

Chapter I : Introduction

Walt Whitman and His Works

Whitman was born on May 31, 1919 in West Hills, Long Island. He spent his childhood in alternation between the farm on Long Island and the streets of the neighbouring city of Brooklyn. His dreaminess and restlessness, made it difficult for him to stick to any one place for a long time. He left school at the age of eleven and worked at a variety of jobs—as an office boy, as printer, as a rural school-teacher. Clearly he was unqualified for school-teaching not only because of the meagreness of his academic background but also because of his dreamy and speculative temperament. For a period of some three years, from the age of about seventeen to twenty, Whitman drifted from one rural school to another. He must soon have come to the realization that he had not yet found his destined work.

Soon the poet drifted into journalism, a profession which could make some demands on his natural abilities. As in school-teaching, he did not remain long in any one job. From the age of twenty to thirty-six Whitman worked on various newspapers in and out of Brooklyn, including *The Long Islander*, *The New York Aurora* and *The Brooklyn Evening Star*. At the age of twenty-seven, he became the editor of the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, a position of importance. The job did not last beyond two years, because of his politics. He was a democrat and so was the paper, but Whitman was a supporter of the Free Soil Party which was opposed to slavery.

In accepting a job on the staff of a newspaper in New Orleans in 1848, Whitman made it possible for himself for the first time to see the vast stretches and varied landscapes of America that he was later to celebrate with such vigour in his songs. Whitman had to be something of a vagabond travelling the open roads and

crossing the rivers of America just to get to New Orleans. He travelled extensively and his imagination was permanently liberated from the provincialism of the narrow Long Island world. His vision of America was enlarged to embrace its vast prairies, its treacherous and rapid rivers, its raw frontiers and its refined metropolises. What he did not see of the lands that lay west of the brown continental river, he was now prepared to conceive through the restless energy of his vigorous imagination. It was once thought that Whitman experienced some intense love affair or passionate friendship in New Orleans that became the seed that was to flower forth after seven years of gestation as *Leaves of Grass*. However now we know that such conjectures are baseless. If he had any love, it was America—the America of his dreams.

Upon his return to Brooklyn in June 1848, Whitman turned to journalism once again, but his political beliefs against the extension of slavery caused difficulty and he finally turned to his father's work as a carpenter. Just how extensively Whitman worked with his hands is open to question. But it seems clear enough that he did know carpentry intimately and that he was engaged in the building trade, much as his father before him.

Whitman worked for a time even as a printer, he taught briefly, and also served as a reporter and editor for numerous New York periodicals. In 1855, Whitman anonymously published the first edition of *Leaves of Grass*, which contained 12 untitled poems in free verse, including works later called "I Sing the Body Electric" and even later "Song of Myself." The personal tone of these poems startled many readers. In 1860, he published the third and greatly expanded edition of *Leaves of Grass*, which included more than 120 new poems, including "Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking". During 1862-1864 he traveled to Virginia to care for his wounded brother and also help other soldiers wounded in battle. In 1865, he published

Drum-Taps, a book of poetry based on his Civil War experiences, which was later folded into *Leaves of Grass*. In 1873, he suffered a stroke that caused partial paralysis, and moved to Camden, New Jersey, to be closer to his brother; then he stayed in New Jersey and continued to refine *Leaves of Grass* and other works until his death in 1892, before he had published the final edition of *Leaves of Grass*, known as the "deathbed edition". Though he received little formal education, spent time studying great works of literature in the libraries of New York City. Though the first edition of *Leaves of Grass* was not well received by the public, it was praised by American poets and writers. In 1865, Whitman was fired from a government job with the Department of the Interior after he was discovered to be the author of *Leaves of Grass*.

The opening lines of "Song of Myself" announce Walt Whitman's American idealism and exuberant trust in the innate value of the individual. The very second line, "And what I assume you shall assume," creates an imperative relationship between reader and poet which is to last the 1336 lines of the poem. Whitman's bold poetry is written in nontraditional, free-flowing verse and celebrates all things and peoples. In 1855, Whitman was bound to publish the collection at his own expense because he immodestly praised the human body and glorified the senses; he even did some of the type-setting himself. His name did not appear on the title page, but the engraved frontispieces portrait shows him posed, arms akimbo, in shirt sleeves, hat cocked at a rakish angle. In a long preface he announced a new democratic literature, "Commensurate with a people," simple and unconquerable, written by a new kind of poet who was affectionate, brawny, and heroic and who would lead by the force of his magnetic personality. The sensual "Song of Myself", which appeared under another title in the first edition of *Leaves of Grass* (1855), is by far Walt Whitman's best-

known poem. At the time of publication, the free verse and frank sexual content of the poem boldly distinguished Whitman's work from that of other in mid 19th century America. The poem an American epic, is a fine example of Whitman's distinctive philosophy of nature and the individual, ideas based in part on the writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau.

The 1855 edition of *Leaves of Grass* contained 12 untitled poems, written in long cadenced lines that resemble the unrhymed verse of the King James Version of the Bible. The (originally numbered, but title-less) poem we now read as "Song of Myself", was a vision of a symbolic "I" enraptured by the senses, vicariously embracing all people and places from the Atlantic to the Pacific oceans. No other poem in the first edition has the power of this poem, although "The Sleepers," another visionary flight, symbolizing life, death, and rebirth, comes nearest.

The most significant poem in the 1856 (second) edition of *Song of Myself* is "Crossing Brooklyn Ferry," in which the poet vicariously joins his readers and all past and future ferry passengers. In the third edition (1860), Whitman began to give his poetry a more allegorical structure. *Drum-Taps* (1865, later added to the 1867 edition of *Song of Myself*) reflects Whitman's deepening awareness of the significance of the American Civil War (1861-1865) and the hope for reconciliation between North and South. *Sequel to Drum-Taps* (1866) contains "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd," the great elegy for President Abraham Lincoln used modern communications and transportation as symbols for its transcendent vision of the union of the individual soul with the universal (or world) soul.

In his later years Whitman also wrote some prose of lasting value. The essays in *Democratic Vistas* (1871) are now considered a classic discussion of the theory of democracy and its possibilities. With the novelty and vitality of both their form and

content, the writings of Walt Whitman reshaped poetry in the United States in the 19th century, and were a tremendous influence on 20th-century American poets. In the following quotation, a Senior Editor Joseph Gustaitis mentions the impact of Whitman's work on American literature, commenting on him, on the 100th anniversary of Whitman's death: "Whitman, who is perhaps the most original, powerful poet the United States has produced, will still work the magic that captivated, overwhelmed, and shocked his readers over a century ago". Today, Whitman's poetry has been translated into every major language. It is widely recognized as a formative influence on the work of such American writers as Hart Crane, William Carlos Williams, and Wallace Stevens. Allen Ginsberg in particular was inspired by Whitman's bold treatment of sexuality. Many modern scholars have sought to assess Whitman's life and literary career.

