

I. Ragtime, a depiction of miseries and tropes

This research focuses on *Ragtime* written by Edgar Lawrence Doctorow. It is one of the twentieth century historical novels, also known as documentary fiction which incorporates not only the historical characters and events, but also the reports of everyday events as in contemporary newspapers. This novel imposes the spirit of American civil rights movement of 1960s on the 'Ragtime' of early twentieth century. Doctorow's characters who are from the early twentieth century have been contextualized around the civil rights movement of 1960s. This book has established him as one of the leading American writers of the cold war period. It undertakes to fashion a cultural history of the first two decades of the twentieth century.

In the context of the research topic, 'Trope of Garbage' means that use of words, to predict the particular mental image or effect of garbage in the text *Ragtime*. But according to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, "Tropes are metaphors and similes, which words or phrases are used in a way that is different from its usual meaning in order to create a particular mental image or effect"(725). And garbage is the place where the wasted things would be collected. In the present text too, similes and metaphors are devaluated or dethroned into the garbage. In another form, we can say that some historical events or the facts are thrown or taken into the garbage in that Ragtime era. And E.L. Doctorow tries to pick-up those wasteful things, collects and gives a form to reconstruct a new form of history, which is different from linear form of history.

Ragtime, itself identifies the novelist as a collector of the discarded materials as an archaeologist, who studies of the culture or things of the past of unacknowledged, not accepted historical knowledge. This novel helps to transmate

something from one person to another person of these remaining things after the long use into the forms of telling knowledge that speaks many more things about the cultures of the historical moments. For all these purposes, Doctorow puts himself in the midpoint or as a bridge between the two pillars of contemporary knowledge and information production. He locates himself in such an important location, which helps him to question or to interrogate somebody over a long period of time, especially in an aggressive way to the so-called scientific objectivity of historical discourse, which is a long and serious treatment or discussion of a subject in speech or writings. So, this research wants to show how Doctorow attempts to pick up the leftover tropes which were dethroned into the garbage and builds a new kind of history. He fictionalizes history with the help of his characters.

Like W.B. Yeats' poem 'The Circus Animals Desertion' which picks up 'refuse' and 'rags' materials and comprises the recycled raw materials. Doctorow assembles images into complex narratives that yield a Yeatsian sheen however improved of mastery and brilliance. In very much contrast of the other writers, Doctorow employs the trope of garbage for the novel in present day culture. He suggests that the serious novel can acquire important cultural legitimacy by locating itself in the interstices of contemporary knowledge and information production. The present novel attempts to assimilate those forms of knowledge that resist integration into the scientific disciplines of late twentieth century, in which we can find different kinds of unacknowledged historical knowledge of historical period which were as valuable as supposed objective knowledge.

In this sense, extending the trope of garbage in the narrative function, the novel can be seen as a figurative waste product, a note of both discarded and

reassembled texts that complicates existent reports on knowledge and disturbs the reality scenarios of other media. This operates the wastes of cultural collection, a way of exposing the epistemological blind spots of other media and disciplines in their formation of truth, knowledge and history. Like any other pieces of literature, this novel can serve as a noisy channel, a dense and multiply coded medium whose content doesn't yield its signifying potential in one cycle of consumption. Its semantic residue is such that even repeated will never, in their entirety, exhaust the arc of possible meanings. As with theme so with the function of Doctorow's novel—as reassimilator of unassimilated and presumed to be unassailable knowledge, they figure the troops of residue leftovers, and garbage to propose themselves as their formal equivalents.

Doctorow has made a career out of historical fiction and he is renowned for both examining and rewriting the American past, most notably in the novel *Ragtime*. It is a unique adaptation of the historical narrative genre where there are three main elements in powerful and in impressive ways, the life pattern of an upper middle class family consisting of father, mother, mother's younger brother, grandmother and a young boy. They make up a white American family who live in New Rochelle, New York, supported by manufacture of American flags, burting fireworks and various trapping of patriotism.

In the novel, there are three fictional families. One of them is the white, New Rochelle family. There is a young boy as a narrator. There are father, mother, mother's younger brother, and grandmother. Second family consists of an African – American origin, a couple named Coalhouse Walker and Sarah. The Third family consists of Jewish immigrants Tatch, Mamesh and a little girl struggling for survival. The white family exemplifies the historiography of this era in an

American culture. Indeed, it is fair to say that most of the accounts of what historian denominated as the progressive era centers on the activities and concern of just such people. In the novel, *Coalhouse Walker*, a black gentle pianist belongs to a marginalized group, rides Ford Model T in Ragtime era. He later forms a group of gorillas and forms provisional American government under his own presidency. A black man of early 20th century America, empowered much, clarifies the intention of the author to pick up the leftover or wastages from the garbage to construct new history, by challenging its linearity. Tateh, a Jew immigrant and socialist struggling for economic justice in pre-World War Ist America gives up his socialist conviction and succeeds. Tateh, a representative of marginalized people, is portrayed as successful filmmaker and equivalent to white American who replaces father in mother's bed. This is the example of trope used as garbage in Doctorow's *Ragtime*, to construct the history.

In the novel's very first page, its narrator startlingly remarks, there were no Negroes. There were no immigrants and this is meant to suggest the limited prospect of New Rochelle family. E.L. Doctorow reveals it out by the use of fictional creation with the history though America had declared equal rights for Negroes after civil war and the historians write it as the truth, but in the history of America, there was still inequality done to the blacks Coalhouse Walker and Sarah. We can see the reality of racism here. The Jewish immigrant's poverty and difficulties to live in New York are the causes behind Tateh to become a filmmaker. Mameh becomes a prostitute and this happens because of political and social instability, crisis which all are parts of American racial history. Coalhouse was shot dead declaring him to be a violent is also the cause of racism which is still alive in America.

In the place of historians' basic optimism about American progress, Doctorow substitutes an ironic skepticism about whether any such progress is possible at least not without a fundamental reordering of social, economic and political power. This modern view is underscored by the fate of the novel's most of principal characters. Coalhouse Walker is assassinated and his followers scattered. Emma Goldman, an anarchist is deported and Tateh adjures his political principles and recreates himself as antithesis, as an emerging aristocrat. *Ragtime* furnishes a crucial model for the blending of fact and fiction and supplies a mine of historical particulars that enrich the panorama of Doctorow's created world.

Reading Doctorow's *Ragtime*, the fictional novel, different critics have come with different views. One of the famous critics, Poley Barbara compares E.L. Doctorow's *Ragtime* with John Dos Passos's USA trilogy with a view to locating these within the more general development of the historical novel. He has done the satiric commentary upon the development of American society in the early years of the 20th century; changing strategies by which novelist depicted historical materials in their fiction. He further says:

What Doctorow has done in effect is to take the materials of Dos Passes 'U.S.A- a sequential series of fictional autobiographical and historical episodes and place them in a compactor, reducing the bulk and hopelessly blurring the edges of definition. And yet the result is on artifact which retains the specific gravity of Dos Passes classic, being a massively cynical indictment of capitalistic racist, violent, crude, crass and impotently middle class America. (85)

Doctorow has taken many models from Passos' USA a sequential series of fictional autobiographical and historical episodes. He compares many historical events,

raises so many fictional characters to construct the new forms of history. He breaks the tradition of constructing history from linear form. He applies the genealogical method to pick up the tropes, historical events, characters which were discarded and constructs the form of history, remaining himself in between of contemporary knowledge and information production.

Ragtime, itself also can be taken as a 'Ragtime Music'. Another critic Laura Barrett compares history written in Ragtime era, itself as 'Ragtime Music'. For him it speaks of contrasts the fusion of regular rhythm and syncopation of structure and improvisation and of European and West African influences. Since it effectively epitomizes the chaotic and inventive era in which it thrived, 'Ragtime Music' is a fitting metaphor for E.L. Doctorow's *Ragtime*. During the flourishing of *Ragtime* in between 1896 to 1917, America was reeling from the cumulative effects of a century of technological, political and demographic changes. In fact as depicted in Doctorow's novel, history itself is 'Ragtime Music', "by that time, the era of *Ragtime* had run out with the heavy breath of machine, as if history were no more than a tune of a player piano " (270). This statement offered near the novel's end is evocative of the postmodern view of history as art, a construction rather than a reflection of the past, makes 'Ragtime Music' pertinent metaphor in the novel. He further says:

Yet music is not the primary trope through which the novel challenges traditional views of history. Photography as it is used in *Ragtime* unravels concepts like objectivity, truth and history, those very concepts with which photography's realism is often associated. Thus the medium which might seem anathematic to postmodernism becomes one of its most effective instruments. Hitting its stride at

the turn of the century and therefore a particularly apt metaphor for *Ragtime*, photography at once suggests progress and nostalgia; a complicated technological future and a simpler bygone era; life and death. (802)

What has been said to Ragtime music, he further says that this is not the primary challenge. This novel challenges the traditional concept of objectivity in history. This novel attacked at the turn of the century using the term metaphor 'Ragtime'.

