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**abstract:** Human literary history is replete with both fiction and non-fiction narratives that chronicle intricate patterns of ‘power’ and its multiple manifestations. There are numerous modes through which power permeates societies and colonization is one of these many forms that have always been prevalent in all epochs and centuries. Literary texts, written by previously colonized nations, usually highlight the major characteristics of this recurrent historical phenomenon. A God in Every Stone (2014) by Kamila Shamsie is one of those novels that does not only illustrate the dynamics of colonization in the subcontinent but also pulls strands from historical eras to illustrate various manifestations of dominations. Michel Foucault’s insights into the dynamics of power and resistance provide a suitable framework to evaluate the power patterns embedded in the structure of this novel. Therefore, this paper is a Foucauldian discourse analysis of hegemonic spatial structures, manufacturing of the colonized subjects, and historical strands of discursive practices of oppression that reinforce the multiple forms and levels of power in this narrative. The study argues that macro and micro forms of subjugations are imbued on numerous levels in this text. The narrative also highlights multiple forms of counteractive resistant forces which emanate as a reaction against colonization. Thus, this paper contends that Shamsie’s novel contains a universal message of hope as it implies that although there are worldly gods in every stone of human history, however, resistance to those gods is imminent and endemic.
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The concept of ‘power’ has always been one of the most common subjects of all literatures from all ages because it is a very significant element of communal and political structures of human societies. Colonization, being one of the multiple demonstrations of authority, is a recurrent motif in the literature written by postcolonial writers. Accordingly, Kamila Shamsie is a contemporary Pakistani author who has been acclaimed internationally for her fiction. Like majority of postcolonial authors, Shamsie has also been discussing national and international power politics in her novels from the very beginning of her career. She explores various modes of powers that depict domination on the basis of race, status, ethnicity, money, gender and nationality. Her novel, *A God in Every Stone* (2014) is a statement on the historical recurrence of power; and resistance emanating from it. This study is aimed at conducting a Foucauldian discourse analysis of the novel which will unravel the subtle constructs of power and resistance hidden beneath the surface level meaning of the novel.

This text explores a world of revolutionary freedom fighters, rebellious warrior women and martyrs as it chronicles many historic and recent struggles between repression and resistance. The mentioning of Alexander, Zeus, Darius, Ottoman Empire and British Empire in the story hints at the recurring motif of power in the human history and predicts the persistence of power structures till the end of times. This study also analyzes the manufacturing of colonial beings under the dominant racist and colonial discourses. In addition, the spaces incorporated in the novel’s plot give an added dimension to the patterns of power enforcement. Moreover, museums, forts, walled cities and hospitals are tangible power structures that support plot’s overall governing imperialist discourses. This paper is aimed at exploring the discursive power structures as weaved into the pattern of the novel and evaluating the invested discourse of the production of power-relations and their formation in the colonized fictional world of the novel. Overall, the paper elicits a discursive trajectory of power constructs in the novel.

*A God in Every Stone* narrates two concurrent sets of stories. On the one hand, it is story of Vivian Rose Spencer, an English woman who is challenging the role of womanhood in the nineteenth century Europe by becoming an archeologist and excavating the sites in in a foreign land Labraunda (Turkey) and Peshawar (colonized subcontinent). On the other hand, the novel traces the life of two brothers, Qayyum and Najeeb from nineteenth century India under the British rule. Qayyum serves the British army in the World War I and gets wounded in the war. The discriminatory treatment of Indians at a British hospital makes him
disillusioned about the British rule and, later in the novel, he joins freedom fighters. Najeeb is the younger brother of Qayyum who motivated by Vivian, becomes an archeologist while Qayyum tries to make Najeeb realize that this knowledge of archeology is another tool of the Empire to create subjects. Meanwhile, many minor characters and historical anecdotes have been incorporated into the story to interconnect past and present power configurations.

