

I. Introduction

This thesis focuses on Nobel Laureate Sir Vidhyadhar Suraj Prasad Naipaul's novel *A Way in the World* (1995). It is a book of nine sectionalized meditations through which Naipaul arrives at a deeper understanding of multicultural heritage and hybrid identity. Naipaul, in this novel seeks to translate liminality by incorporating individual stories into the geo-political and socio-cultural history of Trinidad. Naipaul has created a new world in which he fights against historical incompleteness, absence and liminality by way of reenacting the historical past in the present. In the novel, some chapters were subtitled as "An unwritten story", unwritten in one way or another. These stories either based on verifiable materials or about historical figures, are intended to be true, yet lost histories. Naipaul has also demonstrated in these three unwritten stories new ways of reenacting and transforming history by bringing a personalized past into the cultural and historical past of Trinidad. Naipaul seems to be more interested in exposing the complication of multiple perspectives on the historical past. Naipaul repatterns the documentary materials and rewrites a historical fiction about Raleigh and Miranda. He rectifies and reconfigures the historical past of Trinidad by imaginative reinterpretation and repatterning of documentary evidences. By rectifying and reconfiguring the historical past, Naipaul is trying to combat liminality to accomplish continuity and renewal.

Instead of following the tradition of grand narrative, Naipaul presents different narratives that rather make the text novel of narratives. He patiently gives a considerable detail of the characters as if he is equally familiar to all. Don Jose and Naipaul himself narrate the story of Sir Walter Raleigh, Francisco Miranda, lebrun. Naipaul minutely observes minor events, lower class working people and narrates them while he goes on journey. It justifies Naipaul's sympathy to the immigrants' and

the marginal people. Naipaul adopts the material for his novels that are recaptured from the past but examines them through a different eye. Sometimes he uses his own experience as the subject matter of writing. But such presentation is not of the experiences in crude form rather with some kinds of distortion. He sometimes begins with the historical facts and continues them through fictionalization and such blending of facts and fiction gives a magic realistic touch. Like Salman Rusdie's *Imaginary Homeland*, Naipaul bridges the dichotomy of facts and fiction. This novel is based on the historical facts of Trinidad and other Caribbean countries in the colonial period. It seems more like travelogue rather than a work of fiction. It is good blending of the real events with the fictional lives.

V. S. Naipaul, son of a Brahmin journalist, was born in Trinidad and educated at Queen's Royal College in Port of Spain. In 1950, he won a scholarship to study at Oxford University arrived from Indian Hindus whose father migrated to Trinidad as a agreement servant, he thought himself as a rootless man as he found himself in new vicinity with the people experiencing different social and cultural practices of which he was honestly unaware.

After his graduation, he started his life long career as a freelance writer. It was then for the first time he felt himself as a rootless writer finding himself far from his source culture, language and people. It is proclaimed that Naipaul is probably the greatest living writer in English. It is so not only because of his craftsmanship in writing is innovative but also because his fictions and travel memories are the profound exploration of human condition- damaging effect of "Third World" exemplified in cultural alienation and illusory freedom. He produced much of non-fictional work in his maturity. His political essays and travel memories help to forward his ideas about the post colonial scenario of the world and at the same time

his works makes him an outspoken critic of mysteries and controversies prevailing in the colonial aftermath.

Naipaul first came to literary attention in the late 1950s and early 60s, as a part of a group of writers from the Caribbean who relocated themselves in England. Alongside him were such novelist as George Lamming, Edgar Mittle-holzer, Sam Selvon, Andrew Salkey and Jan Carew. Naipaul however differed from colleagues in his unequivocally expressed desires to put his Caribbean past behind him, to escape from what he perceived to be colonial oblivion. Unlike other Caribbean writers or African writers such as Achebe, Soyinka and Sembene, who at this historical stage, were inspired by the ambition to be a new voice to their people's history, to create a modern literature for their respective countries, to reexamine the whole legacy of a colonial past. Naipaul wanted nothing whatsoever to do with such 'political' writing. He consciously wrote in an oppositional tradition to these other 'commonwealth' or as they later come to be known "postcolonial writers". For him neither Africa nor the Caribbean, nor for the matter India, was a viable world in which to pursue a writing career. The only set of cultural values that possessed and validity were those of the West. In a radio interview in New Zealand in 1972, he explained his feelings as follow:

Coming from a place like Trinidad, which I always felt existed on the edge of the world, far away from every thing else, not only physically but also in terms of culture, I felt I had to try very hard to rejoin the world. So, I had this great drive to achievement. (5)

Naipaul stands among the main contemporary English novelist not only by writing fictions and travel memories but also by using his remarkable and peculiar style of blending different genre of writing. He was severely criticized for his ideas of

representation of the Muslim world and religion by such range of critics as Edward Said and Salman Rushdie.

As a postcolonial novelist, Naipaul situates his novel in both colonial as well as excolonial societies and gives a perceptive account of the complexities inherent to such societies. The major themes of his novel are related to the problem of colonized people, their sense of alienation from the landscapes, their identity crisis, and paradox of freedom and the problem of neocolonialism in the excolonies. In his first four novels, he deals inclusively with the colonial society of Trinidad, the island of his nativity and its preoccupied with themes of dispossession, homelessness, alienation, mimicry and the search for an authentic selfhood. The characters in this novel are continually in search of an identity and home. In later novels, Naipaul emerges as a novelist of post imperial crisis. His critical observant eye and his uncompromising commitment to truth lay base the hard facts about excolonial societies. Naipaul makes it clear that political independence has changed nothing and the imperialist states continue to retain their hold on the former colonies through the newer, more camouflaged methods of neocolonialism. The characters in the later novels are even more lost and insecure than those depicted on the early novels.

Much of Naipauls writing issues from his personal experiences of being a displaced member of minority and religion in Trinidad. However, his multiple heritage places him in a position that makes it possible for him to render a detached account of his subjective experiences. Being an Indian by ancestry, Trinidad by birth and English by intellectual training and residence. Naipaul is Indian a man with a broader perspective.

Naipaul is seeking a home in his writing, which has become a part of his life. His characters are also in the process of creating a home and thereby try to establish a

coherent belonging to their root. His writing expresses the ambivalence of the exile and the problem of an outsider, a feature of his own experiences as an Indian in the west. India, a West Indian in England and nomadic intellectual in a post colonial world. Naipaul really wants to write his history on one of his autobiographical characters. Ralph Singh, who in *Mimic Man* says "my first instinct was towards writing of history" (81). Like Naipaul himself, almost all of his characters are entangled and confused by their cultural history (Fedar 252). He emphasized on Naipauls "search for truth in writing and by that he tries to show a loss" (5).

Thus, Naipaul is understood as a displaced writer from his root, who tries hopelessly to recreate his own past, history, ancestry and culture. He felt himself "Dislocated" and an alienated writer, writing from a margin. When he had come in India, in February 2002 to attend a meeting of IWE (Indian writers in English), he said that he belongs nowhere. Rahul Singh asked a question about his belongings "Have you yourself started feeling more of an Indian?" Naipaul reviews everything that he was born in Trinidad, spent most of his life in England and India was his land of his ancestors. So he is not an English or an Indian and nor a Trinidadian. He is his own person. He spoke the same thing when he received the Nobel prize in 2001. This is the problem of belonging and therefore, the problem of identity.

Naipaul's novel *A Way in the World* is a deceptively complex narrative in nine parts, comprise of autobiographical fragments that are set against reworking of Naipauls earlier writings. But, whichever way the narratives takes us it is always intimately connected to the live and work of V.S. Naipaul. His characters, ideas, events from his past being elegantly Juggled, set down and picked up again with technical brilliance that comes with lifetimes experiences.

A Way in the World deals with writer's interaction with history. The locale of *A Way in the World* is Trinidad. In this novel, he consciously blends history with autobiography and fiction. Through the nine linked narratives he offers searching reflection on the relationship among the personal, national and world histories. As a result, Columbus, Sir Walter Raleigh, Simon Bolivar and his fellow Venezuelan revolutionary Francisco Miranda appears in this book. They contribute to the development of the themes related to the colonial conquest and its impact on a country and its people (Comment XII).

In this novel, Naipaul fuses both travel and Fictional Paradigms which is unique experiences. In *A Way in the World*, he totally fulfills his vision of the new travel fiction complex. It is an extremely confessional and personal account of travel experiences and autobiographical memories that span Naipaul's entire writing career. It seems a "complex of travel autobiography-fiction" (Sarkar 198). All of the travel strategies mentioned in it are 'journalistic, ethnographic, historical, philosophical and autobiographical strategies along with Naipaul's typical fictional elements of characterization, tone and imagery" (Sarkar 198). Naipaul has included these autobiographical strategies in his fiction, in characters, situations, setting, description and imagery. He also used them in his travel writings especially with the use of memory as a tool for genealogical and historical reconstruction. Historical allusions, facts, and autobiography are fastidiously intertwined in fictional passage. Naipaul's typical imagery is found in novel.