Another critic George G. Iggers says that twentieth century novel was historical. He writes historiography in the twentieth century. He points out that for all the criticisms of the postmodernist's historical research and enquiry have continued undaunted in their search to represent historical reality. He adds:

Every historical account is a correct but a construct arising from a dialog between the historian and the past, " or rather perhaps one should say, the remains the past has left behind at all- if anything more people are writing and reading history at the beginning of the twenty first century at any time during the previous hundred year that are the subject of this book. (81)

So, *Ragtime* is the novel which is able to draw the attention of different critics with different views. Some came up with positive response and some with opponent view. But in general form, it is the novel which has used and reused the materials, cultures and tropes which were dethroned in to the garbage after the long use. He goes to such places like an archaeologist, collects the discarded materials, cultures and constructs a new form of history. Matthension, William also comments on *Ragtime* saying *Ragtime* as a kind of music. He further says:

Ragtime shows unquestioning acceptance of a single meaning for the title –ragtime as a kind of music, on which the style and even the structure of the novel may be based. A close examination of the text, however reveals that the title may have a deeper meaning, not previously noted. There are five passages-in which “rag” or “ragtime” refers to music. There are six passages-for the most part, shorter passages –in which “rag” or one of its derivations or compounds has a non-musical meaning, usually one of poverty. (21)

Another critic Parks, John talks about the narration of *Ragtime*. He says, *Ragtime* is energetic sprightly and easy to read, giving rise to criticisms of the novel as shallow and superficial. He further says:

The narrative of *Ragtime* is energetic, sprightly, and superficial. But the book does not intend to be a dense study of character. Its pastiche quality intends to challenge conventional notions of plot. Its idiosyncratic blending of fact and fiction intends to challenge the privileged status of historical discourse. (458)

So, *Ragtime* being a renowned novel of twentieth century, it has tried to collect the leftovers of that historical knowledge known as tropes or discarded materials.

Doctorow interrogates to the so called objectivity of that historical period.

This research topic uses New-Historicism to read the novel. New historicism is a way of reading history different from traditional way of history as Foucault mentions, uses only linear form. Genealogy of history is the appropriate way to read the history from the side of marginal voices. This genealogy goes to the past to collect the discarded and unacknowledged tropes or voices of the past which were dethroned by discourse. The traditional way of reading history creates

discourse, which was in linear form. Discourse is the act which was created by the person, who was in power. But in the novel Doctorow, like an archeologist collects the discarded materials or tropes to construct the new form of history in which all the discarded things were included. All marginalized, valueless or dethroned cultures and customs were refined and reused in a valuable form. Like genealogical method of reading history, Doctorow also attempts to collect the leftovers of the contemporary society. He collects them as an archeologist. How does one archeologist collect an unacknowledged historical knowledge, which were devalued and misused by the power holders and constructs a new history to give a new form.

Along with Foucault's concept of history, the researcher has used illumination theory of Benjamin. Walter Benjamin's Illumination theory also studies history through horizontal way unlike traditional way. This method is also very much similar to genealogy of history, which also goes to the past. Some tropes of metaphors and similes may be discarded and dethroned being unacknowledged by the power holders or the rulers. This method also picks up the discarded materials from the past events and refines and reutilizes them to make valuable and to give a concrete form.

The overall attention of the researcher is a target to analyze the novel *Ragtime* time through the spectacles of New Historicism and Illumination theoretical modalities in order to depict the marginalized and subordinated social picture of the than historical dimension.

Summing up, by applying these methodological frameworks, the researcher aims to show its applicability to construct a new history, which is discarded from the past. Different critiques appeared in different view but Doctorow attempts to construct it

in a new way. He collects the tropes and metaphors discarded and leftover being unacknowledged. Like an archeologist he collects the materials going in to the past and refines them to reconstruct a new history with new culture and history. He locates himself in an interstice of contemporary knowledge and information production. This attempt helps him to interrogate the so called scientific objectivity of historical discourses. So, he constructs a new form of history using tropes, which have been thrown into the garbage in historical period. Hence, he interrogates to the so-called scientific objectivity of historical discourse by using illumination and genealogy of history. In this way the present text stands pivotally is a discourse of creating new form of history by reacknowledging all the subordinated things, which were positioned in the very lower level of social strata.

II- History, Discourse and Subjectivity

Rewriting of History

History has been created in different ways along with the change in time and period. In traditional form of history, there was a creation of discourse by merely power holders. Knowledge a form of discursive practice creates the so called truth. But that so called truth was also discourse, because this truth was coined by power. Who had knowledge they were in power and who were in power they created truth and that truth was known as history. But this truth was no more truth. This traditional way of reading history had discarded the unacknowledged historical knowledge. They had discarded the silences and marginalized voices. But with the arrival of New Historicism, new kind of history was also came into a form. These unacknowledged historical knowledge, marginalized voices and silences were also picked up and put into the centre. By putting these silences, marginalized or unacknowledged tropes into the centre, a new form of history was created. This new form of history was formed to uplift the leftover of that historical period.

Walter Benjamin, Michael Foucault and Althusser are the great figures who interrogate the so called scientific knowledge of the period. Benjamin's Illumination theory, Foucault's Geneological method and Althusser's Ideology helped to uplift the leftovers or the discarded tropes which were very much important and helpful materials to reconstruct the history. In which marginal or silences were given chances and put into the centre. The New-Historicism was a method, which was brought into existence in nineteenth century to uplift the voices of such groups. Like as any kind of radical movements, this history formation process was also changed into a new form. Benjamin's Illumination method is very much helpful to uplift the power from marginal or silences. This method goes to the

past, collects the discarded and marginalized voices and gives them a form to construct a history. Unlike traditional way of history, which used to be read vertically genealogical history was written in horizontal way. Then only the discarded tropes, silences and marginalized groups were brought into existence.

Walter Benjamin's theory talks about the formation of history. This illumination bears the characteristic like genealogy. Illumination method of reading history goes to the past events to bring the fragmented and discarded materials of the traditional form of history. This method upholds those marginalized people, oppressed people, ruled people and creates history bringing them into the centre. This tendency opposes the concept of traditional histories and redefines the role of other groups in different way. Benjamin was in search of a surrealist history and politics. One which clings tenaciously to the fragments, the miniature, the story citation, but which impacts these fragments one upon the other to politically explosive effect, like the Messiah who has transfigure the world completely by making minor adjustments to it. It also resists the traditional form of constructing history and creates a new form of writing history. Benjamin further says:

The break in tradition and the loss of authority which occurred in his life time were irreparable, and he concluded that he had to discover new ways of dealing with the past. In this he became a master when she discovered that the transmissibility of the past had been replaced by its citability and that in place of authority there had arisen a strange power to settle down, piecemeal, in the present and to deprive it of 'peace of mind,' the mindless peace of complacency.

(43)

Finding the tradition and ways of dealing valueless, he had discovered a new form of dealing with the past or new ways to deal with the history.

To support Benjamin's Illumination theory, Beerendra Pandey, a critic of New-Historicism says:

Benjamin leans on the side of what these despised figures of the city represent—a source of revolutionary insight and illumination as he shows in his thesis on the philosophy of history and the chronicle of Berlin. In “Berlin Chronicle”, Benjamin rules out treasure hunting as the task of the true archaeologist he defines archaeologist's task as “exploring the past but its theatre”—a successful excavation that can retrieve the commonplace, the mundane, and the unremarkable—the fragments that can illuminate the disregarded and obliterated dead figures who haunt the city. (64)

Foucault in his book *Archeology of Knowledge* rejects the traditional historian's tendency to read straightforward narrative of progress in historical records. Foucault says:

Historians have preferred to run their attention to long periods, as if, beneath the shifts and changes of political events, they were trying to reveal the stable almost indestructible system of checks and balances, the irreversible progress, the constant readjustments, the underlying tendencies that gather force and are then suddenly reversed after centuries of continuity, the movements of accumulation and slow saturation, the great silence, motionless bases that traditional history has covered with a thick layer of events. (3)

He argues that one should seek to reconstitute not large periods or centuries but phenomena of rupture of discontinuity. He says we must reveal how any given period reveals several pasts, several networks of determination, several teleology, for one and the same science, as the present undergoes change; thus historical descriptions are necessarily ordered by the present state of knowledge they increase with every transformation and never cease in turn to break with themselves.

