

## Chapter I

### Introduction

#### Peter Carey and His Works

This research tries to analyze Carey's attitude towards the nature of and the relation between history and fiction. It will be viewed as the written history of the marginalized people and the immigrants who have been struggling to set themselves free from the social injustice.

Australian short story writer and novelist Peter Carey who was born in Bacchus Marsh, Victoria became the second person to have won the Booker Prize for fiction twice when he received the 2001 award for his novel *True History of the Kelly Gang*. He has combined in his works realism, fantastic, and surreal situations. His parents, who had a General Motors dealership, sent him to Geelong Grammar School, one of the leading private schools, where the children of Australia's Best Families all spoke with English accents. Carey studied briefly in 1961 at Monash University, where he failed a science degree. After leaving university, Carey worked in advertising agencies in Melbourne and London. He started to read passionately, especially the work of Joyce, Beckett, Kafka and Faulkner, and in 1964 he began to write. By 1968 he had composed three unpublished novels. In 1974 Carey moved to Sydney, where he becomes one of the best copywriters in the country. He campaigned among others for Lindemans winery, with the slogan, "You make us smile, Dr. Lindeman" (5). In the 1980s he opened McSpedden Carey Advertising Consultants with Bani McSpedden. About 1990 Carey moved with his wife, Alison Summers, a theater director, and his son, to New York, where he taught creative writing at University of New York.

As a writer, Carey made his debut with *The Fat Man in History* (1974), highly praised by critics and scholars. It was followed by *War Crimes* (1979), an award winning collection of short stories, most of which Carey wrote in an 'alternative community' at

Yandina in the rainforest of Queensland. *Bliss* is a darkly comic novel about an advertising executive, Harry Joe, who wakes up from a heart operation and believes that the life he has known is in fact Hell. The Bellingen Valley and its surroundings left marks on Booker Prize winning novel *Oscar and Lucinda* (1988), and historical *Tour de force* set in the 19th century. *Tax Inspector* (1991) was a tragicomedy of modern life in run-down town outside Sydney, set amongst Catch prices, a cursed family of car dealers. Carey's novels have been a gold mine for critics who look influence of magic realism, Franz Kafka, Jorge Luis Borges, Charles Dickens, postmodernism, and postcolonial political literature. Carey himself has not explained too much of his work. He has said that Garcia Marquez's *One Hundred Years of Solitude* had a huge effect on him, but in a *New York Times* interview Carey confessed that he has "never really read Dickens. I quit '*Bleak House*' after I encountered this nauseatingly good little girl. But I will read Dickens one day, I promise" (Wikipedia, 22). Peter Carey goes back to an outlaw hero's own writings to find the voice for his *True History of the Kelly Gang*.

### ***True History of the Kelly Gang: A Synopsis***

*True History of the Kelly Gang* (2001) won the prestigious Booker Prize in 2001. It drew a colorful portrait of the famous Irish-Australian outlaw and tragic martyr, Ned Kelly. *True History of the Kelly Gang* begins around 1866 when narrator Ned Kelly is twelve years old. narrated in the first person in a series of thirteen fictional parcels of loose paper apparently written by Kelly for his daughter (and later transported to Melbourne in a mysterious metal trunk), the novel follows Kelly and the so-called "Kelly Gang" (younger brother Daniel Kelly and friends Joe Byrne and Steven Hart) over a twelve year period, concluding with Ned's hanging in 1880 at the age of twenty-six. Carey adopted in the book the language of late nineteenth century rural Australians, using among his sources the outlaw's one surviving letter: "I lost my own father at twelve years of age and know what it is to be raised on lies and silences my dear daughter you are presently too young to

understand a word I write but this history is for you and will contain no single lie may I burn in Hell if I speak false” (7). Carey takes the reader from (George Edward) Ned Kelly's childhood and teenage years in prisons to his horse stealings and bank robberings, and finally to his years as a leader of a rebel band of farmers, fighting against corrupt system.

To his pursuers, Kelly is nothing but a monstrous criminal, a thief and a murderer. To his own people, the lowly class of ordinary Australians, he is a hero, defying the authority of the English to direct their lives. Indentured by his bootlegger mother to a famous horse thief (who was also her lover), Ned sees his first prison cell at fifteen and by the age of twenty-six has become the most wanted man in the wild colony of Victoria, taking over whole towns and defying the law until he is finally captured and hanged. Here is a classic outlaw tale *True History of the Kelly Gang* made alive by the skill of a great novelist.