The fires of the rubbish dump burned higher and day. The smoke was black turning to dark brown; it often billowed over the highway; the smell was high; you had to turn up your car windows. The people of the Shanty town, men and women and children, worked in this smoke

[. . .]. The local corbeaux, black, heavy, hunched, hopped about the slopes of rubbish, the children of the shanty town ran between the traffic on the rubbish-strewn highway to get to the dump. (AWW 37)

A Way in the World integrated the travelogue with regarding the narratives techniques, the autobiographical sense and the fictional elements" (Rolden-Santiago 200). These three areas had always seemed to be working together in Naipauls narrative but in his letter writing, they have been vulcanized in totally integrated.

His novel *A Way in the World* offers an account of this self deception on a grand scale. As it investigates the colonial past of Trinidad and Venezuela and their relationship to England and Spain as well as to the United States. The novel reaches back in time to unravel the historical causes that have produced the world that Naipaul grew up in. it is the imaginative journey upon which he set out in the novel. *A Way in the World* is an "imaginative recreation of the past, not historical research perse but it doesn't evade its responsibility towards truth". (FOLKS- 173) In Naipaul's view we are both the inheritors of the tarnished legacies of the past and responsible agents in an unfolding history that is equally at risk.

Naipaul, reaching into the past 150 or 200 years and beyond, he intends to bring the past to life and to position the past in relation to the present. In this novel *A Way in the World* Columbus, Raleigh and Francisco Miranda a lesser known but more pertinent example of New World adventurer, who are painstakingly summoned back to life, to reappear before us in their ignominious mixture of incredible idealism and crass ambition (FOLKS, 173).

Naipaul focuses on the actual condition of human life, not on the utopian plans that have haunted modern political movements and brought with them so much devastation. Given this focus, we should have to admit that at very least; the record of

postcolonial rule on almost every continent has been wretched. In fact “Naipaul finds that the break with imperial authority, not only in Trinidad but also in nearly every place that it has occurred, has been followed by horrendous period of violence, impoverishment, and corruption lasting decades if not centuries” (174). This is the rule of black power that Naipaul describes in Trinidad the revolution, the tyranny and corruption in the newly independent African States. One of the most salient features of the post war period in Trinidad, a time of far reaching faith in the independent movement, is the actual diminishment of human life. Naipauls fiction is a warning not just for so called colonial culture but for imperial culture as well. His method is to portray figures who are representative of the destructive effect that he observes in postcolonial societies. One such figure is the Venezuelan whom Naipaul meets on a plane side from Trinidad to casacas. Mannel Sorzano is seemingly a very fortunate individual, an ethnic Indian from Trinidad who has migrated illegally to Venezuela to work during the oilbloom. Sorzano, as a labourer, discovers a treasure of nineteenth century gold coins. In fact, he lives an unsettled, troubled existence within a brutal and lawless culture. A wise and careful person, Sorzano understand that, in a country dominated by the destructive legacy of the collapse of the Spanish empire. There is danger everywhere. “He is Shrewd and disciplined enough to make his way within this environment” (FOLKS 175). His son Antonio has difficult at several stages of his life. After his wife has an affair with a well to do Syrian merchant, Antonio, who is employed by the Guardia Nacional, thinks of killing his rival and perhaps his wife as well, action that would effectively end his own life.

Naipaul’s strategy of contesting liminality by translating the historical past in terms of fictionalizing history and historicizing fiction can be better understood with reference to Ricoeur's observation of the Analogue. Ricoeur concludes that

[. . .] analogy acquires its full sense only against the backdrop of the dialectic of same and other: The past is indeed what is to be re-enacted in the mode of the identical. But it is so only to the extent that it is also what is absent from all of our construction. (36)

The historical past that has been reconstructed is a recreation from repatterning the similar and imagining the difference in the 'real' past. Also, the experience of the historical past is no more than a historical awareness built and commented on knowledge or understanding. Fiction, through which experience is transmitted and transformed, demands continued rectification and reinterpretation. Naipaul explains that "every exploration, every book added to (his) knowledge, qualified (his) earlier idea of his self and the world" (Naipaul, 2002:168). The expansion of knowledge and qualification of earlier ideas suggest re enacting and refiguring experience in different light in a new book. In this novel *A Way in the World*, Naipaul is rewriting, and reinterpreting the history of Trinidad and other Caribbean countries being a traveler and writer. In Trinidad, ancestral past was forgotten and cultural document were unread colonial education remained abstract and explained nothing. So, Naipaul repatterns the documentary materials and rewrites a historical fiction about historical figures like Sir Walter Raleigh and Francisco Miranda. For this, Naipaul rediscovering and replotting the same documentary facts differently with reenactment of historical past in the present. Naipaul has questioned the generic boundaries between history and fiction and transformed the historical incompleteness, liminality, absence by reconstructing and reenacting personal stories too. He has fictionalized the history by creative imagination. In the novel, narrator tries to fulfill the void by inventively rediscovering Miranda's lost papers. Miranda is

known through the recreated epistolary discourses which he wrote to his wife shows an integration of fictional and factual elements.

From the point of view of traveler, he is trying to accomplish continuity and renewal. He tries to fulfill the lost history, unwritten history of past which is lost and not found yet. He imaginatively creates the letters which describes the historical figures from the different perspectives. He fights against the incomplete representation of colonial period on journals photographs and their travel books which is incomplete representation of Trinidad by colonizer. So he deals with lost history of that period.

The issue of the present research is also not other than to give a new historical reading to the text which undoubtedly is a new approach developed in the area of cultural studies. In addition to the aforementioned critical reading, this reading is basically based on the Foucauldian idea of history that lays history of the periphery rather than that of centre. Nietzsche's idea of history, Foucauldian idea of history, discourse and power will be discussed as prime theoretical subject. The research can be significant in the sense that it will try to explore the depiction of various historical characters which were ignored by so called mainstream history.

The present research has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter is the synopsis of the entire research work. It begins with the short introduction of author, brief outline of the novel, theme and style of the author, and an introductory outline of the present research study itself.

The second chapter tries to explain the theoretical modality that is to be applied in this research work. It provides the short introduction of the terms related to new historicism. For that, new historicist critics will be used for tool. New historicists' idea of textuality of history and the historicity of text will be used as base formula.

The third chapter will analyze the text as considerable length. It will short out some extracts from the text as evidences to prove the hypothesis of the study. *A Way in the World* reenact and replot the same documentary materials and a facts about historical figures form the vantage point of a traveler and writer. This past serves as the core of this research work.

The fourth chapter is the conclusion of entire study on the basis of the analysis of the text done in chapter three. It will conclude the explanation and arguments put forward preceding chapter.

II. Travel Writing and History of the Margin

Confuting Official History

The official history is a recorder of facts and facts dominates over fictions. The official history asks “what happened?” and “what does the events tells us about history?” Official historicism believes that history is series of events that have linear, causal relationship. They believe that, we are perfectly capable of objective analysis, of uncovering the facts about historical events, and those facts can sometimes reveals the spirit of an age. The official history studies literary works in terms of historical periods, such as the Neoclassical, Romantic or modernist periods. Finally traditional historians generally believe that history is progressive, that the human species is improving over the course of time, advancing in its moral, cultural and technical accomplishments.

Official history does not give space to narrate the stories of hardship, struggle, agonies, hope, frustration, and so on. Marginalized voices are dominated. Human actions and sufferings, various kinds of intimate relationship, psychological and physical problems and undiscovered shattering and experiences are shifted into a marginalized position. Socio-historical upheavals may be explored by history, but some fundamental human feelings and attitudes that persists through the ages despite other changes are not recorded by history. Death as one of the eternal touches of life has no meaning in the scientific subjects; but its presence is felt and assessed in the work of imagination.

Official history is limited in its vision and reach and it has not any instruct relationship between people's inner and outer existence. So, against this, new historicism challenged the method of official history writing and seeks the truth in dimension of human experiences.

