalist and material concerns receded (though still significant in particular times and places, as in the Balkan conflict ignited by Serbian ethnic cleansing), while ideological, especially religious, and wider geopolitical concerns were in the ascendant (e.g., the India- Pakistan conflict over Kashmir). Most recently, religious fundamentalist has propelled the recruitment and organization of multitudes

into loose networks of terrorist groups acting more or less on their own with encouragement and logistical assistance from facilitators with resources (on the global level most notably Osama Bin Laden and al Qaeda, along with various Middle Eastern entities). Funds are increasingly provided by a wide range of legitimate business operations and donations to “independent” charitable organization, and channeled through legitimate financial institutions (Turk, 277).

The key to explaining the socialization of terrorists understands how specific individuals are brought to the point where they are themselves as bearers of the responsibility for violent actions. Education, training, socialization – deliberate or not – may encourage the development of a self –concept as one who must fight against the threat to “us.” However, little has been learned so far about how eventual terrorists are selected in the course of their political socialization. It is woefully unhelpful merely to point to religious schools as “factories” producing terrorist, or to assume that only the foolish or aberrant becomes terrorist, or to blame terrorists as evil souls or acclaim them as heroic fighters. Researchers have to be much more aware of the impact of media and political- ideological influences on the definition and characterization of terrorists if their life courses are to be understood (Turk 280).

Nationally and internationally, legal systems and procedures have been developed without anticipating the contingencies involved in dealing with modern terrorism for the first time in history, terrorists are gaining access to weapons of mass destruction. Credible threats of worldwide terrorist campaigns are now regular documented, attacks and attempts in various countries are frequently reported, and multination cooperation in countering terrorism is a growing reality. Political pressure to lessen legal restraints on

police, and military responses to terrorism have resulted in the, possibly temporary, erosion in the United States and elsewhere of legal protections against intrusive and secret surveillance, arbitrary detention, and hurtful interrogation methods, as well as assassination and extralegal executions.

When President George W Bush declared a war on terrorism immediately following the catastrophic attack of September 11, 2001, not only most Americans but also governments and millions of people throughout the world agreed that international terrorism had to be stopped. But it has become obvious that the devil is in the details. The extraordinary threat of modern terrorism has been mirrored by extraordinary counter measures. For example, the US government adopted two fateful policies. The first was the decision to dilute or abrogate established legal restraints on governmental power. The second was the decision to invade Iraq without United Nations legitimation (Turk, 280).

The decision to launch an essentially unilateral invasion of Iraq was a huge departure from generally and increasingly accepted (outside the United States) international norms for reviewing interstate grievances and providing for a collective (Security Council) decision authorizing military action against a sovereign government. The long effort to subject national sovereignties to international legal restrictions has surely been set back by globalization of terrorist and counterterrorist operations. With a war proclaimed, the militant option is being emphasized over the legal option in attempting to control terrorism (Smith et al and Turk qtd. in Turk 282)

As the world's superpower, the United States has weighed and accepted the political costs of ignoring the United Nations. Many international and American legalists, and other voices questioning the unilateral adoption of the military option. The prevailing

assumption is that the threat is beyond the control capacities of established legal systems and procedures. Regard for legalities has been subordinated to concerns with assessing levels of threat and with the demonstrated shortcoming of intelligence agencies in making and responding to such assessments. Numerous governments have joined the United States in expanding investigative and enforcement powers against terrorism, at the expenses of democratic governance and declining investments in public services. The politically dominant approach is to persuade the general public to accept the necessity of militarizing and delegating the efforts to counter terrorism. Post- invasion developments in Afghanistan and Iraq, and continuing attack in those countries and elsewhere, have led to increasingly acrimonious debates over effectiveness of investing so disproportionately in the military adoption. As long as the terrorism war rages, we should expect, given the history of political conflicts in wartime and periods of civil turmoil, that the military option will continue to be given priority over the legal option, and that expansion of legal powers will continue at some cost in civil liberties. The citizens of democratic societies are unlikely ever to see again the freedoms from governmental surveillance that existed in earlier times.

Even though control is the originating and arguably the central concept of sociology, a pervasive bias favoring theory-driven versus policy relevant inquiries has contributed to the dearth of explicitly sociological studies of terrorism. Still, what has been gleaned from sociological research on control offers many promising leads. For example, analyses of success and failures of counterrevolutionary strategies suggest that maintaining the will to repress oppositional violence maybe more effective than limited and erratic appeasement tactics. Alternatively, harsh repression without significant

concessions in the face of widespread grievances seems in the long run to lead to cataclysms instead of social stability. Studies considering these propositions together could pay dividends in generating predicatively useful theories bearing on policy decisions on when and how to use sticks and carrots. Too often such decisions depend mainly on ideological predilection instead of defensible theoretical predictions.

Developing a sociological explanation of terrorism is a politically and intellectually formidable task. Political obstacles abound: officials are inclined to be weary of outsiders with independent agendas and resources. Policymakers and control agencies prefer operational findings clearly applicable to targeting and neutralizing defined enemies. Funding priorities are affected by rivalries within and among intelligence and enforcement agencies, as well as competition for budgetary influences among politicians, lobbyist, and other interested parties such as grant applicants, whose concerns seldom include basic research. The organizational penchant of keeping records confidential is heightened in agencies charged with controlling terrorism. Such political constraints exacerbate the intellectual problems encountered in terrorism research.