This novel purports to be the story of Ned Kelly, the most famous of all Australian outlaws, as told in his own words. Kelly was, in Ben McDonald's terms:

[a]n Australian bushranger who became a folk hero in his twenties for defying the crown, supporting the common people, and outwitting the colonial police for nearly two years until he was caught in 1880 and executed in Melbourne. In Carey's novel inspired by this history, Kelly scribbles his own story in grammar-challenged but emotionally compelling prose. (*Christian Century* 1)

Set in the desolate settler communities in the northern of Melbourne in the late nineteenth century, the novel is told in the form of a journal, written by the famous outlaw and 'bushranger' Ned Kelly, to a daughter he will never see. Here, the novelist Carey makes his protagonist write his own history to reveal the concealed facts which have been ignored by the mainstream history. He claims the history which he has written is true in a sense as he committed to his daughter in the very beginning of the novel. We learn that after Ned's capture in the shoot-out at Glenrowan on June 28th, 1880, "thirteen parcels of stained and

dog-eared papers, every one of them in Ned Kelly's distinctive hand", were discovered among his things (4). These parcels turned out to be a memoir, addressed to the infant daughter whom he would never see because his wife fled to San Francisco.

In a dazzling act of ventriloquism, Peter Carey gives Ned Kelly a voice so wild, passionate and original that it is impossible not to believe that the famous bushranger himself is speaking from beyond the grave. *True History of the Kelly Gang* is the song of Australia, and it sings its protest in a voice at once crude and delicate, menacing and heart-wrenching. Carey gives us Ned Kelly as an orphan, as Oedipus, as horse-thief, farmer, bushranger, reformer, bank-robber, police-killer and, finally, as his country's beloved Robin Hood.

### **Critics on *True History of the Kelly Gang***

Peter Carey's *True History of the Kelly Gang* has elicited host of criticisms and responses from many critics since its publication in 2000. The novel is especially noted for its striking use of ungrammatical use of language, which is quite spare but often evocative. The novel has the demotic language, managing to create a rich literary work through the first person voice of semi literate man. The whole story is narrated with great flair in prose that is heavy on expletives and light on punctuation – yet full of music and poetry. The style of writing is unusual in that there are no punctuation marks – this may be slightly disconcerting initially but coupled with the colloquial language, it adds atmosphere to the book. It is a convincingly read with interesting sub-plots. It also provides an interesting perspective on Irish immigrants in Australia at that time. Regarding this issue Michael Fitegerald in Times Pacific writes, “An energized on fabulation of man and myth [. . .]. So intoxicating is Kelly's voice – without commas or sophisticated grammar, his journals are meant to be drunk neat – the reader quickly forgets that the bushranger is in fact an actor writ by Carey” (6). While talking about the use of grammar and the use of language in the novel by Ned, George Garret in *The Washington Post* argues:

Ned's grammar is not his strong point, but has an authentic ring to it (and is not annoyingly wrong). He is unfamiliar with the comma so sentences run on without the breaks one expects an eye-catching device that holds the reader's attention. The only thing we could not get a handle on is his use of the apostrophe: there's I'm, I'll, won't, don't, can't – but also aint, isnt, wouldnt, couldnt. [. . .] Ned is also quite careful with his language, aware that he is addressing his daughter. The frequent expletives are rendered as 'b----r' and the like, and there is also the liberal substitution of the word 'adjectival' for the inappropriate adjectives. (11–12)

Wendy Morgan in *Trading a fine line Carey's Kelly* assesses Carey's writing. He writes:

I expected a great deal, given Carey's superb story-telling gifts and inventiveness: here I hoped, would be the talent that could give a newly imaginative life to his national figure. If in the reading I was disappointed, it is probably because Carey's imagination was imprisoned in the toils of a too-familiar, too-documented story. (71)

Jane Rogers, in *The Observers*, mainly focuses on the use of language and the voice of the being oppressed people like Ned Kelly. In his terms, "Ned's voice is the book and it is what makes the book wonderful. It is utterly convincing and continually surprising, creating new pleasures on every page. It is simple, direct, colloquial, humorous, respectfully prudish [. . .] and shot through with poetry" (6).

Anthony Quinn views this novel as a complete piece of writing. He, in *The New York Times*, opines: "Whatever one's [slight] misgivings about its status as a 'true history,' the book's power as a narrative is nearly overwhelming. [. . .] *True History of the Kelly Gang* contains pretty much everything you could ask of a novel. It is an adjectival wonder" (15).

Further defining the narrative technique of the novel, Grester Robin in *The New York Times* writes:

Peter Carey makes his pseudo-memoir work by delivering just the right balance between poor grammar and word selection, which demonstrate Ned's poor education, and humor and poetic sensitivity, which demonstrate Ned's imagination. Ned is a great storyteller, and Peter Carey sees to it that his subject's near illiteracy does not get in the way of the reader's enjoyment. In that sense the novel is a tour de force of narrative style. (12)

Peter Kemp finds the description of the rural Australian landscape beautiful. He, in *The Sunday Times*, says, "Through Kelly's keen eyes, we see the rural landscapes of nineteenth century Australia. [. . .] *True History of the Kelly Gang* is a handsome act of reparation to a figure that Carey sees as an outstanding victim of that great unfairness" (5–6). Here Kemp focuses on the portrayal of Kelly as an oppressed protagonist.