The affair of human beings are constantly in progress. So, there has been a great change in the proper nature and scope of the history. History a noble subject dealing with the story of the past, should examine analyze and explains the story in the intelligible and fascinating way. In other words, the proper understanding of man by man is the business of history, which it does by narrating man's unique ideas, thought and ideas. In the past, history was regarded as a mere record of events in a descriptive manner. Now, this notion has changed and critical and scientific study of history has begun. In this context, Prof. B. Sheik Ali remarks “History becomes study of reality in its aspects of becoming the functions of historian is neither to love the past nor to condemn the past in order to understand its bearing in the present” (8). Therefore, historical activities involve three different types of functions which should be performed together. The first is to get at the truths and to know the entire human past as it actually happened. The second is to interpret the facts to access to evaluate and to explain their significance. The third is to present the ideas in a clear manner. These three functions make the historian a scientific to gather facts, a philosopher to interpret them and literati to express them.

History is concerned with analyzing, explaining and describing the events of the past, it is important for a historian to remember the nature of historical facts. A historian can't escape from the facts. A historian may attempt to be objective but he can't remain entirely free from bias because the motives and the consciousness he has are sure to have an impact onto the events of the past. The standard of values which the historian applies to his study of the past is determined by social, political religious, philosophical and economic ideas of his age. To a Marxist historian, the growth of human thoughts and behavior are primarily related to the economic condition s/he has.

So, history is the “result of interplay of man with his environment with his fellowmen” (Shreedharan,1). History is the living part of man. It is the attempt made by man through centuries to describe and interpret his own past. The attempt to reconstruct the past in “a scholarly fashion, sticking to certain define rules of establishing facts, interpreting evidences, dealing with source material etc” (qtd. in E. Shreedharan 4).

As Foucault says that history has no constant human subject which enables us to identify a coherent or constant human condition or nature can't show any rational development i.e. the gradual triumph of human rationality over human nature; has no overarching purpose or goal and being without any constant, its study can't offer any comfort or consolation either. All these shows that man isn't a universal category.

Foucault tells us what effective history is:

“effective history differs from traditional history in being without constant. Nothing in man-not even his body – is sufficiently stable to serve as a basis for his self-recognition or for understanding other man . . . History becomes effective the degree that it introduces discontinuity into our every being as it divides our emotions, dramatizes our instincts, multiples our body and sets itself against itself. (qtd. in E. Shreedharan 285)

What Foucault sees in man's past is not order but haphazard conflict, not general agreement but incessant struggle. Struggle is unavoidable because individuals remain caught up in webs of contingency, discontinuity and incessant struggle, so are history knowledge, as assertion which deprives the past of its hegemony over the present. So, it becomes necessary for history to be rewritten from time to time.

There are other aspects involved in the nature of historical facts. At first some scholars think that history refits itself in the sense that things of the world are the same all the time but the ways are different every time. Although historical events do not occur in the same order and in the same place they have a basic unity and confirm to a pattern which is easily perceived on close study. In the absence of this basic unity, historical laws couldn't have been drawn. As history is related to the life of mankind, and as man is helpless at the hands of his own nature the actions that follow have a common pattern. It is the nature of man to fight and hence war is a psychological fact when is seen through ages.

Those who oppose the view that history repeats itself contend that change is the law of nature if historical events were repeated; the problem of growth, development and progress wouldn't arise. Toynbee says that the growth and development of a civilization depends upon differentiation to integration and withdrawal and return. Thus, those who deny the repetition of history point out the futility of any attempt to reduce all facts to a common pattern.

The notion of continuity in history is based on the belief in the continuity of thought and the conception of time in the terms of totalization of the movements of consciousness. But the reality of the past presents itself in the form of individual, disparate, autonomous events or pieces of happenings which render any idea of unity or continuity in history throughout meaningless. So, history is necessarily discontinuous.

Instead of taking history as a set of fixed objective and stable things, New historicist deals with the text as a diversity of dissonant voice. In this respect M.H. Abrams in his book *Glossary of literary term* writes:

History is not a homogeneous and stable pattern of facts and events which can be used on “the background” to explain the literature of an era or which can be adverted to (as in early Marxist criticism) as the “material” conditions that, in a unilateral way, determines the particularities of a literary text. In contrast to such views, a literary text is said by new historicist to be embedded in its context, and it a constant interaction and interchange with other components inside the network of institutions, beliefs and cultural power-relations, practices and products that, in their ensemble, constitute what we call history.”

(184)

Louise Montrose described the new historicism as “a reciprocal concern with the historicity of text and the textuality of history” (242). The historicity of texts basically refers to the cultural specific the social embodiment, of all modes of writing whether it is social, political, economical or religious not only the texts that critic study but also texts in which we study them. The textuality of history is related with past. But the relation between the past and present is not coherent but exhibits discontinuities or breaks. By this they hope to distance the earlier text and so sharpen their ability to detect its difference from their present ideological assumption.

According to many new historicists, literature does not occupy a “trans-historical” aesthetic realm which is independent of the economic, social and political condition specific to an era, nor is literature subject to timeless criteria of artistic value. Instead, a literary text is simply one of many kinds of texts, religious, philosophical, legal, scientific and so on – all of which are formed and structured by the particular conditions of a time and place and among which the literary text has neither unique status, our special privilege. A related fallacy of mainstream criticism,

according to new historicist, was to view a literary text as an autonomous body of fixed meaning that where to form an organic whole in which are conflicts are artistically resolved. On the contrary, it is claimed, many literary texts consists of a diversity of dissonant voices, and there voices express not only the orthodox but also the subordinated and subversive forces of the era in which text was produced.

History and Power Relations

Foucault developed a theory of discourse in relation to power structure operating in a society. His main thesis is that discourse is involved in power. He views that discourses are rooted in social institutions and that social and political power operated through discourses is the ordering force that governs every institution. This enables institution to exercise power and dominate. Those who possess the authority to define discourse exclude others who are not in power. Discourse informs us of the state of affairs, so it is informative or misinformative. Discourse also tells us of the propriety or impropriety of something and consequently influences our attitudes, opinion and behaviour. The exclusive function of discourse is to serve as a transparent representative of things and ideas standing outside it. Therefore it is directive too. M.H. Abrams in Glossary of literary terms writes:

Discourse has become the focal term along critics who oppose the deconstruction concept of a “general text” that functions independently of particular historical condition. Instead they conceive of discourse as social parlance, or language system, but of particular a social condition class structures, and power-relationship that 'after in the course of history. (262)

Following Nietzsche, Foucault believes that we can never possess an objective knowledge of history “because historical writings are always entangled in tropes”

(Selden, 102). Discourse is produced within a real world power struggle. It is used as a means to gain or sometimes even to subvert power. For Foucault, discourse is a central human activity. He is interested in the process how discursive practices change over time.

Michel Foucault's concept of power, knowledge and truth are closely interlinked. The major concern of power is with the language and the society. The language is a social system. The knowledge is associated with language, because it is produced through the latter, and the language is related to the society but not with individual component. So, it is the power. In this sense, language is the means of replacing and displacing the power.

Michel Foucault, while defining truth and power points out that these two are interwoven and attached. They are not isolated concepts. He states:

The importance things here, I believe, is that truth is not outside power, nor the privilege of those who have succeeded in liberating themselves. Truth is the thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraints. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth its 'general politics' of truth, that is, the type of discourse which accepts. And makes functions as true.

(144)

Truth and power are just the two sides of the same coin but it is the linguistic discourse that originates the truth and truth produces the power and it is knowledge that brings the better discourse and effective power produced through the better knowledge. In this regard, Rama Selden says:

The real effects of power are exercised through linguistic discourse which is the result of knowledge because all knowledge is an

expression of the will to power and therefore, the discourse of knowledge is involved in power and therefore, the discourse of knowledge is involved in power but will to knowledge is not power rather it is the impersonal force. (83)

Thus one can make a conceptual connection that knowledge and discourse are inseparable. The discourses are produced within real world of power struggle. Power can not exist without truth and it is unstable because it is he who controls the power also controls the discourse. Power is made in relation to knowledge and the power changes with the changes of knowledge.

Foucault's ideas of counter-history avoids the primary to the idea of individual and of subjectivity. Alce McHowl and Wendy Grace in *A Foucault Primer: Discourse Power and Subject* writes:

Foucault's thought of the human subject itself is an effect of, to some extent subjection. Subjection refers to particular, historically located disciplinary process and concepts, which enable us to consider ourselves as individual subjects and which constrain us from thinking otherwise. (3)

Foucault with his new thought counters traditional idea of continuity, multiplicity and difference, he questioned the idea to think historically or an epistemic change was the province of the great thinker and says there was a general move to trace the paths of “system of thought” as objects in their own right regardless of their thinker. For Foucault system of thought came to be known as discursive formation and methodology of analysis comes under the domain of archeology.