Gurr is one of the first to have explicated methodological options in studying terrorism and indicated which kinds of research questions are appropriate to each method. Theoretically significant levels of analysis are posited: global, national, group, incident, and individual (Gurr and Turk qtd .in Turk 283)

The intellectually ambitious and stimulating research on terrorism from a world system perspective begins with the premise that the passage of time makes structural analysis more applicable than participant analysis. As time passes, the appropriate level of analysis moves from (a) the individual to (b) group and social movement, (c) nation

and state, (d) the present historical period, (e) a past historical analogy, and finally (F) longer historical cycles. At this ultimate level of analysis, terrorism is to be explained in terms of cyclical rhythms in which waves of terrorist activity are associated with cycles of political -economic deterioration and replacement by new forms of political order (Turk, 286).

Terrorism differs from ordinary crime in that it targets a population, applying a standard of collective liability for perceived violations of normative expectations. Efforts to control terrorism are made particularly difficult because the social distance between adversaries is extreme, precluding the shared normative understandings assumed in law, and because the quasi-warfare of terrorism tends to attract quasi-warfare in return. In so far as the demands of terrorists are beyond negotiation (e.g. that Americans radically change their way of life), and the quasi warfare of each side persists, success full control (sort of extermination) is improbable. Even though the casualties from terrorist violence may be shocking for a while, Black's prognosis is that the technological advances lessening social distance among people and cultures will ultimately destroy the polarities and collectivization of violence that generate and sustain terrorism. Its inevitable fate is sociological death.

Terrorism and Postcolonial perspective

After most of the nation got independence from the colonizer, they still had to grapple with the problem created by the ruler who had in many ways left over some hurdles to put the subordinated in the chain of hurdles, and impediments they had to fight over. In many ways though the rulers drew back , they still had underlying interest to still see them as the master of the depressed or oppressed land assuming their superiority

on all fronts, i.e., academics, politics, economic, civilization, and human development. Due to this, the colonizer or West or Eurocentric sowed the seed of scuffle, war, conflict, violation and aggression in the newly independent nations in the post colonial era. This, in long turn, again went in the hand of western power house to perform the role of their as mediator. However, the fact is that west itself is the bedrock of all the vicious war, conflicts, and violence.

West and USA are now launching a war against terror. They suppose that it is their burden to make the world a terror free zone, are also the product of same clashes, violence, and civil wars which the countries have already witnessed and transgressed apparently but indeed only the forms have been changed and the tendency is still the construction of binaries, hierarchy, masculinity versus feminism, East versus West, center versus margin, WE are god, THEY are evil- which West always takes for granted that it is always right to justify and assimilate its model or view on the others though it clearly undermines and dehumanizes the others. And if there is reactions, defense or uproar against such forms of dominations, the West tends to brand the others as either terrorist, threat to world peace or uncivilized (Mitchell, 568).

Despite independence, the colonized countries have so many problems to face, identities to create on different and to unfasten riddles as the cost of Western Hawkish attitude. As a result, the surge of violence, protest and disgruntling kept on surfacing.

Besides, the perspective of postcolonial conflicts keeps on covering all the phenomena including political, economic, cultural and intellectual debates regardless of particular time and space all are considered under colonial and postcolonial prism. On the

basis of this assumption, all the violence, political polarism , conflicts can be discussed as post colonial perspective of terror and terrorism.

Since few decades back until recently terrorism has gotten a huge deliberation that is sometimes in the name of defending or advocating fundamental religious culture and sometimes identity and sometimes sovereignty of particular people.

As far as terrorism in the postcolonial scenario and its dual definition and War on Terror which USA has launched especially after 11 September 2001, are concerned concern, they have gained unprecedented coverage and ironical purview, they have led the world communities more vulnerable to violence and terrorist attack. In this connection, interpreting terrorism and combating it is a mere irony. It seems that now the USA views the Arabs and Islam as islamofascism and as opposed to Christianity or crusades. It appears more like a clash of fundamentalist branding Muslims extremist of being violent prone to terrorism and American or the Westerns to as the one to subdue the rest of the Arabs.

In this connection, citing and critically evaluating the terrorist attack by Al Qaeda on Washington would be more relevant.

The terrorist attacks on Washington and New York on 11 September 2001 makes it very difficult to get any clear, distinct or compelling message through. It has obviously given plenty of ways to the discourses about terrorism and counter terrorism. Only the simplest messages generally conveyed by images, have any hope of making an impact. It is a moment when words are overwhelmed by pictures, when critical discourses and reasoned inquiry is drowned in a flood of rhetorical figures-and stark oppositions: Good versus Evil, God versus Satan, US versus Them, Civilization versus Barbarism- all the

stereotypes and icons required to motivate Holy Wars, Crusades, Jihads, Armageddon, and Apocalypse (Mitchell, 570).

In the similar light, war against terror and Critical inquiry in it will not be silent in the midst of a crisis that challenge every capacity of judgment, analysis, and critique
Writes W.J. Mitchell in *Criticism and Crisis*:

As always, however our voice will not be univocal, but dialectical and dialogic, a staging of what William Black called “ Mental Warfare”- a reflection on an antidote to the “ Corporal Warfare” that threatens to sweep across the world. This is, as everybody seems to agree, a war without limits, boundaries, or clear goals. It is not adequately described as a war against terrorism since every side regards its antagonists as the true terrorist and it’s won warrior as martyrs and heroes. (570)

And at this point the number of sides has not even become clear, as the US attempts to hold together a shifting, unstable alliance of momentary convenience to support the war whose aims are to take revenge, the imposition of Texas Justice, the killing of one man, the rooting out of terrorist organization that circulates like a virus throughout the entire the world system, the building of a stable nation -state in Afghanistan, are likely to become less clear as time goes on.