Contemporary Pakistani female fiction has been inspired by many prolific female writers like Qurratulain Haider and Bapsi Sidhwa. Both these female writers write about pre and post partition politics in the historical discourses. Hyder’s writing depicts a broader spectrum. For instance, her novel Aag ka Darya (1969), which was translated and published in English in 1999, is an epic scale historical exploration of the two thousand years of the subcontinent (Raja 50). Her novel explores the various dynasties which ruled over India with the help of cultural, linguistic and ethnic influences. The novel narrated the power struggles of the generations (Amarakeerthi 37). Therefore, her novel is a trendsetting novel for historical fiction. Sidhwa, on the other hand, is more interested in portraying the changing face of power configurations in Pakistan after partition in her novels like The Crow Eaters (1978), The Pakistani Bride (1982), Ice- Candy Man (1991) and An American Brat (1993). Thus, Pakistani female fiction has a long tradition of historical depiction of power configurations.

Shamsie paints on a broader canvass in her novels as compared to her ancestors. Almost all of Shamsie’s novels deal with the dynamics of power structures and resistance emanating from it. Her novels are “polito-historical” documents (Dasgupta, The Guardian 2005), for instance, In the City by the Sea (1998), Kartography (2002) and Broken Verses (2005) portray the tyrannical state apparatuses and dominant ethnic powers in the political arena of Pakistan. But her two recent novel Burnt Shadows (2009) and A God in Every Stone (2014) transcend the national history and go a step further to comment on international global history and the rampant power struggle embedded in the narrative of human history. Burnt Shadows, specifically highlights international “power relations” (Zahoor 46). These two novels belong to the genre of historical novels which explore not only the power structures of post-colonial Pakistan but also these novels pull strands from historical, national and international power politics,

A God in Every Stone is an inquiry into the history of Indo-Pak, Britain, and Turkey to explore the recurring patterns of power and
struggle which are applicable to the global history. On the one hand, the novel demonstrates more contemporary events of political nature and on the other hand flashbacks refer to the atrocities inflicted in the past and perhaps insinuate the future of despotism and types of dominances yet to come. The novel has an “epic quality” and deals with the themes of “war, colonialism, nationalism, gender and archaeology without ever being didactic” (Popescu, *The Independent*). The novel “draws lines across the times” (Khair, *Financial Times*) and “explores the intricacies of human relationships against the backdrop of historical forces that shape the destinies of both individuals and nations” (Kaur 1). It is a telescopic portrayal from the Achaemenid Empire 5th century BCE to the British colonization in 20th century (Dunmore, *The Guardian & Kaur 1*). In fact, the novel has a “mythical quality” (Chishti-Mujahid, 2014, *Dawn*) as it echoes the “voices of those silenced from the pages of history” (Observer- *The Guardian*). In short, this text is an epic scale mythical discourse involving figures and reigns of Zeus, Alexander, Darius I, Chinese white Huns Dynasty, Chandergupt Morya, Asoka, Ottoman Empire and British Empire. All in all, the novel draws on a variety of power structures ranging from colonial past to contemporary neo-colonial ways of controlling bodies, souls, ideologies and geographies.

In order to undertake the Foucauldian discourse analysis, it is imperative to understand the characteristics of discourse analysis. To begin with, it is crucial to understand that “discursive practices contribute to the constitution of the world” (Griffin 98) inside the text. Secondly, the discourse of any text “is both constituted by and constitutes the socio-cultural world” (Griffin 98). Thirdly, analysis focuses on “actual language use within a given context” (Griffin 98). Lastly, discourse is “invested” and it contributes to the “(re)production of power relations in society” as well as “the interpretative schema operating within the society” (Griffin 98). Discourse, according to Foucault, is a “group of statements that belong to a single system” of “discursive formation” (*Archaeology of Knowledge* 107). Accordingly, a Foucauldian discourse is usually an amalgamated analysis of "objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices" (*The Archaeology of Knowledge* 38). Thus, in the Foucauldian discourse analysis, the focus of investigation is dominant discourses and the formation of subjects under these discursive discourses (Gibbs, 2009). In Foucault’s tradition, the analysis in this paper will be entrusted to “signs” (*Mad Language* 27), thus, the “repetitive” and “redoubled” language of the novel will be observed and analyzed (*What is Literature* 65). Hence, this paper will
analyze repetitive language, objects, signs and symbols which create the discursive discourse of power struggle in the narrative of the novel.