Foucault's interest in history was different from the traditional notion of history. He was fascinated by the facts that even ideas concepts, experiences as well

as problems all have histories. He critically analyzes and interprets the histories of changing attitudes and modes of thought of the given period. In the introduction, chapter of the Archeology of knowledge entitled "Nietzsche, Genealogy. History" Foucault develops his own ideas about history. Every epoch of history is rejected by Foucault because his idea of genealogy conceives history as a process of discontinuity. According to him, a true genealogist is one who goes against the pursuit of origin and absolute truth. In this sense he gets Nietzsche as a true genealogist.

Idealist philosopher like Hegel and Kant believed history as a continual progression of human life that is based on certain rules and guidelines. They tried to present objective truth without giving their own opinion and pretend themselves to be disinterested. They also tried to create coherent identity and the synthesis is the most important thing to create certain identity. For Kant knowledge is gained, in a real sense, with the synthesis a priori and a posteriori. They believed that the history is moving towards a teleological point, a point of perfection.

A genealogist's view is different from idealist. For Foucault every epoch of history is not connected with each other rather it is a kind of fragmented series of events, a chain of unrelated events. For genealogist even insignificant and minor events are significant because they don't believe in the point possibility of teleology and concept of origin. History for them is not linear and cyclic. Critics see Foucauldian terms like archeology and genealogy as tool. Arun Gupta in his *Healing Thought on Tender Theory* asserts. "For Foucault, archeology and genealogy are complementary rather than being too different approaches, if archeology studies statements, genealogy studies statements but in relation to power. These statements are in a continuous process even today" (116).

Like Nietzsche, Foucault also talks about three different ways in the analysis of history. He names them periodic, dissociative and sacrificial history. Ideas of such histories were derived from Nietzsche's monumental, antiquarian and critical history. There are both similarities and differences in their ideas. Periodic history can be used to mask or hide one's identity. By bringing up the images of the great figures of the past by taking bogus of so called and make up for the unreality of their own identity. It would be possible to overcome this falsity by parodying the idea of monument history as a parody in itself but Foucault sees this history equally important.

Dissociative history, according to Foucault, is the systematic dissociative of history from history instead of imposing it on identity. This uses of history correspond to Nietzsche's antiquarian history but in opposite way. Nietzsche's antiquarian history seeks to discover continuities in which our present is supposed to have been rooted where as dissociative history seeks to explore the discontinuity so that the origin and the series of logical progression are more imposition and not reality of history. The purpose of history that is guided by genealogy is not to discover the root as origin of our identity rather to show that there is not definite root as such, since identity is a matter of process and perceptual change. Foucault differentiates his concept of dissociative history with Nietzsche's antiquarian history by the following lines:

The purpose of history, guided by genealogy is not to discover the roots of our identity, but to commit itself to its dissipation. It doesn't seek to define our unique threshold of emergence, the homeland to which metaphysical on promise to return. It seeks to make visible all of those discontinuities of soil, language and urban life in which our present is rooted [. . .]. (335)

Foucault's third use of history is sacrificed history which corresponds to Nietzsche's critical history. According to Foucault, such use of history sacrifices knowledge and its destructive uses. This uses of history and reaches nearer to the more reliable truth about the past. It reveals the knowledge of past which is based upon injustice of the system that ledge is not a nature of universal truth rather it endlessly multiplies the risk and danger and it dissolves the unity of subject. Foucault suppose it's the most reliable one. He takes it as an alternative to critical history since he sees problem with critical history.

History, Colonialism and Travel Writing

European explanation of other parts of the world began with by sea across the Mediterranean and into the Atlantic. Although there are many legendary accounts of early voyages and considerable historical evidences of extensive, ever intercontinental travel by people such as Viking in the dark and middle ages. European travel beyond the traditional fringe of the Mediterranean appears to have taken a giant leap forward in the early renaissance. This was partly due to the decline of the Muslim control of the middle and Far East, which allowed travelers to proceed under the paxmongolica as far as China. Partly due to the advances in mapping, explores such as Portuguese and the Spanish traveled into the Atlantic itself to discover the off-shore island of the Canaries and find out new places and land.

In addition to such physical exploration, however 'travel' also began as the imaginative construction of the other people and places. This intermixing of actual exploratory voyages with fictive representation of otherness rooted in the imaginative practices of the Middle Ages persists through and beyond the actual eighteenth century circumnavigation of the globe and the extensive travels in the land-mass interior that followed in the nineteenth century. Of course, the idea of exploration and

discovery in such traveling is profoundly euro-centric, since that explores purported discovered was invariably already known to local indigenous peoples, many of whom led white explores to local landmarks, rivers and source of food that enabled them to survive. Yet these discoveries were credited to the European explorers as though, such places had not existed beforehand.

Travel and exploration in the Renaissance period was seen as strictly and unshamedly commercial and exploitation in its purpose. During the eighteenth century however, new kind of traveler in search of new geographical and biological information, and the Missionaries who began increasingly to travel to spread the Christian religion and who, like the scientific explorer saw their interaction with the people of the new world. Initially, these new kinds of travelers were of ten sponsored by trading companies or were attached to government expedition. However, their travels and their account of these travels whether ostensibly factual or fictionally embellished, were as effectively 'capturing as commercial exploitation or conquest.

Accounts of European travel and reports of exploitation to the Royal society helped produce and maintain ideas of Europe itself, ideas framed by Europe's sense of its difference from the place and cultures that were being explored and reported on. The knowledge produced by exploratory travel of these various groups is at the heart of the control of the new possessions. Once 'explored' and so 'known,' these territories were possessed and able to cataloged on under the central of influence of one or other of the colonizing powers. Such travel accounts were quickly appropriated to fictional forms in works as diverse as *The Tempest*, *Gulliver's Travels* and *Robinson Crusoe*.

Travel literature is a travel writing considered to have value as literature. Travel literature typically records the people, events, sights and feelings of an author who is touring a foreign place for the pleasure of travel. An individual work is

sometimes called a travelogue or itinerary. To be called literature the work must have a coherent narrative or insight and value, beyond a mere logging of dates and events, such as diary or ship log. Literature that recounts adventure, exploitation and conquest is often grouped under travel literature but it also has its own genre outdoor literature.

The general view holds that travel narrative are objective and scientific, and they faithfully represent geographical, historical and social reality. Of course, this is totally false notion because travel narratives are embedded with fictional elements and figures. Likewise, fiction includes many 'travel' constituents and style, both deal with representations that are many times exaggerated and inexact, sometimes slurred and grotesque. This is true of many types of written discourses, such as historical writings. Serafin Roldan-Santigao writes that “the distinction between fiction (created) and travel writing (factual) is a false one but also point to the misrepresentation, distortion, orientation and search for cheap effects that characterize much travel writing” (170). This argument concerns around the notion that 'western' travel writing is geared to notion of colonial narratives and its quest for representing the 'other' in post colonial societies and it does this by referencing the 'other' in relation to the metropolitan center. But what is interesting is the categories and kinds of travel writing.

There are three different types of travel writing which have been employed by writers in the past: 1) Information oriented, 2) Experimental (Sentimentalizing) and 3) Intellectual-analytic. The first category, information-oriented travel writing, tries to be more scientific and objective and it “focuses on geographic, mineralogical, botanical, agricultural, economic, ecological and ethnographic details” (171). The authorial voice is minimized, supposedly, and landscapes and its description and documentation

is placed in the front. Of course, there is an ever present hierarchy of information order which even denied is linked to imperial power structures and the global system.

The second deals with “emotional sentiment and involvement” (171). The writer goes into highly personal and emotional displays, and there is an emphasis on adventure and drama. Unlike the first type, there is a 'main character' the traveler and his voice, he is the protagonist and primary focus and there is a 'heroic paradigm.' Early American captivity narratives during the seventeenth to nineteenth century can be said to be travel or exploration writings, and they are mostly experimental in nature. This experimental mode “cast the author/traveler into the major role (as representative of the metropolitan centre) and the 'natives' in the role of the cultural other” (171).

The third category is the intellectual-analytic, the most subjective of the travel modes and most controversial. Roldan-Santiago states “This is the form of writing where the narrative emerges as a kind of intellectual social commentator” (171). The authority is not derived from the presentation or documentation of information, but from the authorial voice that is, “from the acuity of observations and depth of analysis” (171). It is as if the author first sells himself and his name, then his travelogue with his own views and depth in analysis.

When Britain and other colonizers have been practicing the pinnacle of power, discourses produce of that time had been the effective support for the European empire to dominate the native land. Writing of all kinds was motivated by the theories concerning the superiority of European culture. They misrepresented the native culture and their land as being inferior, and interpreted the geography, religion, history and culture according to their imagination. Although colonization was supposed to be political phenomena, it's effect in culture can't be ignored. Cultural misrepresentation was the great challenge that natives were facing in the colonial era. Ellek Boehmer in the book *Colonial and Post colonial Literature* observes these phenomena: “Cultural representation was the central

first to the process of obtaining independence from the colonizers.” With Boehmer’s view, it becomes clear that in the process of both colonization and decolonization, culture was the equally important aspect.