When Whitman was writing his major poetry, with the exception of Edgar Allan Poe, American poetry was dominated by New Englanders - William Cullen Bryant, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, James Russell Lowell, John Green leaf Whittier - who were practitioners of a British influenced verse that was knowing, genteel, and middle-class, with an occasional nod to American subject matter and colloquial language. The debut of Whitman, "... an American, one of the roughs, a kosmos, / Disorderly fleshy and sensual ... eating drinking and breeding," as he described himself, was like the entrance of a mongrel at a purebred dog show. With its rambling, unrhymed, unmetred lines, its defiance of convention, its egotism, sexuality, and vitality, *Leaves of Grass* was, as Whitman biographer Justin Kaplan put it, "the most brilliant and original poetry yet written in the New World, at once the fulfillment of American literary romanticism and the beginnings of American literary modernism. Whitman's romanticism is indeed unique: it is a true romanticism of

common things, sights and people; it is the adventure of daring declarations of the common truths of ordinary experience; it is also in the most truly common language; it initiated not only an indelible romantic tendency in American poetry forever, it also started many other modernist trends like what we now call confessionalism, expressionism, imagism and the like. He declared: "I sound my barbaric yawp over the roofs of the world". All the appetites people possess - for adventure, nature, action, friendship, sex - he celebrated: "Copulation is no more rank to me than death is. / I believe in the flesh and the appetites." Such frankness, not surprisingly, met with some hostility. *Leaves of Grass* did not sell and acquired an unsavory reputation. One who did recognize its worth was the eminent essayist and poet Ralph Waldo Emerson. Though his book was an ode to sensation, Whitman's own life was by no means spectacularly adventurous. His schooling ended when he was around 11, and he learned the printing trade, taught school on Long Island, and worked as a journalist and housebuilder. He became editor of the *Brooklyn Eagle* in 1846, lost the job over politics two years later, and for three months was an editor on a New Orleans newspaper.

The Civil War brought forth *Drum-Taps*, a book of war poems, and Lincoln's death inspired the great elegy "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd" and the famous poem "O Captain! My Captain!" Whitman was too old to serve in the war, but his brother George volunteered. When George was wounded in 1862, Whitman journeyed south to visit him. He remained in Washington, D.C., working first as a volunteer nurse in military hospitals, later as a government clerk. After suffering a stroke in 1873, he went to live with George in Camden.

By the time of his death, translations and articles had appeared in Germany, Denmark, Italy, France, and the Netherlands, and Whitman was well on his way to

becoming the world poet he is today. Whitman's contribution to the development of free verse, his incantatory rhetoric, his lust for life, his vision of democracy, his prophetic voice - all continued to resonate, and poets like Ezra Pound, Hart Crane, William Carlos Williams, Wallace Stevens, and Allen Ginsberg built upon the framework he constructed. Though his style may slip in and out of fashion, the free spirited, somewhat subversive, bard who sang the "Song of the Open Road" seems sure to retain a universal appeal. As Whitman once explained *Leaves of Grass* to an uncomprehending comrade: "It makes (tries to make) every fellow see himself, & see that he has got to work out his salvation himself - has got to pull the oars & hold the plow, or swing the axe himself -& that the real blessings of life are not the fictions generally supposed, but are real, & are mostly within reach of all." (Source: 1993 Collier's Year Book)

New Historicism

New historicism is a type of literary criticism that developed during the 1980s, largely in reaction to the text only approach pursued by formalist and they tried to analyze the text with an eye to history.

A majority of the critics between *1920 and 1950* focused on a work's historical content and based their interpretations on the interplay between the text and historical contexts. With the advent of the text oriented New Criticism, historically oriented critics faded into obscurity. They treated literary texts as self contained objects; they examined relationships within the text to uncover its form and meaning focusing on symbolism, imagery, rhythm and the like. *In the 1970s*, reader response critics roundly attacked the New Critics. However, these critics also focused on the text itself, ignoring the historical context within which literary works are read and written. *Around 1980s*, a form of historical criticism practiced by

Louise Montrose and Stephen Greenblatt began to transform the field of Renaissance studies, and to influence the study of American and English Romantic literature. By 1987 when Brook Thomas published an essay entitled "The Historical Necessity for - and Difficulties with - New' Historical Analysis in Introductory Courses", new historicism was flourishing. Thomas focused on studying the influence white reading a text. By this time, once faded into obscurity, history was making a powerful come back. However, the historicism practiced in 1980s is not the same as that of 1930s and 1940s. New historicists believe that criticism should incorporate diverse discourse. Therefore, it is informed by post-structuralist, reader response and feminist criticism. New historicist critics assume that the works of literature both influence and are influenced by historical reality.

Foucault brought together incidents and phenomena from areas normally seen as unconnected, encouraging new historicists and new cultural historicists to redefine the boundaries of historical inquiry. Foucault's view of history was influenced by the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche's concept of real or true history. Like Nietzsche, Foucault refused to see history as an evolutionary process, continuous development toward the present. According to Foucault, no historical event has a single cause; rather, each event is tied into a vast web of economic, social and political factors. Foucault saw history in terms of power, but his view of power probably owed more to Nietzsche than to Marx. He viewed power not simply as a repressive force or a tool of conspiracy but rather as a complex of forces that produces what happens.

Discourse

Discourse was originally used from about the sixteenth century to describe any kind of speaking, talk or conversation, but became increasingly used to describe a more formal speech, a narration or a treatment of any subject at length, a treatise, dissertation or sense by linguists to describe any unit of speech longer than a sentence.

However, the Foucauldian sense of the term has little to do with the act of speaking in its traditional sense. For Foucault, a discourse is a strongly bounded area of social knowledge, a system of statements within which the world can be known. The key feature of this is that the world is brought into being. It is also in such a discourse that speakers and hearers, writers and readers come to an understanding about themselves, their relationship to each other and their place in the world (the construction of subjectivity). It is the complex of signs and practices which organises social existence and social reproduction.

Discourse is not just a way of speaking or writing but the whole 'mental set' and ideology which encloses the thinking of all members of a given society. It is not singular and monolithic there is always a multiplicity of discourses—so that the operation of power structures is as significant as a factor in (say) the family as in layers of government. Hence, contesting them may involve, for example, the struggle to change sexual politics just as much as party politics. Thus, the personal sphere becomes a possible sphere of political action in ways which might well interest a feminist critic. Here, then, we might see grounds for political optimism. On the other hand, when political power operates in and suffuses so many spheres, the possibility of fundamental change and transformation may come to seem very remote.

Review of Literature

Since the first publication of *Leaves of Grass*, many critics have commented as a mystic, others a pantheist, still others an atheist etc. Some of them prefer to call him to be the Bard of Democracy. Others have seen him as the spokesperson of America, believing that he had immensely contributed in shaping the American mind. Many have spoken of him a great romantic for his compassion to nature and the common man. The following are the brief reviews of previous studies.

Relating with Vedantic mysticism, Yugeshwor Prasad Verma advocates:

Whitman's mysticism is Vedantic in the sense that the expansive and dynamic self, realizing its all inclusive nature after a mystical vision embraces the world and identifies with it. Thus it negates the distinction, dualism, between the self and not-self. 'Leaves of Grass' contains an inverted mystical experience. (155-156)

For Ezra Pound, Whitman is a representative poet of America. He praises, "He is America. His crudity is an exceeding great stench, but it is America. He is the hollow place in the rock that echoes with his time" (Pearce 8).

Various critics have viewed his treatment of sex in his poetry differently. Mostly, critics opposed his frank sexuality but Van Wyck Brooks opines, "Whitman's attitude toward sex was part of a general point of view that was deeply concerned with the continuance and perfection of the species, the feeling of "cosmic continuity" that was much in the air of the time and largely inspired the sociology of Lester F. Ward" (188).

The estimate of Whitman by D.H. Lawrence is, "Whitman was the first to break the mental allegiance. He was the first to smash the old moral conception, that the soul of man is something "superior" and above the flesh" (Pearce 18).