To begin with, the social structure portrayed in the novel illustrates various subject-positions evident from novel’s title. Interestingly, the title of the novel revokes the title of another novel The God of Small Things (1996) by Arundhati Roy. If in Roy’s novel the tyrants are gods of small things, in Shamsie’s novel they are invaders, colonizers and patriarchs embedded in every stone of the colonized land. Vivian, one of the main characters in Shamsie’s novel, realizes that “the people of this region had the vision to find the god in every stone” (81). This statement can be analyzed on multiple levels. Firstly, the people of this region had been into worshipping stone figures carved in the form of Buddha which are being excavated from Peshawar. Secondly, in the stones of Peshawar, many worldly gods can be seen like the White Huns, who “overran Gandhara, burnt stupas, pillaged the treasures” (Shamsie 184) as well as the men who are dictating women. On top of that Italian general who ruled with the “most iron of fists” (Shamsie 144) is considered the best way a “Europe can rule the Pathans” (Shamsie 144). In short, the novel traces the persecution of Jews, Indians, Armenians and Buddhists at the hands one or another mighty ruler.

For instance, the first clue to the power axis of manipulation is evident from the story of historical figure Scylax in the novel. Scylax was a very trusted man of Darius who travelled all the way down to River Indus and provided Darius with the information which helped to conquer India (Panchenko 212). But Shamsie takes the story of Scylax a step further by giving it imaginative touches as she creates a symbol and narrates that Darius “gave him a silver circlet fashioned with figs – a mark of the highest honour” (Shamsie 19). This circlet is the main binding motif of the novel. The word “circle” or “circlet” connotes the encircling or enslaving of a being and his manipulation into obedience by showering honours. Shamsie asserts that this is how rulers regulate and train subjects sometimes by punishment and at other times by incentive like a silver fig circlet.

In this regard, the figs on the circlet are a symbol of bloodshed, coercion and atrocities because the novel starts at the historical site of Labraunda where “the bones of Zeus’ sanctuary had the sweetness of fig” and the juice of “a split-open fig” is “smeared against the stone” of the Temple of Zeus (Shamsie 9). As figs are red in color when they are split open, they not only hint at the history of violence but they also foreshadow bloodshed, violence and oppression in this text. From the
very beginning, Shamsie anticipates violence, bloodshed, coercion, slavery and imprisonment at the hands of the worldly gods.

Shamsie has used the motif of a fig circlet to bind the major discourses of the novel. The fig circlet, according to the text, was a gift for historical figure Scylax from his colonizer Darius. Despite of receiving such generous gifts, Scylax resisted the domination of Darius. The circlet got lost for some reason and according to the novel’s narrative ended up in Peshawar somewhere. Tehsin Bey belongs to Turkey and he intends to excavate this circlet. He invites his English beloved, Vivian to Peshawar so that they can excavate the circlet together. Unfortunately, Tehsin Bey gets killed by Ottoman Empire for his sympathies for Armenians. However, Vivian is unaware and she reaches in Peshawar and waits for Tehsin there. During the course of novel, Vivian touches the lives of Najeeb and Qayyum and inspires the teenager Najeeb to become an archeologist. Many years after Vivian’s visit to Peshawar, Najeeb succeeds in becoming archeologist and discovers the lost circlet of Scylax. Nonetheless, he loses the circlet during the famous Qissa Khawani Bazar massacre of 1930 (a real-life event). Meanwhile, circlet is worn by a minor female character and ends up been buried again by another female character. This circlet is a powerful symbol of all micro and macro level dominations being passed on from one group of characters to another. It is being buried at an unidentified place that further hints at the possibility of dominations yet to emerge in the future of humanity. Thus, the circlet is a manifestation of various facets of subjugations in practice since the beginning of times and will keep on recurring till the end of times.