Cultural confusion and identity crisis, caused due to the colonization, are most important aspects in the writing of post colonial era. During the last two decades, as a major critical discourses in humanities. Post colonialism has occupied its place among other theories like post structuralism, psychoanalysis, feminism etc. As a consequence of its diverse and interdisciplinary uses, it has generated numerous corpuses of specialized academic writings.

The publication of Edward Said’s *Orientalism* (1978) is one of the major events in the developments of post colonial theory. The contribution of Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault’s ideas should not be undervalued because Said’s definition of Orientalism as a discourse is based upon Foucauldean idea. Post colonial theory and writings are marked by “ambivalence.” Ambivalence refers to the complex mixture of attraction and repulsion while characterizing the relationship between colonizers and colonized. It’s way of unsettling the colonial dominance. Bill Ashcroft in *key concept in post colonial studies* writes: “Ambivalence describes fluctuating relationship between mimicry and mockery” (13).

Influence by the theoretical and discursive practices of post structuralism and new historical reading of the history, post colonial writings have always centered on to produce discourses of resistance by subverting and reevaluating the established traditions of literary and rhetorical practices. Those conscious and unconscious movement of resistance as seen in the text of post colonial world not only de-established the colonial discourses of domination as pointed out by Said but they also create a new space and history to locate the new post colonial reality and experiences.

III. Reconstruction of the Historical past in *A Way in the World*

The Novel as the History of 'Otherwise'

History is the reenactment of the past in the present by documentary and imaginative construction. In the novel *A Way in the World* units are subtitled as unwritten story. Naipaul has imaginatively created those stories about the historical character of the colonial period, and lost facts and documents relating them to the historical past of Trinidad and other Caribbean countries.

In the section "Inheritance" Naipaul describes about the migrated Trinidadian who came to work there from other countries and they are unknown about their ancestry. They are unknown in the history because they are not represented in the history drafted by colonizers. Their voice is not heard. One of them is Leonard Side. His past heritage was unknown to all but he lives and works in Trinidad. About his deeds Naipaul writes:

Leonard side was doing things with dough, using those hairy fingers, to knead dough . . . was teaching the women how to make bread and cake . . . teach them how to ice a cake forcing with those hairy fingers colored icing out of the special cones or moulds he had. (5)

He presents Side as an artist and helpful person. Leonard side is the representative of the whole migrated people. They work there but "the recorded history of the place is short" (8) and they are not included in the "documents of the resettlement" which are available in the city, in the Registrar Generals office. There is no idea of where Leonard Side and his ancestors had come from. So Naipaul creates the ancestry of Leonard Side through his imagination by linking his name with version of "Sayed". He writes "the name Side might have been a version of Sayed and that his grandfather

or great grandfather might have come from a Shia Muslim group in India"(8). About his inheritance he creates next version that says:

I can give you that historical bird's eye view. But I can not really explain the mystery of Leonard Side's inheritance. I might say that an ancestor of Leonard side came from the dancing group of Lukhnow. The lewd man who painted their faces and tried to live like woman. But that would be a fragment of his inheritance a fragment of truth. We cannot understand all the traits we have inherited. Sometimes we can be strangers to ourselves. (8)

This shows that Naipaul creates inheritance of Leonard Side by linking his name to a Muslim group by using his imaginative creativity. He tries to create history of marginal group who are unknown and not included in the mainstream history. They do not get space in the history created by colonizer and power holders because they were powerless. Colonizers write history to suit their ideology and they wanted to prolong their power by not representing marginal group in their history.

Likewise narrator recollects his past history as a general worker in the port of Spain, a city of Trinidad . He came to the city between leaving school and going to England and started job of second class clerk in the Registrar General's department which was located in the red house, in St. Vincet Street. Working back to his past, he is only capable of capturing the pieces of his past as an outcome of memory. He used to be a keen observer of things that people generally suppose unimportant. Even the city cleaners of the street and decorated fences, gates of the house, street lamps etc. were the things of importance for him. He did it because a historian should include all events that took place in the past. He writes:

I liked the paved chambered street . . . every morning, after they had done their sweepings and gathering the street cleaners opened the water hydrants and flooded the gutters with fresh clear water . . . Many of the houses had decorative forces of particular style, with a big cart gate at the side, usually corrugated iron and an elegant small gate in the middle leading to the front door. (11)

From this Naipaul remembers the past and attaches them to the present situation and compares the past with the present. Naipaul also describes people who work in the port of Spain. At that colonial period, Blacks people were struggling for power. They want to come in the mainstream history from the marginalized position. A black lawyers who always aspires to be white man, was very famous by his name "Evander". This name was "came from Latin and Virgil"(15). Black people like to put white people's name and they wanted to be white. They try to come to the mainstream as white and they desire to enjoy the power of white people. Naipaul asserts "this was in the late 1940s, few black people at that time could see a way ahead" (16).

Regarding to the aim of Evander, Naipaul writes "Evander was the self made black man who wanted only to be white, wanted to have nothing to do with black" (16).

Naipaul has depicted the marginalized black who wish to become equal as white. They put names like white and wanted to be white. It means that they are struggling to come in the mainstream. They wanted to be like white in manner and work only to leave their deteriorated condition. As marginalized, their voice is never heard they could never enjoy the power position. So they aspired to be white. They wanted to be represented in history, they yearned for power position which they think is possible after being a white. They were deprived of past and representation because they were blacks.

Naipaul portrays the situation of the indentured labours of Trinidad. Most of the indentured immigrants are Indian and came there to serve out on sugar state. They used to drink, live without money and they are without English language and without any kind of representations. About those migrants, Naipaul asserts "this squire was one of the places in port of Spain where homeless people lived. Most of these people were Indians. Many of them would have been indentured on sugar estates" (13). He gives the short history of the Indian people who came there to work in the 'sugar estate' but they are valueless and marginalized groups in the port of Spain. Likewise, about their homelessness condition and their pathetic situation, Naipaul describes in his novel and giving emphasis to them. He asserts:

They had become drinkers; perhaps they had not been given their promised passage back to India . . . found themselves without nowhere to live. These people were themselves without money, job, without anything like a family, without the English language, without any kind of representation. They were utterly destitute. (19)

These working class people have pathetic condition in Trinidad. They are without family and cannot return to their home. Their rights were limited and they were "tormented by the people of the town". To get rid of this situation they used to drink and get relief. So in this novel, Naipaul has given position to those indentured migrants who were not included in the official history by colonizer and rulers of that period.

Naipaul also deals with the lives of colonial societies of the past which have been neglected and condemned by so called privileged history. At that period, white people were ranked in high position but others were relegated in lower rank though they have high academic qualification. One of the white characters 'Belbenoit' who is

the senior clerk in the Registrar General's Department. The narrator works at a "second-class clerk to make copies of birth, marriage and death certificates" (20). A black boy, a brown man, a Chinese woman are also general workers of that office. They did not get chance to work in high class. But white man 'Belbenoit' one of the senior who sometimes checked narrator's certificates. Naipaul writes: "he had no particular imagination but he did not think he had done well enough" (23-24). Naipaul has described the colonial situation of the past where whites were the rulers and others were marginalized and given low position. In the services "best jobs were reserved for people from England" (24).

Next thing, Naipaul includes in his personal history is stereotype created by colonial travelers. They write history about these countries which were the misrepresentation of the local people. Naipaul writes "the writers of these travel books were really acting, acting being travelers in the colonies" (74). Every year, the cruise ships brought travelers who were keeping journals and taking photograph for their 'travel book'. These books they wrote were "curiously impersonal" but they write "everything earlier writers had got in" (74). Though they advocated their writing impersonal and objective but that never gave space to those black people. Later, their writing is considered as a history which was suitable only to the psyche of white people. Naipaul has exemplified the dominated history created by white authors about African who had seen two toned shoes. In their book these writers write "Africans were so fond of squeaky shoes that they took brand new shoes to shoemaker and asked them to put in a squeak" (74). In the travel writing and photograph of the western whites, they create the stereotype of the local people. They did not include the true representation of those local people in the official history documented by them.

Likewise, they create stories about local people. They make stories about the "poverty and ignorance about Grenadians" in their books. Naipaul has depicted their stories in this novel. They write about the Grenadians:

They lived off ground provisions, which they cooked in a pitch oil tin
ground provisions were tubers- yams, eddoes, cassava, sweet potatoes.