Commenting on *Leaves of Grass* Whitman himself said,

Leaves of Grass . . . has mainly been . . . an attempt . . . to put a person a humanbeing (myself in the later half of the nineteenth century in America) freely, fully and truly on record. I could not find any similar personal record in current literature that satisfied me. (Spiller 477)

Whitman's personal opinion in the recent literature disillusioned critics. Their inability to find a structure in "song of myself" has resulted from a failure to find a center of relevancy, an informing idea to which incoherent working parts may be justified. Finally, James E. Miller, Jr. succeeded to bring out a structure - a dramatic structure of the poem. In the first article of 'A Critical Guide to *Leaves of Grass*' he commented "Song of Myself" is the dramatic representation of a mystical experience. The term "dramatic representation" indicates an important distinction: the poem is not necessarily a transcript of an actual mystical experience but rather a work of art in which such an experience conceived in the imagination represented dramatically, with the author assuming the main role. (6-7)

Significance of the Study

This research is an inquiry into Walt Whitman, one of the representative poets of America considered as the Bard of Democracy, it tries to expose the politics hidden under the whitmanian democracy and his discourse of democracy is an attempt to maintain the status-quo. By understanding the grass root people at their depth, he has ventured to rule over them. Since politics of democracy in his poetry has not received

due recognition, I want to fill this critical gap by showing Whitman's politics of democracy in his poetry as flowing from his elitism and the ideology of capitalist America.

Without pondering beneath the surface, we cannot get Whitman's politics—he seems sympathetic towards them. He sings for them—he befriends with them but all of his activities are driven by his dominating psyche, which always wants to see the grass root, common, people under their rule.

He is justifying his all activities as divine behaviour and he has put himself at the top in place of god.

Chapter II: Theoretical Modality

Discourse

Discourse has experienced a relatively sudden rush of fashionability in the past couple of decades in a number of different academic and intellectual fields.

Unfortunately, however, the term's popularity in a range of different academic disciplines means that frustrating differences of usage can be encountered. Martin Jay describes discourse as 'one of the most loosely used terms of our time', adding that the term has been employed in a host of different contexts, from the communicative rationalism of a Jurgen Habermas to the archaeology of a Foucault; from the computerized Althusserianism of a Michel Pecheux to the sociolinguistics of a Malcolm Coulthard; from the textual analysis of a Zelig Harris to the ethnomethodology of a Harvey Sacks' (15). But Jay sees a need to retain the term in his own account of, as the title of his book has it, 'the denigration of vision in twentieth-century French thought':

Discourse in this usage is explicitly derived from the Latin *discurrere*, which means a running around in all directions. The anticlarcentric discourse that I hope to examine is precisely that: an often unsystematic, sometimes internally contradictory texture of statements, associations, and metaphors that never fully cohere in a rigorous way.

In linguistics a renewed reliance upon the term is related to the growth in importance of pragmatics; discourse is language in use, not language as an abstract system. According to the *OED*, discourse as noun can mean. Communication of thought by speech', and Samuel Johnson's definition is quoted:

'Mutual intercourse of language.' Interestingly, the use of the noun to mean 'talk' or 'conversation' is described as archaic. But even within linguistics there are varieties of meaning. Michael Stubbs comments on the use of the terms text and discourse, and states that this is often ambiguous and confusing. He suggests that the latter term often implies greater length than does the former, and that discourse may or may not imply interaction (9).

Thus if we take an academic seminar, for some linguists the whole process of verbal interaction would constitute a discourse, whereas for others an extended statement by one participant would qualify as a discourse. Yet others would be prepared to accept even short statements by individuals as discourses. Moreover, for some linguists' discourse is uncountable, for others it is not, and for yet others it appears to be countable at some times but not at others. If discourse *is* countable, the next problem is to decide what constitute(s) the defining borders of a single discourse: Michael Stubbs notes that the unity of a particular discourse can be defined in either structural, semantic or functional ways. *Critical discourse analysis* is a term used within Linguistics to denote a non-formalist analysis of written or spoken texts which pays attention to issues of social and cultural context.

Gerald Prince isolates two main meanings for the term within narrative theory: first, the expression plane of a narrative rather than its content plane, the narrating rather than the narrated. Second, following Benveniste, *discourse* is distinguished from *story* (*discours* and *histoire* in the original French) because the former evokes a link between 'a state or event and the situation in which that state or event is linguistically evoked'. Contrast 'John's wife was dead' (story) with 'He told her that John's wife was dead' (discourse). (Compare the distinction between *enunciation* and

enonce in the entry for Enunciation.) Some writers on narrative in English prefer to retain *discours* in untranslated form when using the term in Benveniste's sense. Onega and I,anda's definition - also from within narrative theory or Narratology - is simpler; for them discourse is 'the use of language for communicative purposes in specific contextual and generic situations, called *discourse situations*'. I suspect that this is so broad as to be unhelpful.

The work of Michel Foucault has been highly influential across a number of disciplines so far as the term discourse is concerned. For Foucault, discourses are 'large groups of statements'- rule-governed language terrains defined by what Foucault refers to as 'strategic possibilities', comparable to a limited extent to one possible usage of the term resister in Linguistics. Thus for Foucault, at a given moment in the history of, say, France, there will be a particular discourse of medicine: a set of rules and conventions and systems of mediation and transposition which govern the way Illness and treatment are talked about - when, where, and by whom. Clearly we meet a similar problem here to that mentioned in a different context above: how does one define the boundaries of a particular discourse?

According to Foucault

[w]henver one can describe, between a number of statements, such a system of dispersion, whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (and order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations), we will say, for the sake of convenience, that we are dealing with *a discursive formation* ...

All societies, following Foucault, have procedures whereby the production of discourses is controlled, selected, organized and redistributed, and the purpose of these processes of discourse control is to ward off 'powers and dangers'. These procedures govern, variously, what Foucault terms *discursive practices*, *discursive objects*, and *discursive strategies*, such that in all discourses *discursive regularities* can be observed. As Paul A. Bove puts it in his discussion of Foucault's use of the term, discourse 'makes possible disciplines and institutions which, in turn, sustain and distribute those discourses' (57).

It is not just disciplines and institutions which are enabled by discourse, according to Foucault; his work also suggests that rather than considering discourses as secondary to the brute facts of the world, we should move to seeing such brute facts as in some way produced or enabled by discourses. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* Foucault argues that what he wishes to do is to substitute for the enigmatic treasure of 'things' anterior to discourse, the regular formation of objects that emerge only in discourse. To define these *objects* without reference to the *ground*, the *foundation of things*, but by relating them to the body of rules that enable them to form as objects of a discourse and thus constitute the conditions of their historical appearance. To write a history of discursive objects that does not plunge them into the common depth of a primal soil, but deploys the nexus of regularities that govern their dispersion. (47-8)

If we recall Edward Said's description of Orientalism as the means by which European culture was able to 'manage - and even produce - the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively' (1979, 3), then we can, I think, perceive the Foucauldian element within his theorizing. But Foucault goes further: discourse does not just produce disciplines and institutions and discursive objects - it also produces itself: '[suppose that] we no longer relate

discourse to the primary ground of experience, not to the *a priori* authority of knowledge; but that we seek the rules of its formation in discourse itself (79).

Lynda Nead argues that Foucault is not consistent in his use of the term 'discourse', and that consequently there is some uncertainty about its precise meaning even as it is used in a single work of his (she cites *The History of Sexuality*) (4). In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* Foucault is quite open about the flexibility of the term as he uses it.