Robert Edric, in *The Guardian*, says, "*True History of the Kelly Gang* signals the first of its many deceits. Peter Carey's skills, passions and obsessions are all fully on display in this long-awaited take on colonial Australia's most enduring myth" (19).

John Banville, in *The New York Review of Books*, however, views it differently. He argues that it would be better than the present one if Carey had focused on form. He argues:

*True History of the Kelly Gang* might have been better if he had forgotten his duty to the facts and simply played with the form [. . .]. The tone never falters, and this is a considerable achievement given the breadth of the book, yet there are passages when the relentless, unpunctuated periods of the prose grind with awful monotony in the reader's ear. (3)

The analysis of the different criticism on the novel *True History of the Kelly Gang* is criticized and understood by different critics focusing on different themes such as: novel of colonial Australia, postmodern text, biography of an outlaw, novel violating the syntax.

However, this research tries to blend the fact and fiction in order to blur the demarcation between history and fiction in Carey's novel.

### **Significance of the Study**

Peter Carey's *True History of the Kelly Gang* is a work of historical reclamation, in which the past is never past, but always reverberates strangely in the present. It is an accomplished book, a virtuoso exercise in pastiche, but it tells us little of what it is like to be alive today. It has no vision of contemporary crisis. Carey looks resolutely back, not forwards; he is engaged in a complicated process of re-imagining Australian history, subverting the founding myths of his native land.

The novel has been read and interpreted from various perspectives. However, the approach of the present study is to look at Carey's attitude towards history and fiction. The need for a new way of looking at older historical forms makes *True History of the Kelly Gang* a prime example that explores new views of history. Carey believes that proclamation of universal truth in history can no longer sustain. He strongly questions and challenges the traditional ideas of viewing history as coherent, objective and continuous unity. The narrator of the novel, Ned Kelly, tries to present his own story. But he undermines his own claim to tell the 'truth' about the past and renders his narration as merely a human artifact. In other words, he doubts whether the complex reality can be objectively represented in the history.

For Carey, history is no longer a set of fixed, objective facts and it has no limited boundaries. The facts do not exist unless they are interpreted. So, history, like literature, needs to be interpreted. The historians interpret the events of history, present them coherently, and make the history intelligible to us. Historians are the ones who give pattern to history using their imagination. Thus, the historian plays a vital role in making of history, and, in this sense, history is, like fiction, a subjective phenomenon. Since history is a subjective phenomenon, there can be many versions of history.

For Carey, history is no longer homogeneous and final version. It is rather heterogeneous and multiple. By history, we generally understand the official version of history because it is the only version of history that is available to us. However, Carey interrogates the validity of the official history by providing an alternative version of Kelly's history through the novel *True History of the Kelly Gang*. He views the official historical discourse as one of the many versions of history. It is not necessarily absolute and final version of history. It is rather an artifact which is affected by a vast web of economic, social and political factors of that era. Moreover, he views it as an ideological product and which, in turn, always supports that ideology. Thus, the approach of the present study is to show how Carey blurs the demarcation between history and fiction, and interrogates the validity of the official historical discourse of Australia.

The terms 'fiction' and 'official history' need to be defined. To begin with fiction, the term is given a broader significance to mean the literature as a whole. As David Daiches writes in *Critical Approaches to Literature*, "It is any kind of composition in prose or verse which has for its purpose not the communication of fact but the telling of a story – either wholly invented or given new life through invention – or the giving of pleasure through some use of the inventive imagination in the employment of words" (4–5).

Now the term official history, in the present study, means that version of history which is approved by the state authority as true and is generally accepted both inside and outside the nation. Moreover, it is prescribed in academic institutions like school and university. The post modernist thinker Keith Jenkins opines, "History is the theory and theory is ideological and ideology just has material interests" (qtd. in Shreedharan 305). Similarly for Abrams:

[h]istory is not a homogenous and stable pattern of facts and events which can be used as the 'background' to explain the literature of an era or which literature can be said simply to reflect, or which can be adverted to as the



“material” conditions that, in a simple and unilateral way, determine the particularities of a literary text. In contrast to such views, a literary text is said by new historicists to be ‘embedded’ in its contexts, as a cultural power – relations, practices and products that, in their ensemble, constitute that we call history. (250)

The first proposition of the present study is that Carey blurs the hierarchy of history and fiction, notion of giving the former priority over later. He undermines the traditional notion of viewing history as a set of fixed, objective facts. For Carey, history is rather a subjective phenomenon, in the creation of which the memory and process of recalling memories function. Fiction, on the other hand, is not an unreal product of human imagination. It rather contains facts too. It, sometimes, helps to uncover the truth which is neglected or concealed in the official history. In this sense, history and fiction are no longer opposite terms: they are rather complementary to each other. Thus, the demarcation between history and fiction is blurred.