Foucauldian genealogy is a critical approach which analyses the incidents and gives detail analysis of society in general. It tries to explore into race, body and desire. In genealogical history, individual's sufferings and emotions are analyzed and it is the effective one. Unlike the traditional one, genealogical history is the history of oppressed people, not about rulers but about the ruled ones. It attacks the coherence of the subject. Foucault departs from the concept of traditional histories, redefines the role of historians. Genealogy, for him, is a Nietzschean effort to undermine all absolute grounds and to demonstrate the origins of things only in relation to and in context, with other things. So genealogy turns towards the problems of power and practice. To quote him further:

Genealogy, consequently, requires patience and knowledge of details and it depends on a vast accumulation of source material. Its cyclopean monuments are constructed from discreet and apparently insignificant truths and according to a rigorous method. They can't be the product of large and well meaning errors. In short, genealogy demands relentless erudition. Genealogy doesn't oppose itself to history as the lofty and profound gaze of the philosopher might compare the molelike perspective of the scholar. On the contrary, it rejects the meta- historical deployment of ideal significations and

indefinite teleology. It opposes itself to the search for 'origins'. (81-82)

The genealogical concept exercised by Foucault opposes the notion of origin in history, which assumes the origin lofty. He believes that lofty origin is no more than a metaphorical extension which arises from the belief that things are most precious and essential at the moment of birth. He further adds, "we wished to awaken the feeling of man's sovereignty by showing his divine birth: this path is now forbidden, since a many stands at the entrance". (84) The concept of origin, hence is a chimera. He says the origin lies at a place of inevitable loss, the point where the truth of things corresponded to a truthful discourse, the site of a fleeting articulation that discourse has obscured and finally lost. The historians approach to search for origin of history. His clarification regarding Genealogy does not pretend to go back in the time to restore as unbroken continuity that operates beyond that dispersion of forgotten things.

With the development of New Historicism in 1980s, and Illumination theory, based on the premise that a literary work should be considered a product of time, place and circumstances of its composition rather than an isolated creation. The history of New-Historicism dates back to the use of the term by Stephen Greenblatt in an issue of the journal *Genre* devoted to the use Renaissance. Greenblatt and other subsequent critics associated with it, reject it to call a theory or a specific doctrine. Rather it is inclusive of various concerns and approaches like the dismissal of formalist notion of aesthetic autonomy and of the text's situatedness, in broader cultural background.

New historicists aim to understand the work through its historical context and to understand cultural and intellectual history through literature, which

documents the new discipline of the history of ideas. New historicists believe that there is an inseparable relationship between literature and history and proceeds with a presumption that there is no hierarchy between literature and history. New historicists take the history as a narrative like the work of literature on the one hand, and the literature as history often the other. In this regard, new historicism owes something to Marxism of the Marxist analysis of history. But where as the Marxist analysis tends to see literature as a part of structure in which economic base where power is consumed and practiced in a hierarchical order, manifests it, new historicists thinkers tend to take a more nuanced view of power, seeing it exclusively as class related but extending and dispersed throughout society.

Traditional historicists believe literature as the product of historical events. The study of history, for them, would be sufficient to understand the work of literature. For them history is objective. But the new historicists take the history as a narrative like fiction. It dismisses the objectivity of the history. So, the new historicism from the traditional historicism neither takes the literary work as out of historical context nor as solely the reflection of historical consciousness. It takes literary works and history interacting to each other and new historicists are in the opinion that an interpretation of a work of literature is influenced by both historicity of production and interpretation.

New Historicism doesn't talk history as a stable or fixed pattern of events. Neither they take the history solely as a reflection of production of economic conditions as Marxist believe, for New historicists, history is the production of continuous interaction with the components inside the social, political, cultural power relations.

Foucault sees history as an emergence rather than evolution. He has refused the continuous development of history from past to present in linear and straight way. He has neither viewed history as an abstraction of idea or ideal as something that has begun in the beginning. No historical event to Foucault has single cause; rather each event is tied into vast web of social and political factors. For him, history is not a set of fixed, objective facts but, like the literature with which it interacts, that a text whether it is literary or social discourse which reflects an external reality. He sees history in terms of power. He has viewed power not a simply as repressive force or tool of conspiracy but rather as complex of forces that produce what happens. Foucault has encouraged the readers to reject the traditional romantic model of literary changes as continuous development.

New historicists employ the notion of discourse in order to detect in culture of specific historical moment and certain patterns, which are repeated though it in varying forms ranging from political, ideal, logical and social practices to particular works of art and literature. The meaning of the text is seen to be embedded in a web of discursive formation which gives its meaning. So, the text confirms the ideologies and dynamics of the culture at the same time as it reproduces them. In any given historical period, we can write speak or think about a given social object or practice only in certain specific ways and not others. A discourse then, would be whatever constrains but also enables writing, speaking, talking and thinking within such specific historical limits. So, contextualism can not be conclusive, context to the text is an insurmountable problem and context of any text is infinite. Contextual explanation depends upon a certain model of historical process.

New historicism and illumination theory make an impressive resemblance with Marxists, but somehow different. Marxist take social reality as a background

for the development of literature where as new –historicists and illumination take as a set of historical and social, context whose meaning goes on changing with the heart of power relation in society. These create any new form from the marginal or silence’s side and construct new one.

History and Discourse:

Discourse is the ordering force or power that governs every institution. Foucault developed a theory of discourse in relation to the power structure operating in societies. For him every discourse is meant to obtain power. The discourses are rooted in social institutions and that social and political power, operate through discourse. The discourse is inseparable form of power. It is a means of defusing power in to the different relation of social institutions. Discourses, according to Foucault, are produced on which concepts of madness, criminality. Sexual abnormality and so on are defined in relation to sanity, justice and sexual morality. Such discursive formations determine and constrain the forms of knowledge and types of normality of a particular period. Every society has its own regime of truth. So, the power diffuses itself in the system of authority. Foucault sees the truth as a product of relations of power and it changes as system changes. In “Truth and power” a seminal essay of Michael Foucault advocates about the truth that, “how power diffuses itself in system of authority and how effects of truths are produced in discourse which is themselves are neither true nor false” (1156) But the discoveries themselves are neither true nor false both history and literature are the form of discourses which defuse power into the society and work as normal truth.

Postmodernism has made a great impact on the field of historiography. It has developed its own way of historical writing by denouncing the conventional history. It rejects the master narrative as hegemonic stories told by those who are in power.

The dominant class, through hegemony- domination by consent, creates an imperative upon the consciousness or the whole way of social life, value system, norms, beliefs practices and attitudes. By doing so, it gets the consensus to formulate value as general, common and indispensable social values that are constructed by power holder's discursive ethos and incentives.

Foucault develops a theory of discourse in relation to power structures, operating society. His main thesis is that discourse is involved in power. In discourse power and knowledge are joined together. Foucault got influenced from the Nietzsche's idea of 'will to power' takes discourse as a central human activity but not as a universal, general text a vast sea of signification. According to Foucault, "people speak of the ideas they want, they deliver speeches, they propound different theories, write books and newspapers, deliver message that they wish. Foucault calls this process, discourse formation and whatever is produced is the discourse. For him, the production of any information that provides knowledge is discourse" (qtd. In Adams 1156). Once the discourse is produced knowledge about some aspect of life is provided. This knowledge helps to create truth. Discourse gives information about the thing that its producer wishes to impart and whose wishes are also not free from the play of power circuit. People get the knowledge about that thing and the truth is constructed. Foucault believes knowledge is power. The power is generalized dispersed in society by producing the discourses and by constructing the truths. Foucault's notion of power is different from the traditional notion of power. Power, for Foucault, is not the domination by one to other. He argues:

Power must not be thought as negative, as repression, domination or prohibition. On the contrary, it must always be seen as a making possible as an opening up of fields in which certain kinds of action

and production are brought about. As power disperses itself, it opens up specific fields of philosophy; it constitutes entire domains of action, knowledge and social being by shaping the institutions and disciplines in which, for the most part, we largely make ourselves. In these domains we become the individuals, the subjects that they make us. This phrasing, of course makes things sound more determined in advance the subject comes to be whatever or whoever he or she is only within his set of discursive and non- discursive fields. (58)

Foucault's main concern is power, which stabilizes the discourses, and its effects in the society shouldn't be taken negative. It is not a direct repression rather it diffuses itself within the social institutions to work in a systematic way. Foucault is of the opinion that power is only behind the institutionalization of discourse. The discourse is therefore inseparable from the power because discourse is the ordering force that governs the institutions. This enables institutions to exercise power. Those who possess the authority to define the discourse exclude other who are not in power. Discourse informs us the state of affairs, so its information or misinformation. Discourse also tells us about the propriety or impropriety, rightness or wrongness of something that consequently influence our attitudes, opinions and behavior. The exclusive function of discourse is to serve as a transparent representation of things and ideas standing outside it.