[I]nstead of gradually reducing the rather fluctuating meaning of the word 'discourse', I believe that I have in fact added to its meanings: treating it sometimes as the general domain of all statements, sometimes as an individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that allows for a certain number of statements; and have I not allowed this same word 'discourse', which should have served as a boundary around the term 'statement', to vary as I shifted my analysis or its point of application, as the statement itself faded from view? (1972, 80)

Later on in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* Foucault makes another attempt at definition as "[B]y discourse, then, I meant that which was produced (perhaps all that was produced) by the groups of signs. But I also meant a group of acts of formulation, a series of sentences or propositions." *Discursive* here represents the adjective form of discourse, not the adjective meaning 'round-about, meandering'. (John Frow has proposed the term universe of *discourse* as an alternative to discursive formation. He gives as examples of universes of discourse 'the religious, scientific, pragmatic, technical everyday, literary, legal, philosophical, magical, and so on', and distinguishes these from *genres of discourse*, which, after Vologinov, he defines as

'normatively structured clusters of formal, contextual, and thematic features, "ways of speaking" in a particular situation' [1986, 67].)

The work of Mikhail Bakhtin gives us yet further examples of the pressing of the word *discourse* into new services. According to the glossary provided in Bakhtin: 1981, *discourse* is used to translate the Russian word *slovo*, which can mean either an individual word, or a method of using words that presumes a type of authority. [. . .] Bakhtin also refers to 'double-voiced discourse', which he claims always arises under conditions of dialogic interaction (185).

It seems clear that ideology, variously defined, is a near neighbour to discourse in both Foucault's and Bakhtin's understanding of the term, and in his own definition Roger Fowler mentions ideology directly:

'Discourse' is speech or writing seen from the point of view of the beliefs, values *E* and categories which it embodies; these beliefs (etc.) constitute a way of looking at the world, an organization or representation of experience - 'ideology' in the neutral, non-pejorative sense. Different modes of discourse encode different representations of experience; and the source of these representations is the communicative context within which discourse is embedded.

(54)

If from Fowler's perspective 'beliefs, values and categories' are embodied in discourse, Foucault appears to go further and to suggest that discourses may force these beliefs, values and categories on to others, implying that the rules of

particular discourses do not just allow certain things to be said, but impose certain ways of looking upon the world while excluding alternatives. Thus it is not surprising that a marxist or quasi-Marxist use of the term has emerged in recent years, one which owes something to some or all of the sources suggested above, but perhaps most to Foucault (who is not, incidentally, a Marxist).

In his article 'The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality', written in 1980/81, Hayden White distinguishes between 'a historical discourse that narrates, on the one side, and a discourse that narrativizes, on the other' (1981, 2-3). According to him the former 'openly adopts a perspective that looks out on the world and reports it', whereas the latter 'feigns to make the world speak itself and speak itself as *a story*' (1981, 3). A narrativizing discourse, moreover, has no narrator; the events are 'chronologically recorded as they appear on the horizon of the story', no one speaks; and the events appear to tell themselves (1981, 3). Monika Fludernik has proposed a meaning for *narrativizing* different from Hayden White's; 'Whereas I use narrativization to describe a reading strategy that naturalizes texts by recourse to narrative schemata, Hayden White uses the term in the sense of storification, a transformation of historical material into narrative shape' (34).

Not surprisingly, the varied meanings which have accrued to 'discourse' are also active in the term 'discourse analysis'. Robert de Beaugrande (1994) has attempted to gather together some of the varied elements in discourse analysis, suggesting three areas of initial concentration: 'the cross-cultural study of stories and narratives' of the type carried out by Claude Lévi-Strauss, 'the discourse of schooling and education' (such as in the work of Michael Stubbs and others), 'and, with a sociological turn, the organization of conversation' (207). But as de Beaugrande

points out, from the 1970s onwards the picture becomes much more complicated, as 'discourse analysis became a convergence point for a number of trends; "text linguistics" on the European continent; "functional" or "systemic linguistics" in Czechoslovakia, Britain and Australia; "cognitive linguistics," "critical linguistics," "ethnography of communication," "ethnomethodology, and the structuralism, poststructuralism, deconstruction, and feminism emanating from France; along with semiotics and cognitive science, both convergence points in their own right' (1994, 207-8). All human life is truly there so far as discourse analysis today is concerned.

There are certain unspoken rules controlling which statements can be made and which cannot within the discourse, and these rules determine the nature of that discourse. Since a virtually limitless number of statements can be made within the rules of the system, it is these rules that characterize the discourse and that interest analysts such as Foucault. What are the rules that allow certain statements to be made and not others? Which rules order these statements? Which rules allow the development of a classificatory system? Which rules allow us to identify certain individuals as authors? These rules concern such things as the classification, the ordering and the distribution of that knowledge for the world that the discourse both enables and delimits.

A good example of a discourse is medicine. In mundane terms we simply think of medicine as healing sick bodies. But medicine represents a system of statements that can be made about bodies, about sickness and about the world. The rules of this system determine how we view the process of healing, the identity of the sick and, in fact, encompass the ordering of our physical relationship with the world. There are certain principles of exclusion and inclusion that operate within this system; some things can be said and some things cannot. Indeed we cannot talk about

medicine without making a distinction between different kinds, such as 'Western' and 'Chinese' medicine. For these are two discourses in which the body and its relationship to the world are not only different but virtually incompatible. This explains the very great resistance in Western medicine to forms of healing that do not accord with its positivistic idea of the body. Until such practices as acupuncture or herbal remedies could be incorporated into the positivistic framework of Western medicine, by being incorporated into other 'scientific' statements, they were rejected as charlatanism or superstition (they did not concur with 'truth'). It is only very gradually that such rules of exclusion, which keep a discourse intact, can be modified, because the discourse maintains not just an understanding of the world, but in a real sense the world itself. Such incursions, when not controlled, may represent a very great threat to the authority of the discourse.

Discourse is important, therefore, because it joins power and knowledge together. Those who have power have control of what is known and the *way* it is known, and those who have such knowledge have power over those who do not. This link between knowledge and power is particularly important in the relationships between colonizers and colonized, and has been extensively elaborated by Edward Said in his discussion of Orientalism, in which he points out that this discourse, this way of knowing the 'Orient', is a way of maintaining power over it. Said's work lays more stress on the importance of writing and literary texts in the process of constructing representations of the other than does Foucault's, whose concern is more widely distributed across a variety of social institutions. Said's insistence on the central role of literature in promoting colonialist discourse is elaborated in his later work, where he argues that the nineteenth-century novel comes into being as part of the formation of Empire, and acts reflexively with the forces of imperial control to

establish imperialism as the dominant ideology in the period. This emphasis has made Said's work of especial interest to those concerned with postcolonial literatures and literary theory.

Foucault's view of the role of discourse though is even wider, and more pervasive, since he argues that discourse is *the* crucial feature of modernity itself. For the discourse of modernity occurs when what is said, the 'enunciated', becomes more important than the saying, the 'enunciation'. In classical times, intellectual power could be maintained by rhetoric, by the persuasiveness of the speaker 'discouraging' to a body of listeners. But gradually the 'will to truth' came to dominate discourse and statements were required to be either true or false. When this occurred, it was no longer the act of discourse but the subject of discourse that became important. The crucial fact for post-colonial theory is that the 'will to truth' is linked to the 'will to power' in the same *way* that power and knowledge are linked. The will of European nations to exercise dominant control over the world, which led to the growth of empires, was accompanied by the capacity to confirm European notions of utility, rationality, discipline as truth. We can extend our example, therefore, to talk about 'Eurocentric discourse', or the 'discourse of modernity', that is, a system of statements that can be made about the world that involve certain assumptions, prejudices, blindspots and insights, all of which have a historical provenance, but exclude other, possibly equally valid, statements. All these statements and all that can be induced within the discourse thus become protected by the assertion of 'truth'.