The second proposition of the present study is that Carey interrogates the validity of the official historical discourse of Australia. In his view, official historical discourse is not the absolute and the final version of history. It is merely a version which is based on the biases and prejudices. Moreover, it is an ideological construct which functions in favor of state ideology. To counter the official version of history, Carey through *True History of the Kelly Gang*, gives an alternative version of Australian history, i.e. Kelly’s history. Thus, by providing an alternative version of the official history, Carey puts the official historical records in question. To put it differently, he undermines any claim to absolute truth in the official version of history.

As Linda Hutcheon claims that to be a post modern novel it must question the totalizing impulse in any writing of past, this novel, *True History of the Kelly Gang* interrogates the historians’ objectivity and their efforts to present the past in totality. Post

modernist theory does not look upon a historical source as having a wholly fixed and unalterable meaning. History is not longer feasible; what we need to talk about, to pay attention to, are histories – in the plural. Local narratives are a kind of historical works which have come in the wake of the post modernist rejection of grand or master narratives as hegemonic stories told by those in power. They are generally accounts of forms of resistance – individual stories told by prisoners, students, peasants and others. To support the issue Oscar Villalon in *San Francisco Chronicles* writes, “*True History of the Kelly Gang* is Carey's fictional account of the short life of Ned Kelly, the legendary nineteenth century Australian outlaw. In Carey's retelling, Ned is driven to robberies and theft by the cruelty of Australia's judicial system and its English police, who from the beginning make life unbearable for Kelly's Irish family” (9).

All the garbage official history included about Ned is real, true to people who don't know Ned. So the present novel helps them know the reality, which revises the history honestly. Brian Mc Hale calls this kind of novel as a ‘revisionist historical novel’ because he feels it revises and reinterprets the official historical record and transforms the conventions of historical fiction. *True History of the Kelly Gang* is a historical and self-reflexive novel that enacts yet another of the ambiguities of the postmodern position. Carey's novel is an instructive examination of the nature of truth and justice in our contemporary post-modern context. The novel is about power, and about history writing. It is a narrative of both fiction and history. Regarding the issue of revisionist history, Markham in *Behavioral Health* views:

Every Australian grows up hearing the legend of outlaw Ned Kelly, whose exploits are memorialized in the old Melbourne Gaol, where he and his comrades were imprisoned before death at age twenty-six is as genuine as a diamond in the rough. No reader will be left unmoved by this dramatic tale of an instinctively good-hearted young man whose destiny, in Carey's

revisionist point of view, was determined by heredity on one side and official bigotry and corruption on the other; whose criminal deeds were motivated by gallantry desperation; and whose exploits in eluding the police for almost two years transfixed a nation and made him a popular hero. (6–7)

These multifarious responses from various sources well display the richness of the novel. A novel can have multiple interpretations. However, the present study aims to analyze how Carey blurs the demarcation between history and fiction in the novel. In the succeeding chapter the researcher is going to analyze the relation between history and fiction from new historicist perspective.

## Chapter II

### Relation between History and Fiction

#### General Background

The philosophical inquiry about the nature of literature has been going on for over two thousand years. The debate on the nature of literature and its relation to other types of discourses is believed to have started from Plato, the first major figure of Western metaphysics. Plato sees poetry as a product of high imagination that lacks truth. According to him the poet, restricted to the imitating realm of appearances, makes only copies of copies; therefore his work is twice removed from reality. The poet, according to Plato, “is an imitator, and therefore, like all other imitators, he is thrice removed from [. . .] the truths” (qtd. in Adams 15). Poetry, according to Plato, springs from improper knowledge. It is the product of the soul; it has no correspondence to reality or truth. It harms by nourishing the passions, which ought to be controlled and disciplined.

Plato sees imaginative literature to be false, rival and harmful, whereas Aristotle takes it as true, serious and useful. The whole view of the value of imaginative literature is implicit in his discussion of the relation between poetry and history and the nature of literary production. In *Poetics*, Aristotle deals on Plato’s attack on poetry as an imitation of imitation. He strongly argues that poet does not simply imitate or represent particular events or situation which he happens to have noted. He brings out their universal character through his artistic handling. Aristotle differentiates the poetic work from history and the job of artist from historian, marking the superiority of the former over the latter. In his words, the function of the poet is not “to relate what has happened, but what may happen – what is possible according to the law of probability or necessity” (qtd. in Adams 54). The poet invents or arranges his own story and, thus, creates a self-sufficient world of his own. He does not take the verses as a differentiating quality of poetry and history. Poet and historian, Aristotle says, “differ not by writing in verse or in prose [. . .]. The true difference is that one