In the novel, the historical character of Scylax has been employed by Shamsie as a prototype to develop the character of Qayyum who is awarded with prizes for fighting in the war waged by the Empire just like Scylax was honoured. During the narrative of the novel, Qayyum also defies and fights against the power discourses of colonization like Scylax resisted against the imperial forces of Darius. The way Scylax revolted and stood by his countrymen’s side, Qayyum stands by the side of his countrymen. Another Scylax-like character under Ottoman regime is Tehsin Bey who wants to inscribe the story of his “Armenian cousins, the ones braver… who lived their life in rebellion regardless of the cost” (Shamsie 25) and is persecuted as a punishment for his sympathy for Armenians. Thus, Scylax as an archetypal character and his descendents (Qayyum and Tehsin Bey) suggest that power structures induce patterns of betrayals and loyalties.
In addition to the motif of circlet and the metaphor of Scylax, the spatial configurations of the text further the hegemonic structures of colonial power. In colonial and postcolonial texts urban spaces are often sites of power structures which have been witnessed, assimilated, and defied. The landscapes described in this novel are very significant as they evoke the fear and authority. Flynn asserts that contemporary era is "the epoch of space". In Foucauldian analysis, there are heterotopias which are "constant of every human group" and include spaces like "cemeteries, gardens and museums, as well as the "space" of...colonies" (Flynn 169). The cities of Caria, Peshawar, Labraunda and their landmarks like the Sanctuary of Zeus, Peshawar Museum, Mahabat Khan Mosque and Bala Hisaar Fort are "Heterotopias" as mentioned in Shamsie’s text. She has strategically chosen the locations for various incidents in her novel. Thus, this “geopolitics of the region” (Flynn 170) is very crucial to the understanding of overall structure of hegemonic structures and resistance to them.

The novel starts with a historical site of Labraunda where “the bones of Zeus’ sanctuary had the sweetness of fig” and the juice of “a split-open fig” is “smeared against the stone” of the Temple of Zeus (Shamsie 9). From the very beginning, Shamsie anticipates violence, bloodshed, coercion, slavery and imprisonment at the hands of the worldly gods. Taking this point further, Labraunda was the place where “Carian forces fled after losing a battle against the might of Darius” and “Alexander came to see the mighty two-headed axe of the Amazon queen held aloft by the Sanctuary of Zeus” (Shamsie 9-10). So, one place combines the references to the power of Darius, Alexander and Ottoman Empire. The word “might” and “mighty” both refer to the icons of power like Darius, Zeus, Alexander and Amazon Queen. These lines are not only referring to the present day Labraunda but they are also referring to the Armenian genocide in Turkey and human history of bloodshed since the beginning of times. The novel suggests there is always a god under every stone who tried to run the world or government according to his rules of punishment and discipline.

Similarly, landscape and monuments in the city of Peshawar are examples of constructs developed to implement authority. Peshawar is the focal "space of contestation" for both colonizers and colonized (Flynn 169). Peshawar city is the site of many micro and macro confrontations and resistances. In the colonized world of Peshawar, the power is operated by the dispositive of colonization. In this regard, Brigg mentions Foucault’s preposition of dispositive which might also be termed as an “apparatus, with a macro-level application of his concept of
normalization” (Brigg 422 & Bussolini 85). This culminates in the notion of “seiz[ing] hold of life in order to suppress it” (The History of Sexuality 136) because the use or threat of force was central to repressing the uprisings and manipulating colonized/colonizer power relations (Brigg 423). There is “[a] street for everything in the walled city. No map only desire to steer you” (Shamsie 262). These streets are like “Maze-like innards of the Walled City” (Shamsie 149). Shaw, in her Tourist Guide for Peshawar, describes the Walled City of Peshawar as “labyrinth” (5).

The construction of Peshawar city in the novel is also like a maze in which Indians and English are equally lost and by the end of the novel it becomes a prison when English lock it down and no one can either go in or go out. Peshawar is described as a place without any map and a zig-zag of streets. Peshawar city becomes an ultimate symbolic spatial structure of tyrannical oppression by the end of the novel when a real-life massacre is incorporated in the text.

The novel ends with the fictional depiction of real life Qissa Khwani Bazar massacre which happened on 23rd April 1930 in the colonized India. In this peaceful protest, 200-250 demonstrators were killed by a firing squad and their bodies were transported elsewhere and buried without any proper ritual (Habib 55-56). This incident in the novel furthers the discursive discourse of this novel and implies at the tyrannical suppression of masses with the help of colonial power. British colonizers used violent dispositive apparatus to rule and discipline the colonized masses. Both Peshawar city and the brutal massacre portray hegemonic punishments which colonized beings are subjected to when they try to protest against tyranny.