‘The pitch oil tins’ were originally the tins in which vegetable oil was
imported. (77-78)

Western rulers present local working class people in new way. Naipaul has exposed these stereotypic representations of Grenadians in this novel. Naipaul includes the historical revolution of Trinidad which was named 'oil field strike' happened in 1937. That was colonial time, so oil field workers did strike. The leader was Tubal Uriah Buzz Butler. He was revolutionary and leader who go against the will of rulers. So English people did not write about his role and did not present him positively. He was presented as "he was crazed and uneducated African preacher, a Grenadian, a small islander, and eaters of ground provision boiled in a pitch oil tin" (80). Because he was a revolutionary and wanted to write new history about them, so he was misrepresented in their travel books.

Official history hide the reality and portrait it in their favour. They only describe their own victory and justify their rule in colonial countries. Naipaul, being a postcolonial author, he flashes those suppressed historical events and revolutionary historical figure who played great role for the liberation of the country. Naipaul exemplifies English author named 'Foster Morris' who "went to Trinidad and wrote the shadowed liberty" (81). He represents the revolutionary leaders differently. In his writing "nothing had been written about local people" (79). Morris book, one event of "burning a policeman alive in the oil field area" was portrayed without understanding

the feeling of black people. He writes in his book "the crowd burn the black policeman Charlie King alive". Morris wrote about Trinidad without knowing the reality Charlie King was not hated in Trinidad. He was to become in fact, "in clypso and folk memory, a special sacrificial figure, as famous as Uriah Butler himself and almost and that the place Charlie King corner" (80). Charlie King Corner was very respect in Trinidad as Butler. He was respected and honored by Trinidadian but white people portrait him differently in their books written about Trinidad.

Similarly, Naipaul writes how revolutionary figures were tortured and punished in their land. When dominated people go against the rulers, they give tortured and severely punished them. People who oppose their rules were "Imprisoned, loaded with 25 pound chains and given beds of stone and pillows of brick" (326). Naipaul has included such dominated action of rulers in this travelogue. He writes, " The rebels were hang and quarters of the hanged were displayed on the highway over the mountains between La Guaira on the coast and the inland valley of Caracas" (127). It shows how rulers behave with revolutionary. In the past history books of those power holders did not mention such wrong deeds of rulers. Naipaul includes marginal voices in this novel and trying to fulfill the lost part of history.

Moreover, Naipaul writes about historical past of Trinidad and other South American countries. In the past various countries like Spanish, French and British ruled over there. They had come there to expand the territory, to make profit and create history. They also fought each other for the gold mines. They took back a lot of marcasite sand to their country. Naipaul has asserted one example of a young English novel man named Robert Dudley, the Earl of Licester's son. He had gone to the Trinidad and asked Indian about the gold mines. Because of language problem, he did not understand local people. They think gold mine was on the beach, and they take

glittering marcasite. Naipaul writes, "They went in fool armour and saw the glittering marcasite in the sand. For three days Dudley's men loaded up with sand" (168).

Naipaul has included such shameful act of white colonizers. They did not include such action in their travel books. They "did not want to print it" (168). They present there act in other way. About action of Dudley he said "he pretended, he had known all along and brought the sand back on whim."

Likewise Naipaul has written Spaniards exploitations on the migrated Indians. They used migrated people as a cheap labor and got more profit from them. Naipaul writes "used the Indian as a very cheap labor, getting them to cut down cedar trees and saw up the timber and making an extra profit out of them by selling them rum" (334). It clearly shows the dominating psyche of white people. Naipaul discloses the repressive attitude by exposing their view towards working class people. Naipaul has exposed the scenario of plantation run by whites. In these plantation, Negroes work but even "they themselves did not know what they are doing and for what purpose. They just do as they are told." Naipaul writes "Negroes work on the plantation from five in the morning to six in the evening. Six days a week" (265). Workers of the plantation do for the white rulers. This exploitation of the workers is included in this novel. History of the colonizers excluded them. So Naipaul raises those marginal and suppressed into his personal history. The workers of the plantation work hard as directed by the rulers without knowing what they are doing. About their condition, Naipaul writes:

They are just doing as they are told ... make the land slope a way from the hills, to take of the flood water. [. . .] These new Negroes knows nothing about anything. They are working, doing something called

work. [. . .] the commander of the gang pretends he knows but he does not really know. (266)

These workers are working with fear of whites. They cannot say anything about their domination and exploitation to the rulers. So Naipaul has brought those marginalized workers in the colonial period to the mainstream history. He exposes the real relation of plantation people to the workers.

Naipaul, creates an unwritten story about South American countries when Naipaul traveled to these countries. He finds reversal what he sees on his traveling and what he reads about these countries in the account of foreign adventures. Spanish documents and reports of expedition. He does detail reading about the area and went back to the earliest records too. Then he found misrepresentation of the place and they were false. Naipaul writes "the people whose words I was reading went there to intrigue" (45). After his traveling, he thinks "every piece of invention that came to me seemed to falsify what I put as a traveler" (44). So, Naipaul gives his real experiences to the new shape and formed a story. He mixed this actual experience with fictional addition. He creates "unwritten story" from his experience and what he heard about a man on the run. He writes "a man on the run would have been true to the place" (46). Naipaul creates a narrator on the basis what he heard on the journey from local people. Naipaul writes "can the narrator be a man in this quiz, a man on the run? That would be true about the region. In 1971, Michael X, the Trinidad black power man after he had killed two people in Trinidad, went to Guyana (physically like the country of the narrative) and made for the interior to hide" (45-46).

So, Naipaul rewrites the story by creating a fictional narrator who is the traveler of the South American country. He writes "the narrator is going up a high land river in an unarmed south American country" (45). The story Naipaul writes by

creating a fictional narrator who is true but he has fictionalized the history. In the story, the narrator travels on South American land, he meets local people, they voluntarily service him, on the way Lucas and Mateo accompany him. He studies various aspects like culture, desire of local people in the story. From this story Naipaul rewrites the real story about South America through the fictional narrator. The past history recorded by colonizers is modified and he presents the real event of history in new way. But in this novel, Naipaul describes the real situation of the past by creating fictional characters "who is a carrier of mischief" (46). Naipaul also depicts the general people's daily activities on the island. At that time, when foreigners came there, local people like to give volunteer service to them. Many leaders of the country do such voluntary service to the European travelers. African people adopt their religion and want to migrate to Europe. Naipaul writes "most of the black population wants to migrate to northern countries" (49). Two boys Mateo and Lukacs are the African boys who give voluntary services to the narrator and also desire to go to England with narrator. Favored local people who accept the religion can be sent abroad as service volunteers to Europe and other countries. So, local politicians and their relatives also want to be volunteers. Naipaul writes "numbers of Africans, among them the relatives and friends of local politicians who want to be volunteers and go abroad" (49). They also hope that English people "would come and build houses here" (66). Naipaul has exposed the general desire and aspiration of the people who were in bad condition. They are hopeful from the Europeans as like Mateo and Lucas hopes from narrator. He exposes the ambition of political leaders going to Europe with the travelers who comes there.

Re-enacting the historical Characters

In the novel, Naipaul rewrites the historical fiction about Lebrun, Sir Walter Raleigh and Francisco Miranda. Here, he highlighted them although their identity in official history is under shadow. Naipaul historicizes those marginal figures who did not get space in the history of the past and whose voices are unheard.

One of the historical characters Naipaul highlighted is Lebrun. He historicizes Lebrun's political career, devotion and lifestyle. Naipaul asserts "Lebrun, the Trinidadian panamanian communist of the 1930s, as one of the most dangerous man around Butler, the old strike leader" (103). Naipaul also describes physical feature of Lebrun. He writes:

Lebrun was now past sixty, he was slender and fine featured, he took care of himself. Close to, he was dedicate, smooth skinned with touch of copper in his dark complexion that spoke of some unusual- perhaps Ameriandian ancestry". (112)

Lebrun was a Trinidadian but he had grown up in Panama. His family had gone there "to work on the canal, just as the Grenadians had come to Trinidad to work on the oil fields" (92). He was a communist of thirties and dangerous man. More Naipaul writes about him, "he was a fluent Spanish speaker and his business was to travel round central America and the west Indies and west Africa and talk revolution" (92).