relates what has happened, the other what may happen” (qtd. in Adams 59). This is to say that the historian must stick to what has happened and cannot arrange or invent his facts using his genius. So, he cannot manipulate the facts to present them, in terms of human psychology and the nature of things in more probable manner. The poet, on the other hand, does not work according to some chance, observation or random invention. He uses his creative potentiality to present the things in a probable manner. Aristotle finds the manipulation and invention underlying in the poet’s work. But he takes them positively and concludes: “Poetry, therefore is a more philosophical and a higher thing than history: for poetry tends to express the universal, history the particular” (55). Hence, poetry is more fundamentally scientific and serious than history. Aristotle, thus, created a hierarchy between literature and history, viewing the former as more scientific and serious than the latter. No significant development took place in the field of literature during the Middle Ages. So this era is regarded as a ‘Dark Age’ in English literary history.

Anglo-American New Criticism, the most dominant theoretical movement in the mid-twentieth century, challenged the historical view of literature put forward by Hippolyte Taine. New critics treated the literary text as an object essentially independent of its author and historical context. All the leading figures of the New Critical School, in one way or the other, focused their emphasis on the textuality of the text. New Critics assigned full power to the text presenting it as an autonomous, self-sufficient entity. On the other hand, Structuralist critics empower text by viewing it “as a set of Saussurean sign in which signifier and signified are governed by a single, complex system of relationship” (Robey 52). Literary meaning should, therefore, be analyzed in its own terms as a semantic composition, not as a reflection of the external factors. Structuralist critics take language as a self-sufficient system and believe that meaning is produced by the relationships of elements that govern linguistic system as a whole. Following the linguistic model, most of the Post structuralist critics give emphasis on the textuality of the text. We can hear the echo of this principle in Derrida’s

assertion that “there is nothing outside the text” (qtd. in Barry 175). This is to say that for them the text has no relation with the outer world. For them, the political and socio-economic forces are nothing, but the aspects of signifying processes. The Deconstructionists, along with New Critics and Structuralists, overlook the historicity of the text and alienated it from the external reality.

New Historicism which arose in the 1980s reacted against both the formalist view of the literary text as somehow autonomous and Marxist view which ultimately related texts to the economic infrastructure. It sees the literary text not as somehow unique but as a kind of discourse situated within a nexus of cultural discourses – religious, political, economic, and aesthetic – which both shaped it and, in their turn, were shaped by it. If there is anything new about this procedure, it is its insistence, drawn from Foucault and post structuralism, that history itself is a text, an interpretation, and that there is no single history. It also rejects any notion of historical progress or teleology, and breaks away from any literary historiography based on the study of genres and figures. For the New Historicist the culture is situated in a textual construct. Hence, New Historicism refuses to accord any kind of unity or homogeneity to history or culture, viewing both as harboring networks of contradictory, competing, and unreconciled forces and interests.

### **Nietzsche and Foucault’s Concept of History, Power, Truth and Discourse:**

#### **Departure from Old Historicism**

Nietzsche is well-known for stressing ‘will to power’ that is the basis of human nature, the ‘resentment’ that comes when it is denied its basis in action. Nietzsche’s current influence derives not only from his celebration of the will, but more deeply from his celebration of the will, but more deeply from his skepticism about the notions of truth. In particular, he anticipated many of the central tenets of post- modernism an aesthetic attitude towards the world that sees it as a ‘text’, the denial of facts, the denial of essences, and the celebration of the plurality of interpretations and of the fragmented self. The contemporary

supposition of history as the representation of truth no longer exists in Nietzsche because he says that life can never be understood in terms of ultimate truth.

According to Nietzsche, people are all suffering from a consumptive historical fever, suffered with it. He asks people to use history for life; one should be tactful to use history for life which develops critical attitude towards history. According to him the historian as a judge should study history critically. So, he should pick out some relevant events of past, develop critical attitude to these events. He proposes the concept of suprahistorical being who is able to create history to solve the problem of history. It may fail to realize the extent to which men are the results of the past they seek to condemn. Nietzsche asserts the potential flow of joy in critical history:

For when past is analyzed critically, then we grasp with a knife at its roots and go cruelly beyond all reverence. It is always a dangerous process that is a dangerous process for life itself. And people or ages serving life in this way, by judging and destroying a past, are always dangerous in danger. For since we are now the products of their aberrations, passions, mistakes and even crimes. (qtd. in Adams 31)

For Nietzsche, truth is relative or subjective; it is something that never exists. It is history what determines truth. As he defines in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, “Everything has become: there are no eternal facts just as there [is] no absolute truth” (5). Historical facts are only perspectives, determined by power. According to Nietzsche, history emphasizes on events – emergence, beginning and fall. So, all truths are interpretation, and there is no ultimate truth. Any form of writing, claims Nietzsche, can not present truth. Writing, according to Nietzsche, is presented through “a mobile army of metaphors, metonymies, anthropomorphism” (qtd. in Adams 636). He further says, “Truths are illusions of which one has forgotten that they are illusions” (qtd. in Adams 636). History and literature, in this sense, are not two extremes – as if one presenting the truth and other the lies.