Moreover, many monuments in Peshawar city have been used as metonyms for the atrocity of colonizers. For instance, when Qayyum comes back to Peshawar after war he sees the shadow of ‘Bala Hisar’ which is a landmark site for the military power-play among Sikhs, British and Afghans. This elevated fort “casts its shadow over the Walled city” (Shamsie 71). All the atrocity, bloodshed and history of overthrow and power are summarized in the shadow of the fort which is falling on the city of Peshawar. Peshawar in itself is a very important historical site of conflict, fights and colonizing power and was “springboard” of “Military Campaigns” (Sultana 29). In the novel, Peshawar is described as a place from where, “all breathing space” has been “pressed out” (Shamsie 71-72). Thus, Bala Hisar fort are metonymy that has been employed to refer to the prevalent oppression in the city of Peshawar.
Similarly, Mahabat Khan Mosque is also presented as a place for the imposition of tyranny over the lives of the colonized beings. The novel narrates that the minarets of the mosque were used by Italian mercenary Paolo Avitabile “as gallows to hang anyone who broke his laws” (Shamsie 144). This is how the rulers punish the subjects to admonish and educate them according to their will. British Empire did not only create subject categories for the spaces in colonized lands. It was the same Avitabile who erected the walls around Peshawar. Therefore, the monument of Mahabat Khan Mosque has also been used by Shamsie as a metaphor of colonial tyranny and oppression.

Moreover, museum is another spatial metaphor that enforces the British power structures in the novel. The “museum had been built to make men feel small” as inside it Qayyum introduced himself as Lance Naik of the 40th Pathan and “he did not know why he introduced himself in that manner, but this man in the suit, these high walls, those stone figures all made it necessary” (Shamsie 137). Overwhelming aura of the museum led Qayyum to believe that he needs to show his high rank which he no longer carries after becoming a part of freedom struggle. Hence, museum has been portrayed by Shamsie as an emblem of colonial power that is constructed to intimidate the colonized beings in their own lands.

Other than Peshawar, another spatial structure that has been employed in this text is a British hospital. During the course of the novel, Qayyum gets wounded in WWI and he is admitted to a British hospital. Hospitals are called as “Carceral” prison-houses by Foucault, and in the same way, the British hospital in which the Indians like Qayyum are doubly imprisoned in the hospitals (Discipline and Punishment 1638). Firstly, he is kept at the hospital as a patient and he was also imprisoned there as a colonized who should not be trusted. When Qayyum tries to meet Kalam Khan, his friend, in another hospital, he is not allowed to meet him and a man whispers to him that “…even I can’t go out unsupervised. We are prisoners here…” (61). On his way back from Hospital, Qayyum notices “the barbed wire around walls, the sentries at the gate, the boarded up gaps in the hedge” and he felt as if he were in a “German prisoner-of-war camp” (Shamsie 61-62). The entire structure of hospital is a prison for Indians because they are colonized black people who need discipline and surveillance on the part of British authorities. Hospitals are prison-houses according to the Foucauldian discourse of the places of health but the imprisonment becomes more severe and vital for the colonized subjects in Shamsie’s novel. After noticing this subtle forms of colonization, Qayyum starts his resistance from this point
onwards as he later rebels against this imprisonment and tries to break through the security barriers.