Nowadays the term is restricted to this later usage stemming from Greenblatt, and describing groupings of critics and theorists who have rejected the synchronic approaches.

New Historicism

Victor Shea has pointed out that Wesley Morris used the term 'New Historicism' in 1972 'to designate a mode of literary criticism derived from German historicists such as Leopold von Ranke and Wilhelm Dilthey, and American historians such as Vernon L. Parrington and Van Wyck Brooks'. Kiernan Ryan has suggested that the term is foreshadowed even earlier, in the title of Roy Harvey Pearce's 1969 book, *Historicism Once More*, but he concedes that 'it is Stephen Greenblatt who gets the credit for slipping the term into circulation in its current sense in his Introduction to "The Forms of Power and the Power of Forms in the Renaissance", a special issue of *Genre* devoted to what was already billed as a fresh departure in critical practice'.

Nowadays the term is restricted to this later usage stemming from Greenblatt, and describing groupings of critics and theorists who have rejected the synchronic approaches to Culture and literature associated with Structuralism who have attempted to provide more adequate answers to various problems associated with the tensions between aesthetic, cultural, and historical approaches to the study of a range of different sorts of text. Most of those known as New Historicists (some of whom have gone on record with their preference for the term 'cultural poetics') are from North America, while cultural materialism is by and large a British phenomenon. On occasions, however, New Historicism is used as an umbrella term to include members of both groupings. The writings of Michel Foucault and Raymond Williams constitute a major influence on the New Historicists, who have succeeded in defining (or suggesting) new objects of historical study, with a particular emphasis upon the way in which causal influences are mediated through discursive practices (see the entry for Discourse).

Stephen J. Greenblatt is certainly a key figure in the rise of the New Historicism, and in his collection of essays *Learning to Curse* (1990) he admits that for him the term describes not so much a set of beliefs as 'a trajectory that led from American literary formalism through the political and theoretical ferment of the 1970s to a fascination with what one of the best new historicist critics [Louis A. Montrose] calls "the historicity of texts and the textuality of history" ' (1990, 3). Elsewhere he describes the New Historicism as a practice rather than a doctrine (1990, 146). Greenblatt sees the New Historicism's creation of 'an intensified willingness to read all of the textual traces of the past with the attention traditionally conferred only on literary texts' (1990, 14) to be central to its value. Thus in a study of a design by Durer for a monument to commemorate the defeat of peasants involved in protest and rebellion, Greenblatt notes that intention, genre and historical situation all have to be taken into account, as all are social and Ideological and must be involved in any 'reading 'of the design. He continues:

The production and consumption of such works are not unitary to begin with; they always involve a multiplicity of interests, however well organized, for the crucial reason that art is social and hence presumes more than one consciousness. And in response to the art of the past we inevitably register, whether we wish to or not the shifts in value and interest that are produced in the struggles of social and political life. (112)

The New Historicist, in other words, has as much to say about the reading of texts as about their composition.

For those who like negative definitions, Greenblatt cites three definitions of the word 'historicism' from *The American Heritage Dictionary*, all of which he sees to be counter to the practice of New Historicists:

1. The belief that processes are at work in history that man can do little to alter.
2. The theory that the historian must avoid all value judgments in his study of past periods or former cultures.
3. Veneration of the past or of tradition. (Quoted in Greenblatt: 164)

Although Greenblatt and other New Historicists pay tribute to the work of various poststructuralist, the anti-formalist element in their work clearly distances them from important aspects of post-structuralism.

The term 'historicist' is sometimes used in a pejorative sense which is unconnected with New Historicism. Historicist in this sense implies the view that human, social or cultural characteristics are determined in an absolute sense by historical situation; historicism in this sense is thus a form of reductionism as the human, the social and the cultural are collapsed back into the historical. Thus the title of an essay by Louis Althusser 'Marxism This is not a historicism', rests on such a definition of historicism.

New historicists, in contrast, don't believe we have clear access to any but the most basic facts of history. We can know, for example, that George Washington was the first American president and that Napoleon was defeated at Waterloo. But our understanding of what such facts mean, of how they fit within the complex web of competing ideologies and conflicting social, political, and cultural agendas of the time

and place in which they occurred is, for new historicists, strictly a matter of interpretation, not fact. Even when traditional historians believe they are sticking to the facts, the way they contextualize those facts (including which facts are deemed important enough to report and which are left out) determines what story those facts will tell. From this perspective, there is no such thing as a presentation of facts; there is only interpretation. Furthermore, new historicists argue that reliable interpretations are, for a number of reasons, difficult to produce.

The first and most important reason for this difficulty, new historicists believe, is the impossibility of objective analysis. Like all human beings, historians live in a particular time and place, and their views of both current and past events are influenced in innumerable conscious and unconscious ways by their own experience within their own culture. Historians may believe they're being objective, but their own views of what is right and wrong, what is civilized and uncivilized, what is important and unimportant and the like, will strongly influence the ways in which they interpret events. For example, the traditional view that history is progressive is based on the belief, held in the past by many Anglo-European historians, that the so-called "primitive" cultures of native people are less evolved than, and therefore inferior to, the so-called "civilized" Anglo-European cultures. As a result, ancient cultures with highly developed art form, ethical codes, and spiritual philosophies, such as the tribal cultures of Native Americans and Africans, were often misrepresented as lawless, superstitious, and savage.

Another reason for the difficulty in producing reliable interpretations of history is its complexity. For New Historicists, History cannot be understood simply as a linear progression of events. At any given point in history, any given culture may be progressing in some areas and regressing in others. And any two historians may

disagree about what constitutes progress and what doesn't, for these terms are matters of definition. That is, history isn't an orderly parade into a continually improving future, as many traditional historians have believed. It's more like an improvised dance consisting of an infinite variety of steps, following any new route at any given moment, and having no particular goal or destination. Individuals and groups of people may have goals, but human history does not.

Similarly, while events certainly have causes, new historicists argue that those causes are usually multiple, complex, and difficult to analyze. One cannot or is not a one-way street from cause to effect. Any given event—whether it is a political election or a children's cartoon show—is a product of its culture, but it also affects that culture in return. In other words, all events—including everything from the creation of an art work, to a televised murder trial, to the persistence of or change in the condition of the poor—are shaped by and shape the culture in which they emerge.

In a similar manner, our subjectivity, or selfhood, is shaped by and shapes the culture into which we were born. For most new historicists, our individual identity is not merely a product of society. Neither is it merely a product of our own individual will and desire. Instead, individual identity and its cultural milieu inhabit, reflect, and define each other. Their relationship is mutually constitutive (they create each other) and dynamically unstable. Thus, the old argument between determinism and free will can't be settled because it rests on the wrong question: "Is human identity socially determined or are human beings free agents?" For new historicism, this question cannot be answered because it involves a choice between two entities that are not wholly separate. Rather, the proper question is, "What are the processes by which individual identity and social formations—such as political, educational, legal, and religious and ideologies—create, promote, or change each other?" For every society

constraints individual taneously enables individuals to think and act. Our subjectivity, then, is a lifelong process of negotiating our way, consciously and unconsciously, among the constraints and freedoms offered, at any given moment in time, by the society in which we live.