According to Nietzsche, the world runs with the individuals having 'a will to power'. He finds that 'will to power' is at work in all sorts of human behavior and valuations. He views power as the only important thing in the world. Everyone desires for it. "The only thing that all men want", for Nietzsche, "is power, and whatever is wanted is wanted for the sake of power. If something is wanted more than something else, it must represent power" (qtd. in Adams 511).

At the time of Nietzsche's birth (1844), Hegel's ideas were flourished all over Europe. Hegel's idea was that human beings are moving towards a point of perfection, which he calls the teleological point. Hegel and other idealist philosophers of the time thought that every movement is a new experience. Nietzsche's idea of historiography radically opposes such idea and conception about time and history. He charges Hegelian idea to be abstract and says there is no such superimposed idea that humanity in general is headed towards. He perceives the idealists' negation of impulse not more than a fallacy and says that human creature is instinctively animalistic and lives basically on impulse. In fact, despite the suppression of the natural energies, the possible progress when all their potentials, the so called evils as these good are exploited. He celebrates the neglected aspects of things, which are supposed to be evil, immoral, irrational and so on.

Nietzsche's critique of historicism confronts with Hegelian idea. Against the idealists' assumption that the historical processes is a rational process which, in Hegel's time, has ended in an absolute moment in zenith; Nietzsche asserts that the historical process neither is nor can be finished since the completion of history is not merely impossible but undesirable because it would lead to a degeneration of man and that history is not a rational process but is full of blindness and injustice.

It might, thus, appear that Nietzsche simply affects a return to a pre-Hegelian viewpoint which counters history as a realm of chance rather than a dimension of meaning. However, it does not mean that there's no point in which Nietzsche agrees with Hegel. His



criticism on Hegel is based on a crucial area of an agreement with Hegel. The implication of history for Nietzsche is not escape from the present or to deviate from life and action but rather it serves the present. In the Foreword of his 1873 text Nietzsche asserts, “We need [history] for life and action, not for a comfortable turning away from life and action or merely for glossing over the egotistical life and the cowardly bad act. We wish to use history only insofar as it serves living, but there is a degree of doing history and a valuing of it through which life atrophies and degenerates” (1).

New Historicism proposes a model of historical change based upon such thinkers as Karl Marx filtered through Antonio Gramsci, Michel Foucault and Jeremy Bentham. Those holding this view, according to Richard Rorty, constitute a new cultural left “made up of deconstructionists, new historicists, people in gender studies, ethnic studies, a few left – over Marxists and so on. This Left would like to use the English, French, and Comparative Literature Departments of the universities as staging area for political section” (Hoover 359).

Perhaps, the most direct action in which Michel Foucault influenced New Historicism was that his contextualizations were ‘super structural’ (rather than referring literary and cultural phenomena to an economic base): even the realm of economics, like history itself, was seen as a discourse, as textual. The new historicists tended to view literature as one discourse among many cultural discourses.

Nietzsche provided Foucault, and nearly all French Poststructuralists, with the impetus and ideas to transcend Hegelian and Marxist philosophies. Nietzsche taught Foucault that one could write a genealogical history of unconventional topics such as madness, sexuality and the subject matters which located their emergence within sites of domination. Nietzsche demonstrated that the will to truth and knowledge is in dissociable from the will to power, and Foucault developed these claims in his critique of liberal humanism, the human sciences, and in his later work on ethics. He did accept Nietzsche’s claims that systematizing

methods produce reductive social and historical analyses, and that knowledge is perspectival in nature, requiring multiple viewpoints to interpret a heterogeneous reality.

However, Michel Foucault, one of the major Poststructuralists, views that “the discourses including texts are the embodiment of power” (Selden 100). This is to say that the texts can not be free from social and political sphere of an era. Foucault, therefore, endeavors to make a link between the text and the external world or context. The researcher is going to explore how Foucault influences the new historicists’ idea of textualization of history and historicization of text.

An often quoted phrase that describes the new historicists’ reciprocal concern with “historicity of text and textuality of history” seems to have emerged from M.H. Abrams’ clarification of Foucault’s notion, which calls text “a discourse which, although, it may seem to present, or reflect and external reality, in fact consists of what are called representations” (183). The Foucauldian notion that views a text as verbal formations in the form of ideological products or cultural constructs of a certain historical era assists the concept of historicization of the text. The text, to Foucault, never represents or reflects pre-existing entities and orders of a historical situation, rather it speaks of the power structures, oppositions and hierarchies which are after all the products and propagators of power. A text, in Foucault’s view, speaks of ‘history’ but not as it is described by traditional historicists and Marxists. It, within itself, buries the ‘situatedness’ of institutions, social practices including their workings amidst the power relations and the hierarchies. So, a text becomes ‘a history of otherwise’ in that it presents a historical situation, not a background but as something with which it can have constant interaction, for text is both product and the propagator of the power structures of society.