In the response or at the light of September 11, 2001 attack, W.J.T. Mitchell in *Criticism and Crisis* writes:

Whatever else you might say about them, the suicide bombers who flew commercial airlines into the world trade towers and the Pentagon were not cowardly- that the event of 11 September was Lucifer’s greatest work of

art. - that this was God's Judgments on American's turn toward secular values.- that this was God's judgments on the Christian and Jewish infidels who have desecrated the sacred Soil of Saudi Arabia. (570)

Similarly, drawing some similarities he adds that America killed thousands of Iraqis, and supported the repressive policy of Israel towards the Palestinians.-that this was payback time for a half a century of American world dominance and specifically its misguided policy in the Middle East, its backing of repressive, reactionary Arab regimes as a part of policy of cold war containment and greed for cheap oil.- that this is a war we could lose, perhaps are losing already, and will certainly lose if we sacrifice civil liberties, the rule of law, and political or critical deliberation to a never ending state of emergency. – that this is the systematic result of global capitalism, and could well be the oft predicated end of history , the true face of the New World Order, the mother of all battles, Armageddon, Holy War, and the beginning of the collapse of human civilization.-that there are no innocent Victims on either side of a terrorist war that lives of the people being killed in Afghanistan right now are just as sacred as the lives of those killed on 11 September , and that wrapping oneself in the mantle of their innocence is just as misguided as consigning one's antagonists to the role of Evil doers. (571)

These assumptions of terrorist attacks and so called proclamation of war on terror, therefore, help to prove the interpretation of terrorism from western perspective and the war on terror itself is another form of the licensed terrorism.

Terrorism is neither recent nor uncommon. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Russian revolutionaries targeted numbers of autocratic Tsarist government, and radical nationalists- Irish, Serbs, Armenians, and others –used terrorism repeatedly. After

World War II terrorism often has been associated with national and ethnic minorities and has been part of broader, more conventional and nonviolent nationalist movement.

Terrorism has also long been associated with religious and class conflicts and with social justice, and ideological issues. And current fear about weapons of mass destruction in the hands of terrorist actually goes back to three decades (Mitchell, 568).

Overall, West tends to look especially those postcolonial countries or the countries, who are governed by their own policies which the people of the particular countries like yet disapproving Western concept of public liberties and democratic values, are either branded as terrorists even if the countries are defending their fundamental , religious, cultural, ethnic and traditional cult.

Terrorism and Postmodernism

Terrorism in the postmodern time is quite different. It is random, indiscriminate and asystematic. It is more individuals or marking in very small groups. An individual may possess the technical competence to manufacture the weapons: he/she needs for terrorist purpose. When the terrorists work alone or are in very small groups, it becomes more difficult to detect who the enemy is. As Ondaatje says in *Anil's Ghost* "There was no such gesture to the families of the dead, not even the information of who the enemy was" (11). Postmodernism is the time of lone terrorism. The society or any state has become vulnerable to a new kind of terrorism. The advanced societies of today are more dependent everyday on the electronic storage, banking, trade, transportation, and scientific work. Such material things are made the target of terrorists. With the development of new theories, technologies and the changed nature of the world:

postmodern terrorism, their approach, motivation and aims have also changed at the same time.

The question of what terrorism is has many meanings for policy-makers or public. There is not agreed definition of terrorism. The subject of terrorism has connotations of danger about it. The term has actually become an insult. Defining a person or groups or nations as terrorist implies a moral judgment, which has led to the greatest problem of definition. Many have used terrorism and claimed to be fighting in the name of freedom.

The debate on the definition of terrorism has been whether the groups ate themselves freedom fighters or terrorists. The weak argues the strong always condemn them as terrorist and they also condemn the states they are fighting as terrorist in their suppression of the innocent.

The Oxford Dictionary defines terrorism as " The use of violence for political aims or to force a government to act, esp. because of the fear it cause among the people". The US state Department's definition about terrorism is, " premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated again non-combatant targets by sub national groups or clandestine agents usually intended to influence an audience". The British government formulates the definition of terrorism as, " The use of violence for political ends including any of violence for the purpose of putting the public or any reaction of the public in fear".

Wealth and Poole in their *Dictionary of Criminology* defines, "Terrorism is a mode of violence involving the systematic use of threatened use or threatened use of murder, injury and destruction to immediate or shock to target group wider then the immediate victims or to create a climate of terror".

The original use of term “terrorist” in English can be traced back to French Revolution. Edmund Burke has defined the term “terrorist” in 1795, commenting on the regime of terror of Maximilien Robespierre and the Committee of public Safety in France (Gearson 14).

The history of terrorism has appeared in many guises. Scanning the postmodern situation, today society faces not single form of terrorism but multiple forms of terrorism. Now the terrorism has become transnational in its characteristics. Terrorism is not only militants’ strategy. It has become individual working in very small groups due to the theoretical as well as technological impact of postmodernism and post capitalistic society respectively. Over the last two or three decades, individuals have become consciously or unconsciously involved in global network of communication. The significant changes have taken place in transportation and communication, which has made cultural interaction possible, and people are affected by the global flow of information. The worldwide change in theoretical as well as technological has brought changes in perception and mood.

During the 1950s and 1960s, the world has seen much dissatisfaction. Due to these consequences, they have formed many organizations in order to boost political establishment. At the same time, various anti-establishment organizations have been formed. And they have exploited this international agreement concerning the legitimacy of terrorism. In short, transnational terrorist groups have increased significantly in the postmodern time. In this situation, no one can determine with confidence where, when, why or against whom their next attack may be launched. The situation is identical as Michael Ondaatje mentions in his Novel *Anil’s Ghosts* "Yet the darkest Greek tragedies

were innocent compared with what was happening here” (11). The terrorism has become worldwide. There is the absence of significant international restraints in their activities. It may be one cause that many t terrorists groups facilitated their operational capability. Neither the UN nor an individual state is able to restraint this new nature of terrorist activities or attacks. Hence, terrorism is not the problem of an individual or a state: it has become a worldwide problem.