Along with prototypical characters, symbolic significance of objects and metaphorical quality of spatial structures, the novel also hints at the creation of subjects under the dominant discourses by the subjugation of minds, souls and bodies. Foucault’s concept of biopolitics insinuates the dominance of “the physical bodies of individuals” who are “tamed, trained, subjected” (Flynn 176). According to Foucault, the subject is defined as “the subject of a hierarchical political order” (Pickett 452). This might be any individual in any society “who is subjected to the laws of society, nature, truth” (Pickett 452). For instance, the identity of Qayyum was created as a Pathan by the Empire for its own convenience. He admits, “Yes, I am a Pathan” but “[h]e never thought of himself that way before the Army” (Shamsie 68). In the British army, he was categorized according to the will of his colonizers who did not perceive the individuality of Qayyum as “a Peshawri, a city-dweller, with Hindko not Pashto as his first language” (Shamsie 68). He was told and trained in army to perceive himself as “Yusufzai of the 40th Pathan” and “he learned to think himself as just that” (Shamsie 68). This is how a certain discourse places people into subject position and sooner or later the subject finds it acceptable to be whatever category is assigned. Moreover, Qayyum is categorized in a race by British system. It is narrated in the novel that the “King-Emperor himself has sent strict instructions that no one should treat a black- and this word included Pashtuns- soldier as a lesser man” (Shamsie 54). It is very interesting to notice that Indians whether they are fair-colored like Pathans or dark colored are put into the category of ‘black’. The dominant discourse places them in the blacks category so they are black even if they are white skinned like Pathans.

As a result, Qayyum is very strictly fashioned into an obedient person by English that even after he has left Army and fighting as freedom fighter by the side of his own countrymen for his own land; “a command delivered in an English accent still made him want to salute” (Shamsie 236). Additionally, Qayyum was also mentally subjugated by the British emperor, since the very “thought of the King-Emperor made Qayyum rest a hand against his chest and bow his head” (Shamsie 54). The feeling of Qayyum hints at the “power as something so ubiquitous and overwhelming that all resistance becomes pointless” (Pickett 461). This training of colonized army has led him to become a subject to English commands for lifetime. Thus, Qayyum stands as a metonym for all the Indians that are so strongly conditioned into subjugation that both
in their actions and thoughts they are a complete manifestation of intangible forms of colonization.

Another very significant case study of subjection is the character of Najeeb, Qayyum’s younger brother, who is educated by Vivian about the art of excavation. Later on, he is appointed as Indian Assistant of Peshawar museum. Archeology, just like museum, is a major motif of the novel which assimilates various threads of hegemonic discourses incorporated in the novel. Foucault also employs the motif of archeology in his text *The Archeology of Knowledge* (1969) which hints at the excavation of the discursive discourses embedded deeply on a subconscious level. The word archeology means “discourse about ancient things” and “the study of the human past through the material traces of it that have survived” (Bahn 2). In Shamsie’s text, excavation is a very crucial metaphor which works at two levels. Firstly, the novel in itself is an excavation into the history of repression and resistance in the history of humanity. Secondly, the characters always try to dig for the gods hidden inside earth or the artifacts like fig circle- a metaphor for positive reinforcement by the colonizers. An excavation of the history’s archeology in this novel illustrates the hidden artifacts of ongoing repression and resistance. Two excavations sites, Labraunda and Peshawar have been mentioned in the novel and both are associated with the mighty rulers and invaders. As mentioned earlier in this paper, Labraunda as well as Peshawar are two power sites on which power games were played since the beginning of times.

The symbolic significance of archeology becomes very clear when Najeeb asks Vivian “Why do the English dig for old, broken things?” and she answers “[w]e like to find history” (Shamsie 72) but she is unable to answer that question that why do they want to search for history. In the beginning, Najeeb though that “it was humility, this readiness of the English to acknowledge ignorance” but with the passage of time, he understands the power position of British that in the power structure of the world, “to be English was to move through the world with no need to impress or convince” (Shamsie 72). When Najeeb becomes an archeologist it is what Foucault calls” the apprenticeship of the techniques” which “induces modes of behavior and the acquisition of skills is inextricably linked with the establishment of power relations” (*Discipline and Punishment* 1636-1637). According to Foucault, this disciplinary technique has a “double effect”. It helps in “a soul to be known and a subjection to be maintained” (*Discipline and Punishment* 1637). Najeeb emerges as a subject created by the Empire to feel “grateful” to the English for placing spade in his hands and allowing him
to know his own history. He feels so honored to be trained by Vivian. He tries to find Scylax’s circlet which is the symbol of bondage which he finds at Shahji di Dheri (a hint at his readiness to become slave) but he loses it during the Peshawar city massacre. Thus, through the knowledge and expertise blessed to Najeeb, the Empire maintains its hegemony over the body and soul of Najeeb.