M. H. Abrahams, in his *A Glossary of literary Terms*, defines discourse as communicative presumption. He says that an utterance seems purposely to violate these expectations, we seek to make sense of it by transferring it to a context in which it is clearly appropriate. Other language theorists have continued. Grice's analysis of the collective assumptions that "help to make utterances meaningful and

intelligible and serve also to make a sustained discourse a coherent development of signification instead of mere collection of independent sentences” (67).

Discourse, according to Foucault, is produced in which concepts of madness and criminality. Sexual abnormality, and so on is defined in relation to sanity, justice and sexual abnormality. Such discursive formation massively determines and constrains the forms of knowledge, the types of normality and the nature of subjectivity, Which determine what is considered normal or rational have the power to silence what they exclude. His main point here is that meaning of any discourse depends on those who control it. For instance, Galileo's claim that earth revolves round the sun was denied and he was made to recant his claim by the authority. Truth was proved wrong by the power. People recognize particular piece of philosophy or scientific theory as true, only if it fits the description of truth laid down by the socio-political institutions of the day or existing ideology of the knowledge. So, discursive practices, however, have no universal validity but are historically dominant ways of controlling and preserving social relations of exploitations.

Foucault says every action and every historical event is exercised by power. He sees the exchange of power in every term is not power, simply a form of war like domination. It is difficult to sort out just who is fighting war since Foucault seems to lean towards the war of all against all notions. Power flows simultaneously in different directions and different volumes according to the various terms of power relation of power and truth. Foucault says:

Now I believe that the problem doesn't consist in drawing the line between that in a discourse which falls under the category of scientific truth and that which comes under some other category, but in seeing

historically how effects of truths are produced within discourses
which in themselves are neither true nor false. (1139)

He is clear that there is no objective truth or false. They are the mere construction of discourses that are neither true nor false within them. They are the only vehicles for carrying the institutionalized power through their information to the consumers.

For him, every discourse is the way to obtain power. He views that discourses are rooted in social institutions and that social and political power operates through discourse. The discursive formation has enabled institutions to wield power and domination by defining and excluding the other. Such discursive formation determines and constrains the form of knowledge and types of normality of particular period. These discursive practices have also the power. Truth is being told, facts to back it up, but a teller constructs that truth and chooses those facts. Facts do not speak for themselves in either forms of narrative history or literature. Thus Foucault sees truth as a product of relation of power and it changes as the system changes. Literature and history, for Foucault, are narratives and are in the form of discourses, so, they are entangled in the power relations to their period of time. In short, all the texts either history or literature is simply a discourse which seek the power of ruling class- the power to govern and control. Hence the dichotomy between history and literature is blurred, inter-text is produced.

According to Greenblatt, "the circulation of social energy art doesn't simply exist in all cultures, it is made up along with other products, practices, discourses of the given culture" (504). Greenblatt, thus, states that all types of art, including literature are embedded with in the social and economic circumstances in which they are produced and consumed. But these circumstances are not stable in themselves.

So, literary texts are considered as part of a larger circulation of social energies. In the world of Greenblatt, there can be “no art without social energy” (503).

New historicists argue that any knowledge at the past is necessarily mediated by the texts. To put it differently, history is many respects textual. It means there can be no knowledge of the past without interpretation. Just as literary texts need to be read, so do the facts at history. So, history and literature both must be viewed subjectively. Just as old historicists saw unity, homogeneity and totality in history, new historicists see contradiction, heterogeneity and fragmentation in history. There is no master narrative, single history but rather multiple narratives and histories. He says the voices of the dead are heard in the voices of living.

Another critic, Thom Gunn, speaks about the history. In his one poem, he speaks of a German conscript in the Second World War, who risked his life helping Jews to escape the fate in stone for them at the hands of Nazis. He further says:

What persuades men and women to mistake each other from time to time for gods or vermin in ideology. One can understand well enough how human beings may straggle and murder for good material reasons- reasons connected for instance, with their physical survival .It is much harder to grasp how they may come to do so in the name of something as apparently abstract as ideas .Yet Ideas are what men and women live by and will occasionally die for. (13)

So, in this way, these ideas were dominant theoretical perspective of this era. New historicism is in the form of analysis of the history as humanity. The key ideas of new historicism revolve around some of the central notions of Foucault will be the conceptual framework to delineate the proposition of the reconstruction of history.

New historicism, developed in 1980s is a literary approach to literary criticism and literary theory based on the premise that a literary work should be considered a product of the time, place and circumstances of its composition rather than an isolated creation. The history of new historicism dates back to the use of the term by Stephen Greenblatt and other subsequent critics associated with it, reject it to call a theory or a specific doctrine. Rather it is inclusive of various concerns and approaches like the dismissal of formalist notion of aesthetic autonomy and of the text's situated ness in a broader cultural background.

History and Subjectivity:

When new historicism was blown up, new kinds of methods were developed for reading history. In traditional way of reading history was some how subjective. But later on, with the arrival of new historicism that reading approach was changed. In this period, history was said, it was written in objective form but that new historicism questions to the objectivity of the scientific history. In this process, Genealogy, Illumination and so on was in practice during this period.

When we talk about history and subjectivity, we bring the concept of Eagleton's ideology. In his view we can never have a disinterested and objective interpretation, evaluation or creation of a text. Different people interpret in different ways to the same event or past. For Eagleton history is:

A form of narration conditioned by the narrator's own prejudices preoccupation, and so itself a kind of rhetoric or fiction. There was no single determinable truth to any particular narrative or event just a conflict of interpretations whose outcome was finally determined by power rather than truth. (197)

History, therefore, is like literature a product of subjective mind, which does not have a set of fixed and objective facts. The narrator can not be a trans-historical figure. His own historicity, prejudices and preoccupation get involved in his narrative, a renowned revolutionary Marxist critic illustrates the ideological interpretation of literary text. He further extravates:

The abandonment of the notion of ideology belongs with a more pervasive political faltering by whole sections of the east while revolutionary left, which in the face of capitalism temporarily on the offensive has beaten a steady shamefaced retreat from such metaphysical matters as class struggle and modes of production, revolutionary agency and the nature of the bourgeois state. (14)

In this connection, Eagleton, talking about the subjectivity of history relates with ideology. For him the abandonment of ideological exercise depends upon the pervasive political indoctrination. Reading the existence and exercise of ideological and its basic denominator, he further posits:

The study of ideology is among other things an inquiry into the ways in which people may come to invest in their own unhappiness. It is because being oppressed sometimes brings with it some slim bonuses that we are occasionally prepared to put up with it. The most efficient oppressor is the one who persuades his underlings to love, desire and identify with his power and any practice of political emancipation, thus involves that most difficult of all forms of liberation, freeing ourselves from ourselves. (14)

Like this talking about subjectivity and individuality, Althusser talks about interpellation. He further says:

I shall call ideological state Apparatuses a certain number of realities which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions. I propose an empirical list of these which will obviously have to be examined in detail, tested, corrected and recognized with all the reservations implied this requirement, we can for the moment regard the following institutions as ideological state apparatuses. (110)

Althusser, in his book *Mapping Ideology* says that ideology has no history. The project of a theory of ideology, in general is not a theory of particular ideologies which whatever their form, always express class position of the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real condition of existence. He remarks:

Ideology is not their real conditions of existence, their real world that men represent to themselves in ideology but above all it is their relation to those conditions of existence which is represented to them there. It is this relation which is at the centre of every ideological; i.e. imaginary, representation of the real world .It is this relation that contains the cause, which has to explain the imaginary distortion of the ideological representation of the real world or, rather to leave aside the language of causality. (124)

These aforementioned theoretical perspectives, cooperates us to open up the new avenues for redrawing the boundaries and reexamining the socio-cultural practices, which were the root cause of suffering of the contemporary people like Coalhouse Walker in the present novel, which will be proved in further chapter of this present research paper.