The nature of terrorism has shifted in number of ways in postmodern time. In the past, terrorism was meant only as military strategy. It has changed according to geography and culture. It has sometimes been a tool for revolutionaries and nationalists. So it was an instrument of state power exercised by a revolutionary state. That is to say, terrorism in the past was organized, deliberate and systematic form, as have civil wars, revolutionary wars, wars of national liberation etc. Terrorists were either nationalist or anarchist or extremists of the left and the right.

Terrorism in the postmodern time is quite different. It is random, indiscriminate and asystematic. It is more individual or marking in very small groups. An individual may possess the technical competence to manufacture the weapons he/she needs for terrorist purpose. When the terrorists work alone or are in very small groups, it becomes more difficult to detect who the enemy is. The society or any state has become vulnerable to a new kind of terrorism. The advanced societies of today are more dependent everyday on the electronic storage, banking, trade, transportation, and scientific work. Such material things are made the target of terrorists. With the development of new theories, technologies and the changed nature of the world: postmodern terrorism, their approach, motivation and aims have also changed at the same time.

Monument of Civilization

Indeed if we go through the history and chronology, we come across a bloody account of warfare, conflict, and civil strife behind the progress and advancement of the nation which now suppose that they are the super power or the civilized nations, and take for granted that if the rest of the countries and civilizations are different from their way of perception which grossly bypasses the bitter past and present, tend to make the rest to be just like them or to be civilized as West definition, looks ironical.

In the same way, as far as the history of victor ruler who now appears the best and the civilized is the product of once a vicious barbarism or we could say that they were the radish of the barber dam, history has glorified them at an unprecedented place though. While doing so historians have brushed aside all their vices and brutalities at bay. Just like history is the document of the victor dehumanizing the ousted or less powerful and even though they were seasoned in their policies and jurisdiction. History was censored by power, truth was determined by power as what Foucault says, “Power Determines the Truth” (157), the same way, now who assumes themselves as civilized or who talk about civil liberties and want the rest the world to be the same, especially the Western grand Narrative, is obviously the bi product of cruelties. It is generally when the victors appear in the helm of rule, the losers are given different bad wills and the victors are appreciated with all devotions.

Walter Benjamin in his essay “Theses on the Philosophy of History,” writes:

Whoever has emerged victorious participates to this day in the triumphal procession in which the present rulers step over those who are lying prostrate.” He also adds that “there is no document of civilization which is

not at the same time document of barbarism. And just as such a document is not free of barbarism; barbarism taints also the manner in which it was transmitted from one owner to another. (253)

In the same connection, the fourth chapter makes the textual analysis so as to find out how the interpretation of terrorism from the Western perspective is now a political irony in *Anil's Ghost*.

Chapter III

Anil's Representation as Carrier of Western Truth

The central question in the *Anil's Ghost* concerns with the issue of truth and perception of it, especially public truth verses private truth. The central character of the novel, Anil, represents the Western sense of holding truth above anything else. Anil Tissera, 33 years old forensic anthropologist returns to her native country Sri Lanka to investigate possible human rights violations. She has left the country at 18 to be educated in England and America. In this sense, she does not belong to Sri Lanka though other critics have tended to comment her returning as her quest for identity. Her Western training has given her both attitude and desire for discovering western sense of truth. Ondaatje describes her in the following ways:

In her years abroad, during her European and North American education, Anil had courted foreignness, was at ease whether on the Bakererloo line or the highways around Santa Fe. She felt completed abroad. Even now her brain held the area codes of Denver and Portland. (54)

Anil now, arrives in Sri Lanka, as a formal Western, bearing "a British passport" to signal her new national affiliation. She has worked under the auspices of the United Nations. Anil says to Sarath, " Mr Diyasena, I'd like to remind you that I came here as a part of a human rights group, as a forensic specialist. I do not work you. I am not hired by you: I work for an international authority" (274).

Anil is teamed up with a local Sri-Lankan archeologist, 49 years old Sarath. They work together in order to determine whether or not a recent skeleton can provide evidence that the Sri-Lankan government has been systematically killing its own people

in the campaign of murder. Their investigation begins. Who was the skeleton they call Sailor? Who tried to burn his bones? Who is responsible for the terror? Who killed Sailor? Anil and Sarath drive to the south and hire a miner named Ananda to reconstruct the skeleton's head, so the victim can be identified. Though they (Anil and Sarath) work together, the struggles over their philosophy are played out in a drama as two protagonists. The narrative of justice is fought among them.

Anil stands in novels as "Western Hero." She now arrives in Sri Lanka as a formal westerner. Her mission is a simple one charged with the authority of the UN's office of the high commission for human rights. Her job is to investigate the complaints of government-sponsored murder. Complaints have been done by Amnesty International and other civil rights groups on behalf of Sri Lanka.

Anil represents the Western dominant version of civil and political rights. So the novel *Anil's Ghost* extends the discussion about the United Nations' Universal mandate on human rights. The United Nations' approach seems exactly how Anil intrudes in the internal affairs of Sri Lanka. The idea of "truth" or "universal justice", which UN holds of human right violation, is both "discoverable" and at the same time "desirable". By this approach, we cannot say International Human Rights Commission (IHRC) works freely. Certainly, it takes sides. Such investigation occurs without a proper contextual understanding of the domestic situation. Human rights organizations like these often impose Western philosophies of justice on non-western settings. *Anil's Ghost* exposes the politics at work behind the function of the United Nations or such institutions. It is like Michael Ignatieff's assertion that "human rights is nothing other than a politics, on that must reconcile moral ends to current situation and must be prepared to make painful

compromises not only between means and ends themselves” (21-22). Anil’s mission in Sri Lanka is to investigate state sponsored murders. When she and Sarath find a new body buried among the excavations of sixth – century archeological preserver. She expresses her desire to blame the state, in her words:" This is a recent skeleton. We can prove this, don’t you see? This is an opportunity, it’s traceable. We found him in a place where only a government official could get into" (52). On the contrary, Sarath is aware of the fact that such political charging could cost their lives. Anil believes in "truth". At any cost, she wants to prove the skeleton as recent one. This statement gives her search for objective truth:

She began to examine the skeleton again under sulphur light, summarizing the facts of his death so far, the permanent truths, same for Colombo as for Troy. One forearm broken partial burning, vertebrae damage in the neck.