Thus, according to new historicists, power does not emanate only from the top of the political and socio-economic structure. According to French philosopher Michael Foucault, whose ideas have strongly influenced the development of new historicism, power circulates in all directions, to and from all social levels, at all times. And the vehicle by which power circulates is a never-ending proliferation of exchange: (1) the exchange of material goods through such practices as buying and selling, bartering, gambling, taxation, charity, and various forms of theft; (2) the exchange of people through such institutions as marriage, adoption, kidnapping, and slavery; and (3) the exchange of ideas through the various discourse a culture produces.

Chapter III: Discourse of Democracy in Whitman's Poetry

Though Whitman spent much of his ink in writing about common people, he seems sympathetic to them and he seems ready to weep and laugh in their situations. But all his writings, either that may be poetry or prose is politicized because he was a White man first of all and was an elitist. He wanted to show sympathy over them but he never wanted them to come at fore as every capitalist like. Since the political climate of his time was a bit in a confused state. Common people, or black and white grass root people was getting their right of life, liberty and happiness which the capitalist, white, rich people could not accept. And Whitman's psyche was also like a rich capitalist's psyche he never wanted them to come in his place so to maintain his dignity or his level's people status he started to create discourse through his poetry and prose.

It is doubtless that most of Whitman's poems portray common, grassroots people as persona. In all of his poetry he highly extols them. But his act of extolling is coloured with political motivation. He denies every rule, regulation, law, books and he wants to prove all of them are not worthy of anything. He extols common men to the point of greatest height and intentionally lets them fall or he pushes them from there causing great injury in their part to show that they never deserved such height. He praises him in such a way that they tend to believe that he was really superior than others. Here lies politics of democracy.

Whitman's writing of poetry and prose were not democratic rather his intention was to maintain the status-quo. In comparison to the common people he was educated and well read, he went with them, knew their problems, seemingly sympathized them and achieved power, after achieving power he began to create discourse through his writing and started to circulate amidst the grassroot people.

Politicization of Whitman's verse reinforces to maintain the old hierarchical order prevalent before civil war. Whitman was deeply disturbed by the sense that the hierarchical order was threatened by the air of awareness blown in the common grass root people.

Commenting on this issue Roger Aselineau state: sometime Whitman transcribes an everyday scene with extreme simplicity and the great transparence: "The little one sleeps in its cradle/I lift the gauze and look a longtime/and silently brush away flies with my hand" (37).

Sometimes he heaps up abstract words interminably with an enthusiasm which the reader does not always share and he takes the benefit of their misunderstanding, they just understand the surface meaning of the text because they are less scholarly, by knowing this the poet expresses some underlying meaning? Which fulfill his desire of greatness and superior ego of elite class. Really puzzling, he sits in the middle of the two class and he illusions both of them as if he belongs to them. "Great is liberty! great is Equality/Great is youth - equality great is old age . . ./Great is wealth - great is poverty great is expression - great is silence (49).

Even more, the same verse sometimes brings two clashing elements together.

It even happens that is best passages are spoiled by the brusque intrusion of a learned word in a very simple context.

Had he been fair and clear in his expression, he shouldnot have to choose the rambling words and It is a matter to concentrate why he wrote in such a way heaping up abstract words, if his intended readers were the grass root level.

One thing capitalist white people hesitate to think from common people that is their leadership. They never want to be governed by the grass root people. They just

want to express sympathy over them, without giving them full agency. Exactly like this Whitman has done in his poetry. He has spoken from the mouths of all people but not their language but his own language. One thing always haunts capitalist that if the grass root people get agency, they will go against capitalism and their supremacy. So they never let them agency. Whitman, in surface, seems one of the representative person of the common people and is uttering the plea for democracy. But his plea is enveloped by his dominating psyche. In song of myself, he expresses

I do not ask the wounded person how he feels

I myself become the wounded person,

I am the hounded slave, I wince at the bite of the dog?

Hell and despair are upon me, crack and again crack the marks men.(55)

He roamed the island in all directions from Brooklyn to Montauk, where one looked out over the Atlantic from the bluff by the lighthouse. He fraternized with fisherman and farmers, bay-men pilots, and with dancing Negroes and boys with flutter like those of William Sidney Mount, who was painting his long scenes at just this time. He went to the prisoners, orphans, prostitutes, slaves, doctors, and everywhere. To create a discourse one has to get more and more information, he got knowledge. After getting knowledge he created a discourse of democratic man. He knew and he ruled them.

Though, he is always considered the bard of democracy, he is authoritative or arrogant rather democrat. He says we are same, what you think so I think, but his superior psyche haunts and compel him to reveal who he is by heart, what he thinks of him and what he thinks of common people. In song of myself he sings,

Divine am I inside and outside,
 and I make holy whatever I touch or am touched from,
 This scent of these armpits aroma finer than prayer,
 This head more than churches, bibles, and all the creeds. (44)

Not only he has created a discourse of democratic man but also he has tried to create a narcissistic discourse where he praises himself. He wants to show himself superior than the grass root level people and he is jealous at their awareness for their rights. So In "By Blue Ontario's Shore" he declares himself the spokesman for those, "Whom laws, theories, conventions can never master. In "Song of Myself" he asserts "I permit to speak at every hazard, Nature without check with original energy". Again, he expresses his nature of arrogant, "I wear my hat as I please, indoors or out. Why should I pray? why should I venerate and be ceremonious."

It is not a matter to deny that common people were coming at the fore whether Whitman wanted it or not. So he did not want to break their heart rather he wanted them to be hypnotized in his writing. So seemingly he sang for them. In Salut au Monde! he states:

What do you hear Walt Whitman?

I hear the workman singing and

farmer's wife singing

I hear in the distance the sounds of children and of animals early in the day

(149)

As aforementioned, by no means capitalist do not want the common people have agency. So they pretend of singing the song of the minor people. It benefits them

highly because first it helps the common to be dependent on the capitalist and secondly the capitalist can circulate their own discourse being the representative of the grass root level. And while using the language they use abstract words and vast references they bring so the people about whom they are writing cannot understand and they do not pay attention and they just feel content that they are writing about the pains and suffering of grass root people. In his 'I Sing the Body Electric' he goes seemingly sympathizing the common people as:

The female soothing a child, the farmer's daughter in the garden or coward,

The young fellow hoeing corn, the sleigh driver driving his six horses through the crowd,

I knew a man, a common farmer, the father of five sons,

He drank water only, the blood

Show'd like scarlet through the clear brown skin of his face. (117-118)

Furthermore, he tries to befriend with slave. His intention of dominating can be seen in the lines of the same poem. A man's body at auction (for before the war I often go to the slave mart and watch the sale) I help the auctioneer, (121)

The words 'watch' and 'help' should be given more emphasis here. He watches the scene where a poor slave boy is being sold, he finds that interesting so he watches. Through this word we can peep into his capitalist psyche as every capitalist are fond of selling and buying. And they treat everything either that is human being or anything the matter to sell and get profit. His dual role also is mirrored here, by going there at the slave-mart he has tried to win both peoples' heart. By going there in the slave side he wants to say him that he is with the slave. And the word 'help' suggest directly that he is helping the richman. Since he is a person having capitalist psyche

it's not a matter of surprising that a capitalist wants to help another capitalist. Furthermore in his another poem "I Hear It was Charged Against Me", Ambivalent nature of capitalist always puzzle the citizen. Though Whitman regards common people as their intended reader and subject matter. He, unconsciously expresses his ambivalent nature. "I Hear it was charged against me that I sought to destroy institutions/But really I am neither for nor against institution" (143).