III. Troping garbage in *Ragtime*

Confuting History as Evolution

E. L. Doctorow, reconstructs the history in a new form, unlike traditional form of history in his book *Ragtime* and constructs a new form of history collecting the tropes, metaphors and unacknowledged historical knowledge, as an archeologist. He introduces himself as a collector of discarded materials of the contemporary history. He uses these leftover and tropes which were thrown into the garbage of historical movement, and gives a form. By collecting these all things, he interrogates to the so-called scientific objectivity of the historical discourse. Doctorow presents *Ragtime* as a detail of historical documentary. *Ragtime* breaks the traditional history of American Progressive Era of early twentieth century, ragtime era and presents it as of marginalized and silenced. Doctorow's all characters, in *Ragtime*, overwhelmed with the spirit of civil rights movements. So, Doctorow, like an archeologist, goes to the past, collects the details and presents with a form of history. He has interrogated the traditional history or so-called objective history with the presentation of insignificant and dominated events or tropes which were dethroned into the garbage by the historical discourse.

Traditionally built so-called history is viewed as fact or truth in his text *Ragtime*. So, this novel challenges the traditional history of ragtime era. In the then time, we think that history is a discourse, created by knowledge. Discourse would be presented in the form of a text. So, historians interpret the past and make them available to the readers. That sort of history automatically turns to be subjective. Traditionally history is viewed as an absolute, authentic, indebted and final version of history, which has been deconstructed and reconstructed in the novel *Ragtime*. So, every history is guided by the ideology. The historiographic meta-fiction as narrative

technique does a work here in *Ragtime* to make the readers aware of the particular history. These fictional characters of the text match with the real characters of the text. That unity of fictional creations does not lead the historical reference towards disappearance but tries to give it the form of actuality which was hidden before.

Doctorow admirably explores the marginal or dark areas of history, gathering the information of the past, which are not denied by historical records. Traditional form of discourse is coined in vertical form, which has not concerned about the tropes or knowledge which are marginalized silenced. But this new form of rewriting history picks up the whole leftovers and tropes which are dethroned and put into the center. There was a hierarchy in that traditional form of history. But Doctorow attempts to blur the lines of these binaries of unacknowledged and unevaluated historical knowledge and puts in horizontal way. These marginal and silences of traditional discourses are put forth and in to the center. So, we can clearly say that, this is the Doctorow's attempt to construct the history in the horizontal form which radically breaks the so-called objectivity of historical knowledge and constructs the history of marginal one and silences one.

Certainly, history is the record of the events that occurred in the past.

Evidences and proofs create the ground for brief, which they actually happened. Historians can not bring the past in one hand and on the other; they can not escape their own stance. So, they fabricate the facts with their theories and perceptions which leave the historians to rewrite the history time and again in different way. In this sense, history is discourse, situated with in a network of cultural discourses- religious, political, economic and aesthetic shape and their reconstruction is potential again and again. In any text there can be different kinds of interpretation, that can't be found in a single version. This speaks the volumes about the culture's historical moments. In

history, there would be always additions and reductions. So it can't be objective science. Doctorow in the present text *Ragtime* writes about the past's forgotten of twentieth century America. He blends factual and fictional characters, going to the past and brings them in to the centre and brings them to be heard from the side of silences.

In the very beginning of the novel, he talks about tradition of wearing and the people. In traditional master narrative, the little boy, narrator of the novel announces that "Everyone wore white in summer. Tennis racquets were hefty and the racquet faces elliptical. There were no Negroes. There were no immigrants" (3-4). But later on he narrates that "Evelyn fainted. She had been a well-known artist's model at the age of fifteen. Her underclothes were white. Her husband habitually whipped her. Apparently there were Negroes. There were immigrants" (5). Which is the discourse created by the traditional form of history and unreliability of traditional form of history.

Ragtime, talks about the three families in the text. There is an upper-middle class family composed of Father, Mother's younger brother, Little boy and Grandmother. The second family is an economically ruined family of Jewish Immigrants composed of Tateh, Mamesh and their daughter and the third one is the tragic family composed of Coalhouse Walker, a gentle pianist, his wife Sarah and their child. Doctorow tries to blend these characters with the fictional characters. So, he tries to show the history, from the side of the marginal one.

Ragtime opens with the historical reference of early twentieth century. His intention of mixing the facts and fictions to subvert the traditional history by reconstructing or rewriting it in another way is explicit from the very beginning of the novel. He mentions the social trend of historical period, blending with the fictional

evidences or events, to give a new form of the history. He says “patriotism was a reliable sentiment in the early 1960’s. Teddy Roosevelt was president.” (6). American traditional history of the pre-World War-I America has been depicted as a progressive peaceful and just time, the time of luxury, equality and democracy regardless of sex, race and creed. In the beginning of the novel, he claims social discourses of the period were beautiful and harmonious which was coined with the traditional concept but he says that history was constructed on the basis of need of that country. Traditional concept of American history was, harmonious, peaceful and luxurious, but we can find the crimes, injustices, racial domination and female discrimination. Gender equality was very less. Across America sex and death were barely distinguishable, which is the sign of restless America.

Talking to the references of freedom and domination Park John supports to Doctorow. He further says:

Doctorow is critic of the fiction of the private life, a fiction which abandons or neglects the social and political dimensions to feature, instead what Doctorow calls the “entrepreneurial self”. In developing his own poetics of engagement, Doctorow seeks a fictional that is both politically relevant and aesthetically complex and interesting. By blurring the distinctions between fact and fiction Doctorow’s fiction seeks a discourse and to challenge the hegemony of enshrined or institutionalized discursive practices. The narrative of fiction is thus is locus of battle, as it were for freedom (455).

Relating to fact and fiction, John says that Doctorow has tried to disclose the hegemony constructed by power. If there is hegemony, certainly there is domination

and exploitation. Hegemony creates the fact or truth to dominate other. So they want to be free from such domination and exploitation.

Doctorow, in his novel *Ragtime* blends his fictional characters with historical characters, in fictional situations. “The dignified visitors rode the shoot-thechutes and Freud and Jung took about together through the Tunnel of love” (38). Tateh, a fictional character, visits historical character Emma Goldman in one meeting presided by him. This shows that, through the interaction between historical and fictional characters it interrogates the so-called objectivity of the historical discourse. So, extending the trope of garbage in to narrative function, the novel can itself be seen as a figurative waste product. In the novel we can see different events of the past which were thrown as waste product by the contemporary history. So that, this novel is a node of both discarded and reassembled texts that complicate existent reports on knowledge. So this novel is one attempt of Doctorow, to bring the silences and margins in to the centre. This recreation of the history bringing the margins into the centre disturbs the real scenario of other media; it operates as a form of leftover of cultural assembly. This is an attempt of Doctorow, to pick up the whole leftovers of tropes from the garbage. This is a way of exposing the epistemological blind spots of other media and disciplines in their formation of truth, knowledge and history.

Doctorow has taken another reference of historical character, Theodore Dreiser, was suffering from the bad reviews and negligible sales of his first book ‘Sister Carrie’. It was the same time of the history “when he was out of work, broke and too ashamed to see anyone. He rented a furnished room in Brooklyn and went to live there. He took to sitting on a wooden chair in a middle of the room” (26). So, Dreiser could not get the proper alignment to fix his chair. So, is the history? It is

natural that objectivity of history is un-gettable. Doctorow believes, history is thus, same as Dreiser's direction of chair. It can't get the objectivity, fixity.

Doctorow brings the reference of black woman, who was found in cellar of a home on the next block. Being a washwoman of neighborhood, she took the baby from her mother. Father goes exploration of North Pole with Peary Expedition team, leaving his wife to look after the business in one of the peak seasons, "When the woman took the baby in her arms she began to cry. Mother was shocked by her youth" (70). This was a bold decision made by a woman of early twentieth century. But at the same time police came and they tried to send the baby in charity house and the mother who had deserted child, should be send into the prison, in the abuse of attempted murder. At the same time, she boldly says that "I will take the responsibility, please bring her inside" (71). This is the one of the scenario of the 1960s movement, which leads to the women's liberation. But this police's alertness is shown apparently the presence of government but the question why these black women abandoned the child is unanswered. So Doctorow satirizes such incidents and mocks towards the poverty and negligence of the colored people. So he tries to reconstruct the history raising such issues.

To support this, Parks John says that this novel not being a fictionalized attempt to prove the innocence of convicted conspirators- as Epstein would have it- but a polyphonic reopening of the case-a hearing or perhaps better, a "re-speaking" in the context of the New left of the late 1960s, of the crucial issues connected with the trial of the Rosenberg in the early 1950s. The ordeal that denial undergoes as a native son is America's as well, for the fate of both is interconnected" (457).

This novel blurs the idea of single truth and history. " Peary was within a day's travel of his life-long goal. During Henson and the Esquimos mercilessly, he

had refused to let them sleep more than an hour or two at the end of each arduous day” (80). Peary the explorer reaches the so called North-pole but finds it impossible to locate exactly the pole. Peary posed Henson and the Esquimos in front of the flag and took their picture” (81). So that for Doctorow, history is like imposing a spot on the base of power to accept as a single story.