Likewise, Naipaul gives a little view about Lebrun's book which was published in London. He writes "he had written in that book about some of the Spanish American or Venezuelan revolutionaries before Bolivar and he had concentrated on those with Trinidadian connection" (127). Similarly Naipaul gives Lebrun's role in the past as a revolutionary figure. He writes, "Lebrun was an impresario of revolution. That was the role he had fallen into; it had become his

livelihood" (107). In the same way, Naipaul also writes about his extra ordinary spoken language. He asserts:

His language was extra ordinary [. . .] his spoken sentence says however involved were complete [. . .] spoken language was like Ruskin's on the printed page. In its fluency and elaborateness the words wonderfully chosen, often unexpected, bubbling up from some ever running spring of sensibility. (112-13)

These lines present Lebrun as an extra ordinary person user of good language and complete sentences. Naipaul here highlighted his fluency of language. Though he was great revolutionary of the country, great writer and communist leader of that era, he was unknown and not included in the official history. His contribution for the people and country was marginalized, so Naipaul tried to reveal him.

Next things, the novel describes about Lebrun's another book which was printed in Germany. This book had photograph of Lebrun in woodfordsquare in Port of Spain, standing at microphone on the bandstand before the crowd. This photograph shows that he was communist revolutionary and inspiring people for revolution. Naipaul also depicted some stock communist words included in Lebrun's book. He writes "in certain articles, he use stock communist words opportunist, petit-bourgeoisie nationalist, reformist Blanquettes" (126). Lebrun being a communist revolutionary of Trinidad, he continues to write communist slanted articles in "small circulation left wind magazine" (125). He was living a hard "bohemian life" lodging in other people's house or apartment in the Carrabin and Central America, in England and Europe and always moving on.

The novel included a communist revolutionary and about his life. He was left in the mainstream history and was unknown to Africans and Caribbean. Rulers did not

publish about him, his books and speech to the people. So, Naipaul tries to complete the history of past by giving him space in the history. About his past image Naipaul writes "his name did not appear in books about Africa or the Caribbean; writers and publishers didn't want to offend the rulers" (130). Rulers of that time didn't like to make him popular. He was marginalized figure in the history. So that Naipaul rewrites such characters by including his life style, his books and his political contribution for the liberation of Trinidad. Naipaul has included some lines of revolutionary speech which Lebrun had given on a television programme. He said, "The day the first African slave was landed, the region become black territory. If they had known that was going to happen, they might have thought twice" (131).

Naipaul in the novel writes a story about British explorer Sir Walter Raleigh. He rewrites Raleigh's expedition of gold mines in Trinidad and Guiana through Don Jose a captive islander, captured by the British commander 'Keymis' and handed to the old general Sir Walter Raleigh. In this fictional story, Naipaul rewrites Raleigh's expedition to the South American river with Jacobean ship named 'Destiny' to find out gold mines. Naipaul introduces the Raleigh's mission filter through the ship surgeon who questions to Raleigh on the truthfulness of his book titled "the discovery of large, rich and beautiful empire of Guiana of 1595". Naipaul presents the setting of the story is the deck of the ship where Sir Walter Raleigh is waiting for his gold mines expedition, the setting is

The time of 1618, the setting a South American river . . . the tropical light is coming fast. The predawn silence is broken by the sound of heavy splash. A man has jumped overboard. After a while there are shouts from the decks of the ship and the sound of running feet. (157)

From these lines Naipaul uncovers the time of Raleigh's journey to the South American river. He presents the scenario of the ship, where Raleigh was with his crew members on the deck of the ship waiting for his friends.

Naipaul also describes illness of Sir Walter Raleigh and his age too. He writes, "A thin and very old man in Jacobean undress in captain's quarters. This is Sir Walter Raleigh. He is sixty four. He has been ill for many months" (157). Similarly, he asserts the real fact why Raleigh went to find the gold mines in Guiana and other South American countries. This story also exposes of his trouble with the king of England, his life in prison. Naipaul writes:

He has been a freeman for just under two years. For thirteen years before that, he had been a prisoner in the tower of London because of some trouble with the king. He has been released in order to go and find the gold mines of Eldorado in Guiana in South America. (157)

He has been released before two years from prison to find gold mines. He claimed that "he knows exactly where the gold mines are" (157). He also says to the king that these mines exist somewhere on the banks of the Orinoco" (157).he claims that he had plundered all the knowledge of the old conquistador's knowledge about the golden territories. Then after, king released him to prove his point on the condition that if he finds gold, he will be forgiven. He writes, "if he finds gold everything will be forgiven. He will be executed if he does not find gold or if he disturbs the Spaniards" (158). From these lines, Novel presents the facts and unwritten events of historical character which were not written in official history.

Here, Naipaul creates fictional narrator to reveal the Raleigh's journey. Through him Naipaul revealed the real events which were happened in the journey and mission of the journey. Don Jose narrates the story of Raleigh's expedition. He is

a captured man of San Thome (Trinidad). Raleigh took him to England as a helper of general and later he was send back to homeland. He traveled with Raleigh on the Journey from San Thome to England. So, the whole story of expedition is narrated by him. Raleigh sent different groups to find the gold mines but he becomes unable to find out it. He lost his son, Cook Francis, gold refiner Fowler, Lieutenant Keymis and lost so many men. He becomes sick and very weak. Then, he returned back to England and kings men came to arrest him and execute. Don Jose narrates the buried ceremony of General Raleigh's son. When he died in the fight against Spaniard in Trinidad, commander Keymis buried him with great honor. Don Jose narrates:

One of them was the son of the son of the English General [. . .]. The next day they buried the two men stretched out in the government house. They brought shrouds from the ship and rapped the bodies in them. They placed the bodies in the planks and some man carried the planks round the open base ground of the plaza, in front of the shack and thatched adobe church [. . .]. Some of the soldiers marched in information with their flags pointing down [. . .]. Twice they walked round the plaza, Then the bodies were buried in another hole we had dug the day before." (187)

From the narration of Don Jose, he exposes the Raleigh's son who was killed in the fighting with Spaniard. He also narrates the buried ceremony where British soldiers buried him with due respect and following religious rules too. He was buried on the place where he died.

Similarly, Don Jose narrates the future of the General Sir Walter Raleigh. He narrate the condition happened with king and his situation when he returned to England. His narration goes on:

He had lost many men, many friends, many noblemen. He had lost his son. And he had Spanish blood on his hands. He had promised the English king there would be no fighting with the Spaniards. That battle at San Thorne shouldn't have taken place. I understood about that later. What I understood at that time was that he had not found fold and that as soon as he went back to England, he would be arrested by orders of the English king and after that he would be executed." (193)

In the chapter "In the Gulf of Desolation: An Unwritten Story", Naipaul writes a story of a Venezuelan revolutionary Francisco Miranda. Naipaul writes "I thought, I should try to do a play or a film- a film would have been better- about the gulf . . . Francisco Miranda. The Venezuelan revolutionary in 1806 [. . .] with his own vision of the New World" (237). Naipaul remarks the reason why Miranda is not well known and his story is unwritten. He writes, "On the day he was betrayed, he was separated from his papers" (238). Miranda is "not as well known" as Columbus or Raleigh. He is Venezuelan revolutionary who came before Bolivar but not famous in the history of South America and was given less space. So, Naipaul rewrites a story and valorizes the marginal figure of history relating his career. Naipaul writes, "His career is just as fabulous and original but he has no historical myth and it is necessary at this point to establish his story" (238).

The novel illustrate the life of Miranda, his struggle, his lost letters which were written to his wife and wife's letter written from England, about his wife, sons and his political position in revolution. Naipaul gives detail about the 1806, at that time he was fifty six and he has been out of Venezuela for thirty five years. Naipaul writes "for more than twenty of those years, in the United States, England, and France, he had been routing around an idea of Spanish American liberation" (238).

Miranda was a deserter from the Spanish army and has been cut off from family wealth as he has in Venezuela. After that, he has been living on his wit. About his military service in Spain and role in French revolution served some months as general in revolutionary army. Naipaul writes:

"For eleven years he has been a captain in the Spanish service in Spain, north Africa and the west Indies. Fleetingly, before he deserted and went to the United States, he was a colonel. But when he got to France he encouraged the French to believe that he had been a general in the American war of independence, and in the early days of the French revolution, he had served for seven months as a general in the revolutionary army, until he was arrested for incompetence." (241)

Naipaul also writes ancestry of Miranda. He exposes about his birthplace, his father and his occupation. Miranda was born in Caracas in 1750. His father was a canary islander and liven merchant. That is neither a proper Spaniard from Spain, nor someone occupied by the Creole Spanish aristocracy. But a rich man, rich enough to pay eight thousand pesos.