The possibility of small bullet wounds in the skull entrance and exit.

(65)

Finally Anil and Sarath successfully investigate sailor's name, profession, and date of abduction. But their teamwork falls apart as they have different philosophy. Anil's distrust of Sarath's political motives leads her to take matters into her own hands. She rushes to Colombo to present their evidence to a group of military and police personnel. During the hearing, Anil is confronted by a hostile Sarath. He interrogates her from his position in the audience because he is able to see what she can't. Sarath knows that the government will not tolerate any expression of illegal activities. Sarath discredits her as well as the entire investigation in order to save her life. Sarath has seen such happening

before in another case where civilians have tried to expose the government's illegal activities. For example, the warden of an orphanage who reported cases of annihilation was jailed. A human rights lawyer has shot and the body removed by army personnel (42). Towards the end of the novel Sarath is killed for his part in the investigation, while Anil has escaped the country but the narrative of *Anil's Ghost* moves forward.

Just as critics call into question the "Universality" and "Objectivity" of a system of international law that is founded in Western philosophies and Western capitalism, *Anil's Ghost* invites us to question the grand narrative or brand of justice as offered to the people of Sri Lanka by a Western dominant institutions. Such institutions control the narrative of justice in the name of human rights violations and terrorism.

Anil's representation or her investigation is just to create the truth about Sri Lanka. The following excerpt serves the comment on the independent act of human rights:

American movies, English books-remember how they all end?' Gemini asked that night. "The American or the Englishman gets on a plain and leaves. That's it. The camera leaves with him. He looks out of the window at Mombasa or Vietnam or Jakarta, someplace now he can look at through the clouds. The tried hero. A couple of words to the girl beside him. He is going home. So, the war, to all- purposes is over. That's enough reality for the west .It's probably the history of the last two hundred years of Western political writing. Go to home, write a book hit the circuit. (285-86)

It is clear that the kind the of stories we tell our stories matter than the other tells our stories. This fact is made clear by above excerpt where Gemini makes us understand

that the story will ultimately tell about the "truth" of Sri Lanka is a western story. As Lyotard in *Postmodern Condition* urges us to "wage a war on totality" (83). The tired western hero "who gets on a plane and leaves "will escape back to the West. Her accounts of Sri Lanka will reflect "enough reality" for west. Her accounts become the truth for them as an objective truth. They have distorted the reality for "the last two hundreds years" (35). That the "truths" Anil will take back ultimately serves the political interest of human rights and capitalistic society of the West. The information Anil bears might be used to write a book and hit the circuit. The statement "hit the circuit" implies the capitalist interest or mission after all. The novel insists the statement throughout that the reason for war was war. It offers us to think why the two major ethnic groups of Sri Lanka are involved in political dispute that involves daily disappearance, torture, fears and terror. We are made to think that the justice decided by the West is meant to serve the West. So the Western legal practice or justice is shaped in order to economical liberalization Sarath states:

Every side was killing and hiding the evidence ...the government was not the only one doing the killing. You had and still have three camps of enemies- one in the north, two in the south using weapons, propaganda, fear, and sophisticated poster censorship. Importing state of the art weapons from the west. (17)

The war in Sri Lanka has taken place only for war sake not for political solution.

Ondaatje stress:

It was a Hundred Years' war with modern weaponry, and backers on the sidelines in safe countries, a war sponsored by gun and drug runners. It

became evident that political enemies were secretly joined in financial arms deals. (43)

Ondaatje frames his text with the suggestion that justice for the SriLankan people may not be obtained through the human rights mandate that is governed by cultural outsiders.

The justice is not eternal and universal but it is a culturally and historically constructed. Furthermore, Anil's introduction to the horror of SriLankan civil war is only the first of many incidents. Throughout the novel we come to know many atrocities. Sarath's wife confronts with incident when she makes her way to the village school. The narrator describe the atrocities in this manner:

She is about ten yards from the bridge when she sees the heads of the two students on stakes, on either side of the bridge, facing each other.

Seventeen, eighteen, nineteen years old ... she does not know or care.

She sees the two more heads on the far side of the bridge and can tell even from here that she recognizes one of them. (174-75)

Similar atrocities we hear that the teacher herself and forty -six of her students are picked up in the school yard by trucks with no license plate. Many atrocities have been committed by several people and groups in Sri Lanka. Sarath informs Anil about these atrocities in the pages below:

We have seen so many heads stuck on poles here, these last few years. It was at its worst a couple years ago. You'd see them in the early mornings, There was only one thing worse. That was when a family member simply disappeared and there was no sighting or evidence of his existence or his death. (184)

Ondaatje also reinforces this idea in these words:

In a fearful nation, public sorrow was stamped down by the climate of uncertainty. If a father protested a son's death, it was feared another family member would be killed...this was the scarring psychosis in the country.
(56)