I am neither for nor against' like expression hinders the readers to get any meaning and the person who makes such expression pleases because that baffles both the capitalist as well as the proletariot, the lowmaker as well as the lowbreaker etc.

His policy of duality gets proceeded in his another poem too. In his poem 'Native moments' he opines,

He shall be lawless, rude, illiterate, he shall be one condemned by others for deals done, I will play a part no longer, why should I exile myself from my companions. O you shunned persons, I at least do not shun you,

I come forth with in you midst, I will be you poet,

I will be more to you than to any of the rest.(130)

These lines express at the best about Whitman's attitude to common people. What he used to think about them that they lack their volition and they can be driven anywhere. So he speaks with them I will more to you than to any of the rest. He goes to the lawmaker's house and he affirms the lawmakers theory and pretends of being company of him. He also goes to the lawbreakers house and pretends of soothing him. But both of them he says that he is true to them.

By creating a discourse of a 'democratic man' he is justifying his abnormal behaviours. Whatever he does that is divine and anything that is opposed to him is

worthless for him. His whole writing gets concluded here in his discourse and his justification.

Had he really been sympathetic to the underclass people, he should have given them chances to speak and people would believe him but he himself speak and urges us to believe whatever he thinks is divine, he is divine and his behaviour is the divine behaviour. In 'Song of Myself' he advocates:

Through me forbidden voices,
Voices of sex and lust, voices veil's and
I remove the veil.

So, the poet takes all people's speak to right and he alone speaks.

"I do not press my fingers across my mouth" (43)

The word 'press' is vital here, yes he does not press his finger across his mouth. But by speaking alone for all he presses his fingers across others mouth. This is the ideology of capitalist, they do not let others to speak - they try to press their fingers across the common people's mouth. But they do not do it directly, they do it indirectly. They seem sympathetic to them but their sympathy is repleted with inferiorization. They inferiorly sympathize the common people.

As power is never wholly confined to a single person or a single level of society. Rather, power circulates in a culture through exchanges of human beings, and most important for literary critics, as well below, exchanges of ideas through the various discourse a culture produces. He circulated the discourse of a democratic man.

All historical analysis is unavoidably subjective. Historians must therefore reveal the ways in which they know they have been positioned, by their own cultural

experience, to interpret history. Looking through the lens of New Historicism, Walt Whitman is not only a literary figure but also a historian. We can get the true mirror of the society by going through his poetry.

A plurality of historical voices also tends to raise issues that new historicism considers important, such as how ideology operates in the formation of personal and group identity, how a culture's perception of itself influences its political, legal and social policies and customs, and how power circulates in a given culture. No doubt Whitman saw the discrimination between black and White, his consciousness shaped by the differences in human being. He perceived the thing differently or prejudicially because he was in practice of such behaviour.

As America was materially progressing in Whitman's time. He has left no stone unturned to support capitalist of that time. In his 'Song of Myself'. "I bequeath myself to the dirt to grow from the grass I love/If you want me again look for me under you boot soles" (74).

The metaphor of grass under boot soles is worth-noting here. Though in surface outlook he prefers grass and aspires its life but if we plunge into the lines deeply, he has positioned the boot over grass. We can interpret grass as nature and the representative of common people and boot soles that is the symbol of capitalism. As capitalism usurps the right of grass root level so he has depicted in his poetry. He responses the place of common people as 'dirt' but he shows his hypocrisy by liking that but in reality he hates that and he always wants to undermine the common people.

Sometimes in the name of democracy he becomes so freaky, so lawless, and so manner less that threatens in the status of the society. His discourse of democracy wants to break everything, wants to disrupt everything and through his discourse he

not only justifies his abnormal behaviour but also inspires the grass root people to violate everything. In 'Song of Myself' he urges:

And that all the men ever born are also my brother, and the women my sisters and lovers.

[. . .]

I help myself to material and immaterial, No guard can shut me off, no law prevent me (28)

And I know that the spirit of God is the brother of my own,

His writing always puzzled and deceived the critics because they understood and explained him wrongly. They always saw him a democrat, a representative man of grass root level people but they could not see his politics behind his privileging democracy.

It's sure that in surface he is for the grassroot people but in course of his poetry he cannot leave his authoritative nature. He dares to divinize himself in "Song of Myself". His ego of elitism tries to divinize himself in his poetry. He says he sees god in everyone's face and he concludes he sees god in his own face. It means that he is like god and he is as equal as god to the grass root people and they should respect him and come under his will.

I see something of God each hour of the twenty-four, and each moment then,

In the faces of men and women I see God,

and in my own face in the glass. (72)

This is his policy he also says all people are divine but at last he puts himself at the top and unknowingly people conceive his discourse, without understanding his politics. "I speak the password primeval, I give the sign of democracy/By God! I will accept nothing which all cannot have their counterpart of on the same terms" (43).

The frequent use of 'I' also relates with his politics. Taking all peoples' voice he wants to speak, making them dumb forever and dependent on him. It is the crux policy of capitalist because when someone becomes dependent on you, he/she cannot go out of your order or your way. So he is rather undermining the grass root people instead of uplifting. Nick Aaron Ford expresses in his Walt Whitman's conception of democracy. He also tried to abolish Negro slavery for the full American democracy but the problem of slavery involved the relation between the federal and state government and Whitman believed in 'States Rights' as ardently as he did in abolition of slavery. Therefore, despite his personal desire to see slavery abolished, he contented himself in subsequent articles with affirming the principle that all new territory annexed to the United States should be free of slavers.

My argument is really not opposite of what Nick Aaron ford has said, but my confusion lies in the word, 'content'. If he really wanted slavery abolished, why he remained content, he should have to fight, he should have to aware the people through his writings. He did not do so because he also by heart did not want the slavery abolished. He just wrote some essay and poems favouring them because that was the demand of time and he had to write.

Moreover, Whitman's abstractions his rhetoric and declamation, were not appreciated by the average reader. His art is highly symbolic and suggestive. His poetic form was a definite stumbling block in the way of his popularity his technical complexities and innovations can be appreciated only by the few. His poetry is

apparently formless, and a line from it is hard to remember. Neither his so-called democratic free-verse is favourable for the common people nor his sympathy that means not feeling with but feeling for console their sufferings. By heaping so many words and Jarglens he has made his poetry more complex. To strengthen my points some lines of Song of Myself- "Echoes, ripples, buzz'd whispers, love-root, silk-thread, crotch and vine/My respiration and my inspiration, the beating of my heart/the passing of blood and air through my lungs. (25)

His narcissistic discourse of extolling himself also plays vital role in his poetry. Rather expressing the political turmoil of that time and the pitiable condition of the common people we can get his interest in describing himself. He begins his poetry extolling himself and ends the same. Had he been really conscious of the time and miserable condition of the people, he should have described that first. His narcissistic discourse of extolling himself also plays vital role in his poetry:

I am the poet of the Body and I am the poet of the soul,

The pleasures of heaven are with me and the pains of hell are with me,

I am not the poet of goodness only,

I do not decline to be the poet of wickedness also (40-41)

In the name of free verse, he sometimes writes whatever comes in his mind and we people also get confused not only the common grass root people.