Doctorow’s novel *Ragtime* deals with the history and fiction in the first part. Mother’s Younger Brother, a solemn young man, the admirer of Evelyn Nesbit, follows her after the murder of Stanford White and the imprisonment of her husband Harry K. Thaw. Once he would be able to see the naked body from his hiding in a closet. He couldn’t stop his sexual desire and masturbates hosing his semen all over the Nesbit’s body. So Nesbit being a historical character and Younger Brother, a fictional character they develop their relationship. Their closeness and relation approves the relationship between fictional and historical character. She was dressed in impeccable taste. Her testimony, created the first sex goddess in American history. Doctorow, blending two historical and fictional character into the intercourse, he attempts to blur the clear distinction between history and the fiction. This intersection and interaction produces the intersect, which is the reconstruction or rewriting of history, giving a new form from the traditional form of history.

Doctorow, brings one reference of economic injustice. Tateh, being a socialist, abandons his wife. He migrates from place to place, because of unbearable injustice of America. The problem of the unemployment of the time cried loudly as expressed in this way:

His pay was just under six dollars. The family lived in a wooden tenement on a hill. They had no heat. They occupied the room overlooking an alley in which residents customarily dumped their garbage.

He feared she would fall victim to the low-class elements of the neighborhood. He refused to enroll her in school-it was easier here than in New York to avoid the authorities-and made her stay home when he was not there to go out with her. (120)

It shows that, economic injustice was vast. There was vast scarcity of opportunity and prosperity. It was the condition of American people. They wouldn't get the opportunity too. This was also the clearance to myth of prosperous ragtime era in America. That shows extreme exploitation of the labor. The owners paid very little to the workers in comparison of their labor

Because of over exploitation labors were obliged to strike against the owner of the factory. They were not satisfied with envelopes, which were given reducing their wages in comparison of their former paid. Instead they tried to dethrone the labor. Labors in against of the owner, left the company, and announced the strike. "Several Italian workers left their machines. They ran through the mill calling for strike. They pulled out windows" (121). That strike was gone in to the climax and caused every mill get to be closed. But it had caused another problem to owners. They were shot to death. This strike united the workers whole over the country. A strike committee was formed with every one of the races represented and the message went all over the country. That workers' movement had attacked the sentiment of whole American people. Owners used government policy and militia to dominate and break the labors' movement. This shows that the myth of democracy and equality was just an imposition. There was only democracy for the owners but not for poor workers. But owners had thought that they can't move their movement with empty stomach, but they had already got the sentiment of many American people. So, this industrial revolution of labor was the challenge and threat to the capitalist owners. Poverty was

overwhelmed all over the country. But this situation was really difficult to carry on the strike for the workers because they had to look after their family too. But American people, who were observing the movement, helped them. They offered shelter to the children of the workers to carry on their strike until there would be justice to the labors of the factory. But capitalist owner captured the children of the workers and to torture them. Terrible screams were heard because police were employed by the owner, started to separate their mother from the children. Tateh who was also willing to send his daughter away, to take participation in the strike was badly wounded by the police. So that he couldn't do as his wish:

As he was sitting her down he came to the attention of one of the policeman. The policeman cracked him on the shoulders and the head with his stick. What are you doing. Tateh cried. He didn't know what the man wanted of him. He moved back into the crowd. He was followed and beaten. He stumbled away from the crowd and was still beaten finally he fell. (127)

This was the condition of America. He was badly wounded. By hook and crook, he attempted to escape. At last with the help of two conductors he could catch a train to Philadelphia and found his daughter there. How much the capitalism victimized and gave pain to Tateh, we came to know that in democratic America. So, he can't continue his career but became a film maker. Government took all the responsibilities of this labor movement to perpetuate the hegemony of capitalism. They want to preserve their culture of capitalism without any obstruction. Tateh becomes filmmaker, not because of his choice but because of the condition of America. This shows that the people in America were not able to sustain in any field, they had to migrate from place to place and they had to change their occupation for survival.

Reversion of White hegemony

Doctorow, brings another reference of Black family. A black pianist, a ragtime musician comes in existence. He comes in to the Father's and Mother's house where the black child and women were living. He wanted to meet black women Sarah, but she refused to meet. Coalhouse Walker became the victim of some white racists which leads him to violence and the end of his own life. He pleaded Father and Mother with rag music and coon songs. His moderate way of behaviour makes father and mother that, he was Negro. Coalhouse Walker didn't fit to Father's white American Eye as a Negro. Father, though a liberal white man, is also not completely free from the latent thought of white superiority over black. Father thought that, he was no different than the white people in manner and behaviour except his skin. He had owned a Model T Ford, an expensive auto-mobile which was the symbol of equality to white in material prosperity of a black man which was provoked some white racists to stop him literally as well as symbolically. "He was not unaware that in his dress and as the owner of the car, he was a provocation to many white people. He had created himself in the teeth of such feelings" (174). Coalhouse, while passing the way, he was blocked by the volunteers of Firehouse.

When Coalhouse Walker was going ahead, he was asked money by Firehouse volunteers suspecting him not being a resident of the town. But he was aware about the locality and toll, no private toll was there, because he had traveled many times through that toll. But volunteers informed the chief because he had refused to pay. They rounded him for the fire fighting. The fire company chief and his volunteers imposed a degrading behaviour upon Coalhouse Walker. "...If Coalhouse didn't pay up he would not pass. With his two hands he lifted his hat from his head and reset it so that the visor covered his eyes. This caused him to tilt his chin upwards in order to

see, giving him a pugnacious look” (176). He was asked to pay \$25, in his own country as if he was a foreigner. This is the great satire to the contemporary America in the time of prosperity, peace, harmony and democracy. Arousing different kinds of thinking, at last he decided to oppose the chief. He requested two color boys and went for complain in police station. But he was again shocked by the police’s ignorance, supposing him Blackman, and that was the case against white man. “The policeman listened to his complaint and shook his head and spent something removing his handkerchief from under his frock coat and blowing his nose” (176). The response of the police shows the negligence to the black people in America. It is also the dominance of white power over government. Then he returned back to the Firehouse lane.

The police department advises him there is no toll road anywhere in the city. He found his car filled with mud and deposited it in back sit was mound of fresh human excrement. His loyal demand in the police station, police asked the firehouse chief if he and his man had detained the Blackman’s car illegally. But that chief resisted it, saying that it was a serious business to move the damn car from the mid of the road. But Coalhouse says “There is no real damage. Scrap of the shit and forget the whole thing. It was on my way when they stopped me” (178). But this incident was taken as a false story by the policeman. It shows that blacks were blamed and suffered without being mistake. To seek justice, became his crime in front of the white society. He did nothing but he was suffered a lot. That was the power dominated by whites, so in the eyes of police, blacks became inferior and whites were saved by policy too. This present condition of walker proves that how blacks were supposed by whites and it was better to confess to the crime although it was not the mistake. So that he was taken to the prison.

Doctorow has presented a character, Walker to show the enrichment of Civil Rights movement of 1960s to pick up the tropes and unacknowledged knowledge dethroned into the garbage. He picks up the characters like Coalhouse Walker to construct the history from the side of marginal voices. So searching for justice, he desires to sue the case and searches a black lawyer, but unable to find out. He went to the Harlem Court, but the attorney of the Harlem didn't want to process the case for the known. But Harlem indicates that there would be no justice for the blacks. He was depressed from everywhere because he couldn't get a word of sympathy too from anywhere. So, finally he adopted violence to make the deaf American society of the ragtime era to hear what he was seeking through peaceful manner earlier. Being a man of principle, he was different from the mainstream and hegemonies blacks of the era. But only Father was in supporting of him. It shows that despite the hegemony of white's cultural thought, there were different voices which were obliterated by the traditional history.

In the house of Father, Mother and Younger Brother, Coalhouse Walker's demand for justice was only a 'case' to be heard or read or speculated, but Sarah, didn't limit it. But she knew, being a Coalhouse, a man of principle, he had to take on a course of her own. Sarah decided to appeal for justice with Mr. Taftis, vice-president, James Sherman to secure her family from the upcoming tragedy. When James Sherman arrived at the destined place, Sarah called him and followed him supposing president. Policeman kicked against Sarah's chest as hard as he could. Sarah who went to plea for the justice got the mortal blow. Her extended hand was seen as weapon by the white eyes. She was assassinated to the prison, supposing disturbing the peace and she was dead. Doctorow brought Coalhouse as a hero. His voice is one of the examples of voice of traditional form of history shaped by

discourse. Younger brother, deceived by Evelyn Nesbit, influenced by Emma Goldman is also sympathetic to Coalhouse, while responding to Father's comment on Coalhouse as a man who has never been tested in his principle. But Sarah's death leads to Coalhouse, to attack the American society. First of all, he attacked to the Fire House Station, but fortunately chief was out from the station.