Now the question arises: how does Foucault influence those who believe in the history of sexuality? As he is always aware of the fact that a historian cannot escape the ‘situatedness’ of his time, Foucault takes a historian to be ‘embedded’ in the social practices.

It is, by this logic, clear that history is also written from the perspective of the historian. The position, a historian occupies in society, determines the history he writes.

Foucault's idea of counter-history avoids the primacy to the ideas of the individual and of subjectivity. Alec McHoul and Wendy Grace in *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject* observe, "Foucault thought of the human subject itself as an effect of, to some extent, subjection. Subjection refers to particular, historically located disciplinary processes and the concepts, which enable us to consider ourselves as individual subjects and which constrain us from thinking otherwise" (3).

Hazard Adams in *Critical Theory since Plato* says, "Foucault's influence in a literary theory has been strong among revisionist literary historians known as 'new historicists' who study the culmination of power through society and the literary texts that are part of it" (1133). The position a historian occupies in the society determines the history he writes. The way he goes inside the forms of power structures and social practices determines his description of history. Now another question arises: Is history then different from fiction if it is nothing other than fictionalized details of a person's perspectives? In this regard, Foucault has some affinity with Derrida because both of them say that a 'subject' who thinks may not know his own limitations. It indicates an uneven history of relations that testifies to the civilization failure of the Cartesian Project which Foucault says "being as it ends in violence" (85). He further says in the essay "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" that "[d]evotion to truth and the precision of scientific methods arose from the passion of scholars, their reciprocal hatred, their fanatical and unending discussions, and their spirit of completion – their personal conflicts that slowly forged the weapons of reasons" (86).

In *The Archeology of Knowledge*, Foucault comments on the nature of humanistic notion of history by finding in it a contradiction that began with Cartesian Mathematics. It is, as Foucault writes, "an exhaustive ordering of the world as though methods, concepts, types of analysis and finally men themselves [. . .] [are in] inevitable unity of knowledge (75–76).

The insight which is so dispersive sees history as not having a casual law or final goal but as having a network of power relations to work upon an individual. In “Nietzsche, Genealogy and History” Foucault taking the concepts of truth and power as described by Nietzsche in his idea of genealogy, has a three fold aims. First, he offers his arguments supporting his break with archaeology. Secondly, he expands the scope of genealogy. And thirdly, he reviews the role of the historian.

In arguments that support his break away from archaeology, Foucault describes genealogy as a diachronic method. Genealogy, for him, is a Nietzschean effort to undermine all absolute grounds and to demonstrate the origins of things only in relation to and in context with other things. So, genealogy, unlike archaeology which seeks to uncover the layers of civilization by position in them the stability of systems of thought that stay long for an era and come to a sudden end, turns towards the problems of power and practice. Regarding his movement towards genealogy, Foucault states that “the search for descent is not the erecting of foundation: on the contrary, it disturbs what was previously considered immobile; it fragments what was thought unified; it shows that heterogeneity of what was imagined consistent with itself” (88).

Writing about Foucault’s shift from archaeology to genealogy, Arun Gupto describes the Foucauldian concepts of these two historical readings to be complementary. Both of these historical approaches are, for Gupto, in disagreement with “a fairy-tale like totalizing concept of history” (114). Most interesting idea with genealogy is its scope. Firstly, genealogy attacks the supposed coherence of a thinking ‘subject’. Secondly, it dissolves the fiction of singular human identity. Thirdly, it attacks the notion of origins in historical investigations. Fourthly, genealogy stresses the idea of history as discontinuity. Finally, it focuses not upon ideas or historical mentalities but upon the ‘body’ so as to show it totally imprinted by ‘history’. Genealogy is the study of history not in relation to facts or events but in relation to power relations and dominance. It is the study of consequences of a historical event.

Genealogical approach is a critical one which analyses the incidents and gives detail analysis of society in general. It tries to explore into race, body and desire. In genealogical history individual suffering and emotions are analyzed and it is the effective one. Unlike traditional one genealogical history is the history of oppressed people not about rulers but about the ruled ones. Genealogical history attacks the supposed coherence of the subject.

Foucault, departing from the traditional concept, reforms the role of a historian. A historian, for Foucault has a three-fold task. First, while confronting the 'one' reality, a historian should be in favor of the use of history as a 'parody'. Second, he should be against a singular human identity. And thirdly, the 'investigations' should be directed against objective truth.

To sum up Foucault's idea of historical reading, it can be said that his is the general approach that seeks to analyze "the order, mechanism, and exclusion that have been the feature[s] of western societies since enlightenment" (Gupto 114). This general approach, in sharp contrast to total history which looks at the overall development of the period, attempts to describe differences, changes, alternations, mutations and so on.