In vain the speeding or shyness

In vain the plutonic rocks send their

Old heat against my approach

In vain the mastodon retreats

Beneath its own powdered bones,

In vain object stand leagues off and assume manifold shapes. (49)

The discourse of democratic man does not eulogize the grass root people but of himself. He puts himself at the top and the common people as the grass. And as a person take rest sitting on the grass he has always enjoyed over the right of the common people. "I am large. I contain multitudes" (73). Whitman's dreamy enthusiasm is to maintain the social hierarchy prevalent in the society. He is not down to earth regarding the problem, he just tries to fascinate the poor, slave, orphans etc. by his dreamy discourse and never tries to make them feel equal in reality. By unraveling the nulls of ordinary being the poet becomes liberated and unlimited. He reaches to become one with supreme power, leaving the pairs of opposites as playthings. He places himself at the center of cosmic drama shoring the omnipotence and omnipresence of Godhead. The poet tries to go beyond the empire of God and accepts them as his equal. He is jealous at common people's arrival at the fore. So he is hurrying to make him equal to the God. So the grass root people always worship him and sing the hymn for him.

I am also the gambling of cheats, and of the splendid

I am splendor, I am victory, I am adventure and I am good quality in
all superior man. (10-36)

I have no chair, no church, no philosophy (46)

Divine am I Inside and out and I make holy whatever I touch or
touched from. [. . .]

This head more than churches, bibles all the creeds. (24)

The same jarring not is something produced by the unexpected use of a slang term.

The spotted hawk snoops by and accuses me, he complains of my gab and my loitering. (6)

Thus, most often, the different stylistic element, instead of being used separately and kept from all admixtures, enter into complex combinations. The concrete passages, in particular are not always the realistic and perfectly objective and clearly understood by the common people.

In case of sex, he becomes freaky and maximum liberal. He has presented his persona, the so-called democratic, arrogant man in such a way that the society could not digest of that time. He insinuates the common people and tries to justify his excessive interest in sex is also good. In 'From Pent-up Aching Rivers' he expresses

From the long sustain'd kiss upon the mouth or bosom,

From the close pressure that makes me

or any man drunk, fainting with excess

From what the husband knows,

From the of fatherhood (116)

In his another poem "Once I pass'd Throw A Populous City", By picturing a woman, who is amrously infatuated to him, he has tried to make him superior. His arrangement tone and his intended meaning beneath the surface is he slept with her by compulsion, he spent a couple of days and nights with her compulsion not by his choice. "I remember I say only that woman who passionately clung to me/Again we wander, we love, we seperate again/Again she holds me by the hand, I must not go. (130).

"Again She holds Me" he shows he is sensually aristocratic so she does not let him go. By representing such an event he is circulating his power towards the other woman. He also wants them to spend some days and nights. By these sweet words he is trying to fascinate them.

The word 'divine' he has used repeatedly in his entire poem. We can interpret his obsession in the word 'divine' as the capitalist's interest in divinity. As every capitalist wants to give sympathy to the grass root people and they want to show themselves as omnipotent and omnipresent as well. Since they want them to be subjugated forever in their clutch. They wanted to get respect, honor and above all worship from the common people. By labeling himself in the place of God Whitman also is showing his arrogant psyche.

It could be due to his nostalgia of the society before civil war. In which time, common black people were the things to be sold and bought. And their right of life, liberty and happiness used to be in the rich people's honor. Rich people used to think themselves as God and took pride to have authority of the common people's lives.

As we go beneath the surface of his poem we come across his politics. He never wanted to see black man in his label rather he wanted to see them under his clutch. So by making the discourse of democracy he not only justifies his abnormal behaviour, which the society could not digest as divine but put himself at the top and undermine all the common people, as the boot soles undermined the grass, usurping the life, liberty and pursuit of happiness of common people. "And the good or bad I say of myself I say of them" (20). His discourse of democracy or equality gets disrupted when he displays his superiority of his knowledge about the interest and disinterest of the common people. This type of self-superiority always appears with him.

Chapter IV: Conclusion

Whitman's discourse of democracy in his behaviour, in his writing and in his treatment towards other people is colored by his politics. His politics beneath the surface tries to maintain the social hierarchy between the owner and the owned, capitalist and the proletariat, the rich and the poor etc.

As every capitalist wants to see the proletariat below them, wants to sympathize them and wants to guide them, so does Whitman in his poetry, by not giving any agency to them. He speaks for all, taking all people's voice. In such speaking, he usurps their right of expressing their pains and sufferings. As every capitalist fears that if they (proletariat) got agency, they would speak about their feelings and sufferings and they would go against the reign of capitalist.

The obsession of divinity in Whitman's poetry is his nostalgia for feudal past as the common people were raising their voices against the oppression of the capitalist land owner. Whitman begins most of his poem celebrating himself and ends with such celebration. In 'Song of Myself', his drama like poem he begins with 'I' is celebration at last he ends with the metaphor of grass under boot soles. This metaphor is sufficient enough to understand his politics, as boot soles usurp the right of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness of the grass, undermining it forever.

His privileging of democracy in his poetry is for the sake of justification of his odd behaviour and the domination of the capitalist. As a capitalist says to the proletariat you cannot express your feeling. So I'll express, as you cannot hear properly I'll make you hear and by saying these they take all agency and make the grass root people deaf, dumb, handicapped and dependent forever.

Creating a discourse of democracy, he hankers to break everything, wants to create everything and through his discourse he not only justifies his unnatural behaviour but also inspires the grass root people to violate the rules and regulations. He creates his own rules and regulations and compels them to copy it. He advocates all people are divine/God but finally he himself occupies the top post leaving others in status quo. He has indirectly created his superior status over grass root people though he pretends to be inside the heart of them.

All his writing, either they are poems or proses, are politicized because after all he was an elitist. He shows sympathy over grass root people but he never wants them to come out at the centre as every capitalist does. Because the political climate of his time was a bit in a bewildered state. Common people or black and white grass root level people were not getting their fundamental rights, Whitman's psyche was like a rich capitalist's psyche, and he never wanted to give an appropriate place for them even if he outwardly pretends such. So, to balance his dignity and status he started to create discourses in his poems and proses and formulated some kind of make-shift truth. Whitman's Self-presentation as preacher-healer messiah provides the structural key to his poetry.

Works Cited

- Allen, Wilson Gay. Ed. *Walt Whitman's Poems*. New York: New York UP, 1995.
- Althusser, Louis and Etienne Balibar. *Reading 'Capital'*. London: New Left Books. 1977.
- Books, Van Wyck. *The Times of Melville and Whitman*. New York: E.P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1953.
- Cowley, Malcom, ed. *The Complete Prose and Poetry of Walt Whitman*. New York: Garden City Books, 1954.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Trans. Sheridan Smith, A.M. London: Tavistock, 1972
- Fowler, Roger. "The Lost Girl: Discourse and Focalization" 1990. *Rethinking Lawrence*. Ed. Keith Brown. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1990. 53-66.
- Greenblatt, Stephen J. *Shakespearean Negotiations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Greenblatt, Stephen J. *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Jay, Martin. *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Lawrence, D.H. *Studies in Classic American Literature*. New York: The Viking Press, 1964.
- Loving, Jerome. Ed. *Walt Whitman's Leaves of Grass*. New York: Oxford UP, 1992.
- Matthiessen, F.O. *American Renaissance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Pearce, Roy Harvey Whitman. *A Spectrum Book*. Prentice-Hall Inc: Englewood Cliffs, 1962.

Ryan, Kiernan. Ed. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism: A Reader*. London: Arnold, 1996.

Spiller, Robert E. ed. *Literary History of the United States*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.

Verma, Yugeshwor Prasad. *Masters and Mystics*. Kathmandu : The Nepal Press, 1968.

Wilson, R. Jackson. Ed. *America's History*. Chicago: The Dorsey Press, 1987.