After the attack in the firehouse station, Father thought that it is good to inform the police on the moral ground. Whites were supposed that Coalhouse Walker is the cause of Sarah's death. Father says:

I hope I misunderstand you. Would you defend this savage? Does he have anyone, but himself to blame for Sarah's death? Anything but his damnable Nigger pride? Nothing under heaven can excuse the killing men and destruction of property in this manner. Brother stood so abruptly that his chair fell-over. The baby started and began to cry. Brother was pale and trembling. I didn't hear such a eulogy at Sarah's funeral, he said. I didn't hear you say then that death and the destruction of property was inexcusable. (211)

Doctorow presents such incidents from myth too. In that traditional form of so-called subjective history, such tropes were thrown in to the garbage. Such major incidents of the blacks and silences were devaluated and neglected. Doctorow tries to attack the consign of the people, by bringing such incident into the forth. Characters like Coalhouse Walker and Sarah were misunderstood by whites of the past. So, he attempts to bring them into the centre, and constructs a new form of history.

Coalhouse walker wrote two letters to the Newspaper. But in these letters he had demanded to repair, his damaged car, instead he would go into the action. But these letters were not published, thinking that it would be aroused as a racial issue and

insurrection of the dominated groups. Coalhouse Walker as a killer may not be the main problem. “Squads of police quality went through the Negro-neighborhoods and asked questions about Coalhouse Jr. At the same time, police of neighboring towns with negro population did the same” (212). It is the satire to the American society. He was taken seriously by the authority. The Firehouse chief sheltered at the police station, realizing his fault. So, white officers also teased the fate of chief. “They teased him about his fate. We may have given you to the boogie man, Willie, they said. Just to get some peace around here” (218).

Coalhouse Walker, attacked municipal fire company, second time to pressurise the authority to be heard his demands. His anger was directed towards the city administration and Willie Conklin, “A delegation of firemen marched to City Hall and demanded to be sworn in as police deputies and given arms to defend themselves” (221). After his second attack, the authority kept on its stubbornness by interpreting the Coalhouse Walker’s strength. They did not realize the injustice to the whole race, but just moral ground for their unity to fight against the injustice and domination; they were facing but not to get the money back. “He has to pay his cohorts. He has expenses. Where does he get his money? Where does he stay between his mad raids on these gentle city” (236)? But this attack was the cause of attention to New Rochelle people. People know the cause of attack and considered the Walker’s demand to Willie Conklin, a anonymously suggesting him to live New Rochelle. Every people of the town were supporting the movement. Writers also supported the movement, “Largest headlines in their story to the intelligence, that the Conklin family had gone into hiding in New York City” (239). From everywhere, people’s consign had gone to Walker. Main editorial of the almost largest paper of the

city had supported to the movement and his demands. “Let him now burn down the entire metropolis of New York” (239).

Younger brother, who had attempted to meet Coalhouse Walker, from several times, accompanied him. He had tried to join Walker in Sarah’s death too but unfortunately, they did not get chance. “I should very much like to speak with Mr. Coalhouse Walker” (241). He was a black man who fought for justice, civilization and the right of every human being for a dignified life. He was well composer of bombs too. “I can make bombs [...] I know how to blow the things up” (243). So, going to the past, Doctorow, brings such characters and such issues which were dethroned into the garbage and tries to reconstruct the history.

They, time and again struggled for their voice to be identified in such discriminated society. Attacking on Immense Liberty of Pier Pont Morgan, they raised another revolution. “Coalhouse’s gang had broken in to one of the cities most celebrated depositories of art, Pierpont Morgan’s library on 36th street” (267). Liberty was obsessed by the notion of reincarnation. This consists of history, which was created by discourse, which had discarded the marginal voices, silences and tropes in garbage. They couldn’t include such tropes in their history. Marginal, working class, silence groups always would be the means of production, to conserve the main stream culture of history. The seizure of the library symbolizes the culture of domination and hegemony. Through the help of seizure, he wants to cut that boundary of domination and hegemony and wants to construct the new one bringing such marginalized and silenced into the centre to give a form from the garbage.

Later on, authority met in a negotiation with Coalhouse Walker. They conclude that Model T would be repaired by Willie Conklin, and Coalhouse would surrender. But in his period of surrendering, he was shot to death.

“With eight people dead by Coalhouse’s hand, horses destroyed and buildings demolished, with a suburban town still reverberating in its terror, his arrogance knew no bounds or is injustice once suffered” (268). This was an example of severe brutality and cruelty; one surrendered man had killed blaming him committing several crimes. So, Doctorow, tries to reconstruct the history bringing such shot dead voices and marginalized voices in to the centre. That traditional form of history was formed only in the concept of such capitalist Morgan, symbolizes the liberty or power of capitalist society. Capitalists had captured the whole authority of the government. So, Doctorow attempts to harass such groups and tries to construct one new form from the concept of such groups. “The great freedom of New York could be made to pay an army of Fire Chief’s and a fleet of Model T’s for the ransom of its Morgan” (269).

Doctorow, bringing forth to Walker, tries to show the extreme rate of brutality, poverty, injustice and exploitation of the traditional concept of power in America. Revolution is the output of such extremeness. Emma Goldman, like characters who was the sign of revolutionary characters, expressed the thought that Coalhouse Walker was a rebel because he suffered in the scorching racism and injustice. Different kinds of approaches were used to surrender Coalhouse. Booker T Washington, a famous negro, was used to convince Negroes. But being a Negro, he had accepted the white domination in one or other way. He was the product of American hegemony. His submissive voice made him the most famous black man in white dominated America. “Every Negro in prison, every shiftless no good gambling and fornicating colored man has been many enemy” (281). He used different kinds of flattery to convince Coalhouse for surrender;

Thousands of honest industrious Blackman can’t undo the harm of one like you. And what is worse you are a trained musician as I understand

it one who comes to this infamous enterprise from the lyceum of music, where harmony is revered and the strains of the harps and the trumpets of heaven are the models for song. (281)

Convincing him in different approach, American hegemony became success to make surrender him. Those who supported the American hegemony of the culture were famous and those who tried to seek their identity and opposed the hegemonic culture were dethroned into garbage. They were neglected and devaluated. Booker T was in front because of acceptance of American dominance and Walker being opponent was dethroned into the garbage.

In the novel *Ragtime*, mother remarries Baron, the earlier Tateh who had accepted the American hegemony and entered into mainstream of culture. Now there was legal provision to marry between a Jew and Christian. She had kept three children; her own son and Sarah's son and Tateh's daughter. Baron wants to make a movie of the three children each from a White, Black and Jew community. That is very much clear intention of Doctorow, to pick up the left-over, and tropes which were unacknowledged and devaluated into the past, by so-called objectivity of history and gives a form of history from the side of silences, marginalized and dethroned groups.

Doctorow, bringing different tropes which were thrown into the garbage by that power holders of the contemporary America like Coalhouse Walker, Tateh, Sarah, Emma Goldman and so on and gives a form to construct a form of history, which is the radical one than that of the traditional one. Like an archaeologist, Doctorow, moves to the past of the history to collect such troops which were thrown in to the garbage.

In *Ragtime*, it is said that there were no immigrants, no blacks. But Doctorow went to the past of history. He also brings some historical characters too, to prove his attempt of reconstructing history from the side of margins and silences. How much brutality are there in the traditional form of history? Blacks' women were neglected as animal. They were also dam cared during their pregnancy too. Immigrant families are forced to immigrate here and there time to time. White hegemony is surpassed to the blacks. Blacks didn't get breathe of freedom. By hook and crook, they were forced to accept the white hegemony. Tateh, like characters were forced to accept their hegemony and to shift their occupation too. Sarah like characters were died time and again by that culture and died being the victim of such culture. So, Doctorow in his book *Ragtime* attempts to collect all these tropes and unacknowledged historical characters from the past and builds a new form of history. So, Doctorow interrogates so-called objectivity of that historical document.