So, every group and everybody are involved in violation and terrorism. But Anil's investigation is directed to find evidence of government's wrongdoing; every one and everything is nearly wrong, not only the government. Anil appears to be more objective. She is convinced of her own political impartiality. She says, " we are an independent organization, we make independent report" (274). Anil's mission is focused on creating truth – about a specific kind of atrocity and to charge government in any way. On the contrary, Sarath is not convinced. The truth Anil sees becomes partial and subjective to . Sarath. Sarath puts his argument Against Anil's truth in this manner:

The bodies turn up weekly now. The height of the terror was, eighty-eight and eighty – nine, but of course it was going on long before that. Every side was killing and hiding the evidence. *Every side.....*The government was not the only one doing the killing. You had, and will have; there is no hope of affixing blame.... What we've got here is unknown extrajudicial execution mostly, perhaps by the insurgents, or by the government or the guerrilla separatists. Murders committed by all sides. (18)

Sarath points out that everyone has blood on her hands in SriLanka, not just the government. The truth of SriLanka may be far more complicated than Anil's investigation. Ondaatje says that if murder is committed by all sides then Anil's finding

of government sponsor murder has no value. The question of whether or not truth is discoverable is asked throughout the novel. Anil's search for truth in Sri-Lanka is somewhat troubling as many characters point out. Gamini for example, warns Anil that when it comes to Sri Lanka's civil war, "Nobody's perfect; Nobody's right" (132). Even the epigraphist Palipana shares similar view. That he argues to Anil, "These were nothing to believe in with certainty. They still didn't know what the truth was; we have never had the truth. Not even with your work on bones... most of the time in our word, truth is just opinion" (102).

Palipana's view is that the truth cannot be known because truth is just opinion. The fact, the novel suggests that the domestic and political situation of Sri-Lanka is not easy to know as Anil does with knowing the proper situation of Sri-Lanka. So Sarath instructs to Anil:

I want you to understand the archeological surround of a fact. Or you will be like one of these journalists who file reports about flies and scabs while staying at the Galle face Hotel. That false empathy and blame... That's how we get in the West. (44)

Sarath again and again tries to understand the complex nature of truth. Sarath insists in another moment that it was another world with its own value system. He explains this complexity to Anil in the pages below:

Things were so bad in Sri Lanka that the Sri-Lankan government was obliged to adopt the illegal murder of civilian to control the bloodshed: the law (was) abandoned by everyone... we would not survived with your rules of Westminster. (154)

Here, Ondaatje questions the apolitical nature of international sponsored human rights investigation. By presenting forensic science in the identification of the sailor, U.S. or the West creates the "truth" that seems beyond history, culture and politics. Anil, by doing so, wants to create "permanent truth", truths that hold no political bias.

In the novel, the forensic truth about sailor's death is parallel to a political truth about Sri Lanka's human rights record. Even Anil cannot tell the difference. Anil emphasizes, you're an archeologist. Truth comes finally to the light. It is in the bones and sediment (259). In these lines, Anil is no longer talking about the truth of sailor's death rather she is talking about the truth of the broader situation. But Sarath offers an alternative perspective by saying, "Truth is in character and nuance and mood" (259). But this fact is denied by Anil. She says, "That is what governs us in our lives [But] that is not the truth" (259).

The UN, by depending on the objectivity of science or launching scientific strategies and practices conceals the political nature of its work. It has been even in the case of Sri Lanka. As the novel tells us, the president of Sri Lanka only approved of Anil's visit in an attempt to placate trading partners in the West. This statement says that why the Sri-Lankan government has taken the interest in civil rights. It is clear that Sri Lanka is involved in business with West. So he has allowed to human right to investigate its people. SriLankan civil war is big business to the West. Because those Western states have been capitalized on the production of the weapon. There is the conflict in Sri-Lanka due to Western trade. As Ondaatje writes It was a Hundred Year's war with modern weaponry... political enemies were secretly joined in financial arms deals.

This is way, Anil represents as western hero. In any sort of involvement in the Sri Lankan human rights violation, she appears to deliver a new brand of justice. The brand of Anil's justice is not separate from global politics. She has not any mission to act in the best of the Sri Lankan people.

Sarath as Non Westerner

In this novel Anil and Sarath stand as contrasting character within the same parameter. The tension on how West views truth and its treatment form its own perspective which Anil carries and how Sarath opposes the Western version of truth and its justice stands as an irony of the Western mission. To further clarify this point Ondaatje writes about Sarath:

“Sarath knew that for Anil the journey was getting to the truth. But what would the truth bring them into? It was flame against a sleeping lake of petrol. Sarath had seen the truth broken into suitable pieces and used by foreign press alongside irrelevant photographs. A flippant gesture towards Asia that might lead, as a result of this information to new vengeance and slaughter. There were dangers in hiding truth to an unsafe city around you. As an archeologist Sarath believed in truth as a principle. That is, he would have given his life for the truth if the truth were of any use” (156-57).

From this statement, Sarath clarifies that truth to that is from the Anil's perspective under the current Circumstance which is obviously different from that of how Anil's perception is shaped “is of no use”. For him objective truth can not be translated to social and political situation unproblematic. He adds that the truth at the wrong time can be dangerous and Anil's revelation of “truth” about the Sri Lankan government proves itself to be careless gesture.

Sarah is one of the competitive protagonists of the novel. He is 49 years old, a local Sri Lankan archaeologist, works with Anil to help her find out the truth. He finally challenges Anil. Though Ondaatje does not take any sides, at the end of the novel, it turns out that Sarah is at least partly right. He doesn't believe in Anil where her perspective is colored by the typical justice agenda of the West. In the urge of Anil to believe in "truth", Sarah replies her, "I believe in a society that has peace, Miss Tissera what you are proposing could result in chaos. Why do you not investigate the killing of government officers?" (275).