Moreover, there is a discursive discourse of archeology embedded in the structure of this text. The narrative illustrates that the empire has left the “studying of history” for the “colonized masses so that they can read a history manipulated and created by English and always remain in debt to the mighty knowledgeable English” (Shamsie 182). Najeeb is eluded that the artifacts in Peshawar museum are left by English in the museum as a courtesy so that he can see his own history (Shamsie 86) but Qayyum tries to make Najeeb realize that British colonizers “knew so well how to make you feel that you were never so honoured as when they were the one to honour you” (Shamsie 135). However, Qayyum makes Najeeb realize the working apparatus of the colonial powers through which subjects are provided with positive reinforcement in order to keep them under the hegemonic rule.

Time and again, Qayyum tries to make Najeeb comprehend that he is being trained to think that English are so kind that they “dig up our treasures because they want you to know your own history” (Shamsie 185). Qayyum writes in his letter to Najeeb that “museums are all part of their civilizing mission, their white man’s burden, their moral justification for what they have done here” (Shamsie 185). According to Qayyum, it is just the most fantastic tale in which Najeeb is lured. Qayyum further elaborates for Najeeb that “the spade they place in your hand, the honors they shower on you” are in fact necessary to create “a class of Indian who will revere them, feel honoured by them” (Shamsie 185). In fact, Najeeb is one of the many victims of that strategy in which the subjects are created to boost up the ego of colonizers. Najeeeb, according to Qayyum, is “nothing but a subject, a yoked Pashtun who thinks the yoke is a silk cravat and that a silk cravat is as much yours to wear as a turban” (Shamsie 185). Since cravat is a fabric worn around neck, thus, under the colonial discourse analysis it might be interpreted as bondage and neck collar or chain which is a sign of slavery. So, the education, knowledge and honours by English are silk cravat that are presented as tributes to carry around gracefully but in reality these objects are used to discipline the colonized subjects.
In the end, Najeeb finds himself totally into another discourse when he unconsciously starts chanting “Inqilaab Zindabad” among Khudai Khidmatgaar at Qissa Khawani bazaar. According to the novel, “[i]t’s only then he realizes that every experience of his life feels pallid beside this one, including that moment yesterday in which the shape of that object [circlet] in the soil of Shahji-ki-dheri became clear” (Shamsie 279). Resultantly, this massacre at Qissa Khawani Bazar, makes Najeeb coming full circle from innocence to experience. He always had passion and subjected into becoming an archeologist as a result of Ms. Spencer’s “Civilizing Mission” (Shamsie 263). Najeeb finds himself immersing in his national discourse. The men around him mould his being here. Even empire’s education becomes useless when the passion of resistance surfaces among the subjugated masses.

In conclusion, a Foucauldian discourse analysis accentuates the micro and macro power configurations in the socio-political milieu of the novel. The cities of Labraunda and Peshawar are microcosmic representations of the global historical recurrences of colonization. Popular monuments like Bala Hisar Fort, Mahabat Khan Mosque and Museum located in Peshawar city are metonymical illustrations that unravel various modes of colonization. The silver circlet has been used as a symbol that stands for multiple forms of positive reinforcements given in the forms of awards, honors and medals. Additionally, Najeeb’s training in the art of archeology is a symbolic manifestation of empire’s claim on their superior knowledge and skills. However, the text does not only highlight the discursive formations of authoritarianism but it also gives hope to the oppressed people that they also have the power to defy and break the vicious cycle of subjugation. For instance, the historical character of Scylax is moulded into a prototype for all those colonized beings who first sided with the colonizers but they rebel when they realized the hidden motifs behind the petty honors given by the colonizer, like Qayyum and Najeeb in this novel. This study unravels the intermittent patterns of the discursive power discourse of colonization and the ensuing confrontations perpetrated by the colonized individual and masses. Hence, based on a Foucauldian discourse analysis of the text, this study contends that this novel does not only illustrate the persistent patterns of imperialism in the human world, but the narrative also anticipates endemic rebellion against these structures. Thus, the text is an optimistic piece of reflection for the contemporary world and indicates that the germ of resistance gets sustenance inside the womb of oppression.
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