Doctorow brings some reference of white characters that were leaden by their own hegemony of discrimination. Characters like Willie, Conklin and Pierpont Morgan were the representation of white dominated society. Without being any cause, they suffered a lot to the black people. Sarah, a genius fictional character died being victim of such discriminative society. Characters like Booker T, being a black, already had accepted that white hegemony ,were also used to suppress the blacks. So Doctorow bringing them in to the forth from garbage, constructs one form which is really applicable to mention here. Those immigrants, historical characters, blacks, women were dethroned into the garbage by that so-called objective history of the past. He went to the past, picks up those leftovers from the garbage and used them bringing them in to the centre. So he questions to all the so-called objective history

Doctorow, blending all characters, like Jewish, Immigrants, Blacks which were into the garbage because of the damcareness of historical fiction in to the lap of characters like Mother, attempts to show the sign of harmony. This is the victory of the marginal groups, tropes of garbage and the group of silences. So that, in Doctorow's novel, one character, Tateh, later on Brown, makes the film of the history of these three characters, which is the victory of these groups. So, Doctorow, collecting tropes from the garbage succeeds to make a form of history from the side of marginal and silences.

IV. Conclusion:

E.L. Doctorow's *Ragtime* collects the tropes of garbage, which were underestimated and unacknowledged by so-called scientific objectivity of historical discourse. Doctorow, as an archeologist goes to the past and searches unacknowledged historical knowledge. This novel transmits leftovers into the forms of telling knowledge that speaks volumes about a culture's moments. By collecting such tropes from the garbage, he locates himself in between contemporary knowledge and information production, which helps him to interrogate the so-called scientific objectivity. His book helps to collect the tropes from the garbage of early twentieth century ragtime era by imposing the spirit of Civil Right movements of 1960s.

Doctorow, extending the trope of garbage into narrative function, novel can itself be seen as a figurative waste product, a node of both discarded and reassembled texts that complicates existent reports or knowledge and disturbs the reality scenarios of other media. This novel re-assimilates unassimilated and presumed to be unassailable knowledge, figure the tropes of residue, leftover, and garbage to propose itself as its formal equivalents. Doctorow presents his narrator, little boy as a gourmet of garbage who treasured discarded. So, Doctorow's *Ragtime* understands history as a collection of bits and pieces left over from the lives of others. So, Doctorow contains most of his novel, explicit models of their self formation in terms of junk and stuff. *Ragtime*, being far from entering a synergy of representation, narrative form and content pastiche and theme are diametrically opposed to one another. *Ragtime* for that reason is legible as the most peculiar and stunning monument to the aesthetic situation engendered by the disappearance of the historical reference.

Doctorow attempts to show the personal history of the characters from the marginalized groups such as Blacks, Jews, Immigrants and Women to show the discarded tropes of historical period. Doctorow goes to the past, as an archeologist to pick up the

tropes of Marginal group, Immigrants, Blacks, Jews, and women which were devaluated and dethroned into the garbage. He brings such groups into the centre to give a form of history with gender equality, racial equality and freedom for all. It also enforces to the motto of Civil Rights movement. Doctorow, to show the failure of so-called objectivity of historical knowledge, blends fictional character and historical character in his text. The so-called objectivity of historical knowledge blends fictional character and historical character in his text. The so-called truth is challenged in Doctorow's text *Ragtime*, because in the very first part of the novel narrator says that there were no Blacks, no Immigrants. But in the context of America, we can see the marginalized and unacknowledged Blacks and Immigrants with the development of the novel. These groups were neglected by the mainstream history. Doctorow presents in his text that the history is the document of past, manipulated by power, had dethroned knowledge and characters of marginal groups into the garbage.

Doctorow presents some fictional characters like Sarah, Coalhouse Walker who became the victim of such discriminative American society, and thrown into the garbage. He presents such characters as tropes in his novel. Coalhouse fights for racial equality in a very radical way in early twentieth century. He attacks Firehouse Station firstly and secondly in Morgan's Library, to challenge the white dominative society against the extreme rate of brutality, poverty, injustice and exploitation. Sarah died because of the animalistic behaviours of the police brutality in America. Tateh like characters were obliged to shift from place to place because of the extreme exploitation to labor in American Industries. Industrial movement was also the cause of extreme exploitation in America. He was obliged to change his occupation, because of the white hegemony leaden upon them. Such discriminative concept of hegemony had dethroned such groups into the garbage. So, Doctorow picks up such groups as trope in the centre and made silenced to be voiced.

Doctorow, blending historical character with fictional character shows the similarity of history of fictional. Emma Goldman, a historical character welcomed Tateh, a fictional character as chairperson. Americans have leaden their hegemony. Booker T, like characters is used to convince Coalhouse Walker for surrender. Surrendered person was shot death, which is the extreme domination shown by white brutality. They were not free to breathe in that discriminative so-called objectivity of historical discourse had developed and dethroned such issues and events into the garbage. So Doctorow, brings them into the centre from the garbage to give a form and gives a form of history with voice of such blacks, marginal, immigrants and workers.

To construct a form of history after Civil Rights Movements of 1960s in America, Doctorow brings reference of such characters. He puts forth such groups in to the centre. He presents them in to centre. Tateh, being immigrant in his country, changes his occupation. Black women are suffering by whites during their pregnancy too. Sarah is dead, because of her attempt to ask help with white man. Coalhouse Walker is supposed as a foreigner in his own country. So, Doctorow, bringing them into the centre from the garbage, puts them as trope in his new form of history, which is really a challenge and blow to so-called objectivity of history of that period. Like this, Doctorow attempts to merge Jews, Blacks and Immigrants child in the lap of model character Mother, to show the harmonious victory of groups which were thrown into the garbage by historical discourse. Another character Brown remarries to Mother and addresses that he would make a film on the story of these children. So that this text is the Doctorow's attempt of collecting tropes, which were dethroned into the garbage, neglecting by that historical discourse, to construct a new form of history from the side of Marginal, Silences, Blacks, Immigrants and Jews. To give a voice to be heard to American society he picks up such tropes through the garbage.

Works Cited

- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Towards an Investigation)" *Mapping Ideology*. Ed. Slopvaj Zizek. London/ New York: Verso, (1994): 100-140.
- Bachner, Sally. "When History Hurts" *History and Theory* 42 (2003): 398-411.
- Barrett, Laura. "Composition of Reality: Photography, History, and *Ragtime*". *Modern Fiction Studies* 46.4 (2000): 801-824.
- Benjamin Walter. *Illuminations*, Ed. Hannah Arendt, Trans. Harry Zohn:New York, Schocken Books, 1969.
- Doctorow, E. L. *Ragtime*. New York: Random House, 1975.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London/ New York: Verso,1991.
- Evans, Richard J. "From Historism to Postmodernism: Historiography in the Twentieth Century" *History and Theory* 41 (2002): 79-87.
- Foley, Barbara. "From U.S.A. to Ragtime: Notes on the Form of Historical Consciousness in Modern Fiction" *American Literature* 50.1(1978):85-105.
- Foucault, Michel. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History". *Intellectual History Reader A Critical Introduction*. Ed. Beerendra Pandey (2005):81-102.
- ... "Truth and power" *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams.
- ... *The Archeology of Knowledge*. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. London: Tavistock, 1972.
- Green, Martin. "Nostalgia Politics". *American Scholar* 45.1 (1975): 841-845.
- Greenblatt, Stephen and Giles Gunn. *Redrawing the Boundaries: the Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. New York: The Modern Language Association, 1992.

- Hean, Theo D'. "History, (counter-) Postmodernism, and Postcolonialism". *European Journal of English Studies* 1.2 (1997): 205-216.
- Henry, Matthew A. "Problematized narratives: History as fiction in E. L. Doctorow's Billy Bathgate". *Critique* 39.1 (1997):32-40.
- Hutcheon, Linda. "Intervisionist Literary Histories: Nostalgic, Pragmatic, or Utopian?" *Modern Language Quarterly* 59.4 (1989): 401-417.
- Mattheson, William. "Doctorow's Ragtime". *Explicator* 42.2 (1984): 21-22.
- Pandey, Beerendra. "Benjamin's Ambivalence towards the City and Sex: Reading Baudelaire in *Illumination and Reflections*" *Presentations of Postcolonialism in English: New Orientations* (2007): 61-74.
- Park, Johns G. "The Politics of Polyphony: The Fiction of E. L. Doctorow". *Twentieth Century Literature* 37.4 (1991):454-463.
- Roberts, Brian. "Blackface Minstrelsy and Jewish Identity: Fleshing Out Ragtime as the Central Metaphor in E. L. Doctorow's *Ragtime*" *Critique* 45.3 (2004): 247-259.
- Wutz, Michael. "Literary Narrative and Information Culture: Garbage, Waste, and Residue in the work of E. L. Doctorow" *Contemporary Literature* 44.3 (2003): 501-535.
- Zammito, John. "Ankersmit And Historical Representation". *History and Theory* 44 (2005):155-181.