To make his history more inclusive Naipaul imaginatively creates epistolary discourses. He gives voice to Miranda's wife to understand the real plight of Miranda and even Miranda gets via to reveal his destitute condition. Letters which were written by Miranda to his wife Saraha in England and its reply to him by her too. Naipaul creates misspelt letters which is written by Saraha to her husband Miranda. Through those letters she explains her situation in London. She writes:

27 Grafton Street, Fritzory Square London. April 15th. My ever dear General, I embrass this opportunity of writing to you. My dear sir for while I am a night and the two babies are asleep it seems as if I am

talking to my dear friend himself and can hear his own voice. Lander has set down his dream and sword and gun, we have had a fair in the Road, and he makes such a noise my dear sir saying Mammy I am going to war to fight for the general . . . (253)

Likewise, Miranda also writes letters by describing his situation to his wife.

He writes:

My dear sally, I love every misspelt word you write and every mistake you make. These words you wrote four months ago come to me now with your own voice. I can see my house and library and the books again. I think without you, my dear sally, I would become quite dizzy here, in this place I don't know any longer . . . (253)

Miranda's anxiety and fear becomes known through the recreated epistolary discourses, which show an integration of fictional and factual elements. Naipaul also creates a dialogue between Level De Goda, a lawyer and Miranda himself. When Miranda was betrayed and revolution raised by him was defeated, he was prisoned. Naipaul creates imaginary dialogue between them when Miranda was on Prison. By such conversation, Naipaul exposes why Miranda came South America and how he was betrayed. Miranda says to lawyer, "Piston has damaged me in 1789, nearly thirty years after I had left home. He had written to the minister in London that though I was important, I was nothing" (329).

Novel also included how and where Miranda died, how he was behaved at the end of his life. Naipaul writes:

Miranda had died in Jail in cadiz just about thirty months after he left Puerto Rico [. . .] died painfully, over four months, racked by one

affection after the other, violent fits, typhus, and towards the end by an illness that made him haemorrhage from the mouth. (339)

Miranda was revolutionary, he was not respected when he was arrested. He died in the jail by illness. He was not given honour and respect on his burial ceremony. Naipaul asserts:

He was buried unceremoniously, lifted away from the hospital of the jail in the matters and sheets of his deathbed, and in the clothes in which he had died, and set down with it all in his grave [. . .] gathered up his other clothes and possession and burnt them. (339-40)

Similarly, Naipaul also described about his wife Saraha and his second son Francisco. Later Miranda's son also went to fight in South American civil wars when he grows up. Naipaul writes, "Francisco, his father's namesake [. . .] went to fight in South American civilwar. He was executed in Colombia in 1831, when he was twenty five" (340). Naipaul also included Miranda's wife and her death in London. He puts forward, "Saraha had died in the house in Grafton Street. She was seventy three. She had lived in the same house for forty-eight years, and for the last thirty seven of those years she had been without Miranda" (340).

Naipaul also explained why Francisco Miranda was marginalized and not included in the official history. He was very famous revolutionary before Bolivar for Venezuela but he "is not well known". He has recorder everything he "considered important" in his papers. When he was betrayed, his papers were lost. Naipaul writes, "It is also because on the day he was betrayed he was separated from his papers, the sixty three leather bound folio volumes, he had brought out from England two years before and the paper were lost for more than century" (243).

Miranda is not famous for Venezuelan and his papers were lost. So he did not remain in the mainstream history. When his lost papers were found "more than a hundred years after his death" (340). Those papers were later identified by Robertson in 1922 in Bathurst library in Gloucestershire. So Naipaul historicizes Miranda by including lost documents by Re-discovering and replotting the same documentary materials and facts differently in this novel.

To sum up, Naipaul has reconstructed the history of marginalized people who exist on the margin of everyday history. He gives voices to those who were unheard in official history by repatterning the documentary materials and facts differently. For that he creates stories about the historical figures, misrepresentation of travelers in their books, lower class people who works for Trinidad and exploitation of colonial rulers to indentured labours. So, Naipaul rectifies, reconfigures and repatterns the same materials and facts differently and deals with the lost history of that era.

IV. Conclusion

This thesis explores the new vision of history in *A Way in the World*. It presents the cultural and historical past of Trinidad, Venezuela and historical characters of the colonial period and their expedition. Naipaul has imaginatively created the stories based on the historical figures and their contribution for the Caribbean countries. He historicizes those marginal figures, facts and documents by imaginative representation and repatterning the documentary evidences which never get space in the official history.

Colonial history never provided space to those marginal groups. History written by them represented only themselves and their acts in positive light but colonized are either misrepresented or not represented in their books. Naipaul dug out such reality which were buried by so-called official history. He endeavors to give voice to those voiceless, marginalized people of Trinidad. People who were relegated from historical texture, who were aspiring for the position and power were nipped by colonizers whose psyche was hindered their representation. Those people who own the power manipulated history in their own hand by not truly portraying the condition and situation of Trinidadian lower class people in their travel books which becomes history. But Naipaul foregrounds those historically enmeshed characters and incidents. For instances, he illustrated indentured Indian people who works in Trinidad and their brutal exploitation by colonial rulers. Naipaul in this novel avers, "Where thirteen men . . . had been imprisoned, loaded with twenty five pound chains and given bed of stones and pillows of brick" (236).

Naipaul has even thrown light upon the revolutionary activities heralded by Trinidadian people and heroic contribution of their leaders. Uriah Butler, the leader of the oilfield strike of 1937 and impresario of revolution was projected derogatively by

the colonial rulers and English authors like Foster Morris in their travel books on the subject of Trinidad. In these books, he was presented as "crazed and uneducated African preacher, a Grenadian, a small islander and eater of ground provision boiled in a pitch oil tin" (80). But Naipaul reveals the repressive psyche to which thwarted potentiality of colonized people. Naipaul also rewrites the story about British explorer Sir Walter Raleigh and Venezuelan communist revolutionary Francisco Miranda. Naipaul recreates their history by depicting their heroic deeds and contribution mixing fictional addition too. Those figures were also deprived of mainstream history and not given space in official history. So Naipaul historicizes those figures who were denied by previous white authors and travelers. Naipaul also creates story about South American countries based on his personal experiences. He mixed his actual experience of traveling to those parts with fictional addition. He creates a fictional narrator whose activities were unfold by author himself. He writes, "the narrator is going up a highland river in an unnamed south American country" (45). From the story, he shows how colonial travelers present the reality by false portrait and tries to give the real history of Trinidad.

Thus, the novel is the written history of the characters of the past who bear no existence in the official history of Trinidad as well as the authors imaginative creation of the lost facts and documents too. In another level, it can be viewed as the written history of the marginalized people and the immigrants who have been struggling and their exploitation and suffering in the hand of colonial rulers. For that, Naipaul repatterns the documentary materials and rewrites a historical fiction. He has reconstructed the past of Trinidad by imaginative reinterpretation and attempting to accomplish continuity and renewal.

Works Cited

- Adams, Hazard. ed. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Rev. ed. Florida: Hourcourt, 1992.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *Key Concepts in Post-colonial Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Boehmer, Ellek. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphor*. New York: OUP, 1995.
- Dissanayake, Wimal, and Carmen Wickramagamage, *Self and Colonial Desire: Travel Writing of V. S. Naipaul*. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.
- Folk, Jeffrey. "Naipaul's Way." *Modern Age*. 49.2(2007): 171-77.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1979.
- . "Truth and Power." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams.
- . *History of Sexuality*. Vol 1. Trans. Robert Herley, New York: Vintage books, 1980.
- . "Nietzsche, Genealogy and History." *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rainbow. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984. 270-91.
- Gupto, Arun. *Healing Thought on Tender Theory*. Kathmandu: New Hira Books Enterprise, 2004.
- McHoul, Alec and Wendy Grace. *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Montrose, Louis. "New Historicism." *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992.392-418.
- Naipaul, V.S. *A Way in the World*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

- Nightiangle, Margaret. "V.S. Naipaul as Historian: Combating Chaos." *Southern Review* 13.3 (1980): 239-50.
- Philip, Caryl. "The Voyage in *A Way in the World* by V. S. Naipaul." *The New Republic*. 210.24 (June 1994): 40-48.
- Roldan-Santiago, Serafin. "V. S. Naipaul's Vulcanisation of Travel and Fiction Paradigms." *Critical Essays*. Ed. Mohit K. Ray. Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Dist., 2002. 170-204.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Penguin Books, 2001.
- Sarkar, Subhas. "V. S. Naipaul's Fiction: A Story of Self-division and Impact of Ancestral Memory in Colonial Society." Ed. Mohit K. Ray. Delhi: Atlantic Pub. and Distributor, 2002. 163-69.
- Selden, Rama. *A Reader Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. 2nd ed. Kentucky: UP, 1985.
- Shreedharan, E. A.. *Textbook of Historiography*. New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2002.