Anil never accepts that the idea of truth at wrong time becomes more dangerous and it is like a flame against sleeping lake of petrol. That is why she boldly announces the murder of sailor in the gathering of Sri Lankan officials towards the end of the novel. On the days or hours of her announcement civil violence occurs, which takes Sarah's life. This incident shows that the search for truth about global human right violation leads to at least one more killing. It obviously illustrates and ironizes Western interpretation of terrorism branding others as becoming terrorist and themselves as one to make the world terror free. Also, it clarifies how West in the name of investigating and probing human rights violation, is violating and sparking terrorism in the non western countries.

Western Universalism and Irony

Anil, been a female, has been attributed with male's name. From the very onset Anil's created identity has been ironical. In Non Western context the name Anil generally refers to male rather than female. She is one of the competitive Sri Lankan born protagonists living in the West and a created personality to advocate just what she is designated rather than to use her discretion independently with regards to truth, justice

and probing of human rights violation and terrorism. She is a forensic anthropologist who has spent the last fifteen years in Britain and America. As a UN human rights investigator, she is permitted to return to her homeland for seven weeks. Now she has a British passport. And the UN International Human Rights commission (IHRC), has chosen Anil to investigate, explore and expose violence and make a report about the human rights violation. Years of medical school in Britain and Western training have turned into a person, who identifies herself more with west. She has come in Sri Lanka with mission. Her mission is to create truth. In this sense, she is a Westernized outsider.

Since Anil is a forensic anthropologist belonging to UN human rights commission, it is better to know the task of forensic anthropologist in association with United Nations. The major aim of United Nation is to create universal law or the universal truth and internationally protected code of human rights, on which all nations can subscribe and to which all people can aspire. Thus, Anil uses scientific technique of investigation. She exhumes the skeleton from the unmarked graveyard and comes to conclusion that the government personnel killed *Sailor*. She finds it in the place where only the government officials could have access. For her, truth is discoverable and her permanent truths that hold no political bias: she argues that the permanent truths are same for Colombo as for Troy "(65). Anil looks for permanent truths in the chemical traces that survive in bones. But her competitive protagonist Sarath insists that truth is inseparable from life. Forensic experts like Anil, conduct the exhumation in the appropriate scientific manners. Forensic experts analyze the skeleton remains to examine the physical characteristics of the victim, together with the cause, manner, time and place of death with a view to asserting the victim's identity. In doing so, they use techniques of

pathology, ontology, radiology, etc. Anthropological studies may be undertaken to determine the skeleton age at death, sex, and race. Like all forensic experts, Anil follows all techniques to discover the truth guided by the west.

The novel successfully avoids the western narrative, which needs the univocal truth by showing the vanishing of western hero. Anil, as a western hero, never makes symbolic departure from Sri Lanka. We never learn of her possible fate and what comes out of her report, which she delivers in Geneva.

Finally she faces different problems in carrying out her mission because of the unhelpful tendency of government officials. Army and police officers humiliate her at the day of presentation of her report about her mission or investigation.

Ondaatje suggests that the solution of Sri Lankan crisis is not based on politically charged motives of a western – based human rights discourse rather than the human compassion that touches person to person. Even after the collapse of Anil's mission, the narrative of *Anil's Ghost* moves further. The reader at the last witnesses two random events. The event involves the assassination of the president of Sri Lanka. The second event occurs away from violence of Colombo, which involves the reconstruction of an immense statue of Buddha that was destroyed in bombing. The second event comes with the promise of peace and reconstruction.

By showing the importance of human to human compassion in the resolution of this internal conflict of Sri Lanka, Ondaatje ironizes the intervention of Western mission in Non- Western countries. Ondaatje suggests that though the UN has made significant progress in promoting social justice world wide, its role in those efforts has not been an entirely neutral and independent one. Like the Western states from which it derives the

authority, the UN necessarily takes sides, and promotes political, cultural and economic agendas in Nonwestern countries.

Chapter IV

Conclusion

Anil's Ghost, as a fictional work, is subtle and very vibrant presentation of violence and terrorism in Western reading as irony in cotemporary Sri Lanka and the Non West World in the post modern era. Michael Ondaatje very powerfully depicts the contemporary terrorism, violence and ethnic strife in Sri Lanka. Besides, it is an interpretation of Western universalism and truth in Non Western setting in itself as an irony.

Though the novel tries to depict how the island was entangled in internal strife, its assumption is largely that how postcolonial or Postmodern scenario of many counties like Sri Lanka and others who got independence from the colonial rule, still suffer from the Western Power influence to determine their universal justice system which is solely advocated by Western narrative. Nevertheless, the application of the Western grand Narrative to Nonwestern setting, as Michael Ondaatje problematizes, fails to uncover truth.

In *Anil's Ghost*, Ondaatje deliberately intends to defy the Western Universalism and UN's mandate in different ways to ironize the Westerner's interpretation of terrorism and human rights with regards to nonwestern setting.

Firstly, the narrative structure of the novel has focused ahistorical, unofficial version of truth. The frequent rapture in linear temporality transcends its historical location of Sri-Lanka. As a post modern novel, *Anil's Ghost* does not offer any political solution of the Western mission to solve the Sri Lankan conflict. Neither Anil, the protagonist the Western back representative of UN, nor West can find out the true

interpretation and solution of terrorism and human right, violation mainly for it is obsessed with only Westerners perspective because it inherits underneath the terror and violence. It is how Ondaatje attempts to interpret terrorism from Western Perspective as irony.

As mentioned earlier the sole purpose of the present study is to find out how terrorism is interpreted from West and how it tends to view the rest of the World and how it takes itself of being the patron of civilization, is itself an irony. The research has examined the novel from the perspective of irony in the sense that the Western notion of terrorism and barbarism which until now in one or another way Westerners are tainted with their underlying structure, and which once they had blatantly exercised to have their influence or dominance over the rest, Sri Lankan soil, in the context of postmodern era, is an irony that Westerners do not realize whereas the same precedence is being applied to them and they are ensnared in a trap of indecision and failure just like Anil's mission to uncover the truth collapses in the novel.

Anil's mission to discover the truth or to interpret terrorism in the conflict torn country, from the Western brand of justice is therefore denied by Ondaatje in the Non Western setting by problematizing the procedures and methods of reading and presenting the fact from Western blueprint of justice disregarding the socio political facts of particular setting is mainly to deny the interpretation of West to Non West is Irony.

Moreover, by disregarding grand narrative, Ondaatje has attempted to show his disregards to the logocentric justice to marginal. Ondaatje, to some extent, seems neutral as he takes neither sides or as he is nonaligned to the warring groups and the mission, could mainly be to mean the problem. Terrorism in the postmodern time has been quite

arbitrary and ambiguous. It is random, indiscriminate and asystematic. In the novel *Anil's Ghost* Ondaatje has problematized the case to show the irony of truth as unattainable by Anil's mission.

Especially, in the postcolonial or postmodern nature of terrorism the enemy is complex to track down. From the same token, wars and conflicts in this time are unidentifiable and even to read and thrash out solution at such juncture by UN system is under question and Anil's attempt to read the case is an irony. The particular neutrality of Ondaatje hints to what is implied by "responsible" and what is "non-responsible" with regard to the politics of another country that can be determined through the Western perspective, again by the West, which itself is a bedrock of barbarism and ghastly byproduct of terrorism, looks as an irony.

In the postmodern time, identity, dimensions and nature of terrorism are unidentifiable as it prevails randomly causing difficulty to interpret. For the same, Ondaatje has implied the rapture of narrative style and failure of the Western hero to its mission indicating how West's interpretation of terrorism is a complete failure.

The tool sociology of terrorism and Monument of Civilization used in this present research is to show the West itself is also the product of barbarism, and it, in one or another ways, assumes terrorism behind its brand of justice. And the UN being the representative of Western Powerhouse, which In *Anil's Ghost*, Anil Tissera represents as Western unitary notion of truth, gets ruptured and problematized as she lacks the real discovery of truth which is acceptable to a global ideology of justice.

Ondaatje has compared Anil and Sarath as two different characters at the same reading. Anil is a representative of West whereas Sarath is presented as what West can

not see about the rest, has finally tension on agreeing on common ground. Here, Anil's mission is to bring the Sri Lankan government to justice as it is one of the perpetrators of human rights violation on the basis of the evidence Anil found in one of the only government accessed archaeological sites, from the typical justice agenda of West. Therefore, her mission looks insignificant or more or less irrelevant as Sarath points out that truth under the circumstance "is of no use," signifies interpretation of terrorism or violation of human right from Western eyes. Anil or UN does not have significance as the representative is incapable of finding an all encompassing and all inclusive truth and interpretation of justice. Besides, the West in itself is the archetype of terror, in barbarism and massive violator of civil liberties, human rights in the interest of imposing its perspective on other causing others terrors and intimidations in the hoodwinking of UN global Justice. This is the crux of my study in the *Anil's Ghost*.

The postmodern concept of "Truth" and "Justice" is not universal rather it is relative. The novel is denial of universal truth which the West or the UN is trying to impose upon the others. In the novel, Ondaatje, by defying Western narrative, has tried to ironize Western historical account filled with "false empathy and claim". We do not find a proper historical ending of Novel and Anil's exit.

In *Anil's Ghost* Ondaatje tries to show how West, in the name of civilization, and protection of human rights and war against terrorism, has indirectly invited that the assumed reason of war was war. For example, when Anil announced human right violation from the side of government, more from the perspective of West rather than on the basis of Sri Lankan people, it led to more killing and devastation resulting Sarath's death. By this evidence, we can prove that Western interpretation of terrorism and its so

called principle to make the world free from terror and promote respect to human rights has been ironized. It could be rather summarized that the west itself is a cause of war, terror and human right violation and patron of barbarism. Besides, UN or the West rather than serving humanity protects and garners its political and economic interest in the Non-Western countries.

Works Cited

- Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. Tr. Harry John. Ed. Hannal Arendt. New York: Schooner Books, 1968.
- Foucault, Michael. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and Discourse on Language*. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pentagon Books, 1971.
- Gray, Paul. "Nailed Palms and the Eyes of Gods: Michael Ondaatje's *Anil's Ghost* is a Stark Successor to *The English Patient*." *Time* 1 May 2000: 75.
- Methodologies and Data for the Analysis of Oppositional Terrorism*. Presented at the sympt.int.Terror.Dft.Intell.coll., bec., Washington, DC.1989.
- John, Garson. *The Nature of Terrorism*. USA Blackwell Publishing, 1985.
- Kushner, Hw. "Encyclopedia of Terrorism". 82.6 (2003):304-307.
- Mitchell, W.D.T. "Criticism and Crisis." *Critical Inquiry* 28 (2002): 567-72.
- Nagengast, Carole. "Violence, Terror, and the Crisis of the State." *Review of Anthropology* 23 (1994): 109-36.
- Ondaatje, Michael. *Anil's Ghost*. New York: Vintage, 2000.
- *The English Patients*. London: Picador, 1992.
- Interview. *New York Times* 16 Oct. 1994, Late ed: c 25
- *Running in the Family*. London: Picador, 1992,
- The World Book Encyclopedia*. Volume E. Chicago: World Book. Inc, 2000.
- Turk, Austin. "Sociology of Terrorism." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23.3 (2000): 273-86.