Foucauldian radicalism of history manifests itself in three dimensions: it rejects absolute truth or origin and argues for fictionalized history and historicized fiction; it confutes the linearity of history and exposes how a body is imprinted and inscribed by history. Foucault tells us what effective history is:

Effective history differs from traditional history in being without constants.

Nothing in man – nor even his body – is being sufficiently stable to serve as a basis for this self-recognition or for understanding other men. History becomes effective to the degree that it introduces discontinuity into our very being – as it divides our emotions, dramatizes our instincts, multiples our body and sets itself against itself. (qtd. in Shreedharan 285)

Foucault develops a theory of discourse in relation to power structures operating in society. His main thesis is that discourse is involved to power: “It is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together” (*Sexuality* 100). He views that discourses are rooted in social institutions and that social and political power operate through discourse. The discourse, therefore, is inseparable from power because discourse is the ordering force that governs every institution. This enables institutions to exercise power. 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 mis-informative. Discourse also tells us of the propriety or impropriety, rightness or wrongness, of something and consequently influences our attitude, opinion and behavior. The exclusive function of discourse is to serve as a transparent representation of things and ideas standing outside it. Therefore, it is directive too. M. H. Abrams in *A Glossary of Literary Terms* writes:

Discourse has become the focal term among critics who oppose the deconstructive concept of a “general text” that functions independently of particular historical condition. Instead they conceive of discourse as social parlance, or language-in-uses and consider it to be both the product and the manifestation not of a timeless linguistic system, but of particular social condition, class structures, and power-relationships that alter 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). Discourses are produced within a real world of power struggle. Discourse is used as a means to gain or, sometimes even to subvert power. For Foucault, discourse is a central human activity. So he is interested in the process how discursive practices change over time.

The written discourses or the texts are meant to be addressed to the readers. So, they are not meaningful until they are actualized and made present by the readers or critics. Text,

being emanated from the author, is meant to be verbal message, which needs to be deciphered by the reader or critic. This helps to formulate an opinion that to engage in an interpretation of a text is to take part in a dialogue with the author. Bakhtin school has similar opinion stating that, “every utterance is potentially the site of a struggle: every word launched into special space implies a dialogue and therefore a contested interpretation” (Selden 75). In such a situation, it is impossible to establish a single authoritative meaning because language “is always contaminated, interleaved, opaquely coloured by layers of semantic deposits resulting from the endless processes of human struggle and interaction” (75). All interpretations become site of power-struggle.

Discourses, according to Foucault, are produced in which concepts of madness, criminality, sexual abnormality, and so on are defined in relation to sanity, justice and sexual normality. Such discursive formations massively determine and constrain the forms of knowledge, the types of normality and the nature of subjectivity, which prevail in a particular period. Foucault argues that the rules and procedures, which determine what is considered normal or rational, have the power to silence what they exclude. His main point, here, is that meaning of any discourse depends on those who control it. For example, the scientist who first claimed ‘the earth revolves round the sun’ was punished and his truth was ignored because for the people who were in power had another version of truth: ‘The sun revolves around the earth’. So truth can be proved wrong by power. People recognize particular piece of philosophy or scientific theory as true, only if it fits the description of truth laid down by the intellectual or political institution of the day, by members of ruling elite or the existing ideologies of knowledge. Every system of knowledge, we may say, establishes rules for exclusions or discriminations and it always implies taking sides. The discursive practices, however, have no universal validity but are historically dominant ways of controlling and preserving social relations of exploitations. Foucault’s interest is in historical dimension of discursive change. Systems of knowledge establish rules and procedures governing the

particular epoch by exclusion and regulation. Foucault regards the nature of discourse as an event in time since it is not only that which represents struggles or systems of domination, but the object through which and with which we struggle, the power we seek to possess. For him, as for Nietzsche, any attempt to produce and control discourse is 'will to power'. Every instance of discourse embodies power struggle, as Foucault argues, "Discourse is a violence that we do to things" (qtd. in Selden 60). Truth itself becomes not an unchanging universal essence but a perpetual object of appropriation and domination. This implies that a discourse is always in a process of formulation, correlation and transformation, which takes place after a certain epoch.

This concept of discourse is obviously very different from the Anglo-American concept that connects the term discourse only to language or to social interaction. It is so because for critical theorists like Foucault, discourse refers to well bounded areas of social knowledge. And this social knowledge is reflected in discourse.

In "Truth and Power," Michel Foucault revisits the major theoretical trends and questions of his career. Foucault spends much of his career tracing the threads of truth and power as they intertwine with the history of human experience. He especially loves to study asylums and prisons because they are close to an encapsulated power structure. Using techniques gathered from psychology, politics, anthropology, and archaeology, Foucault presents the analysis of the flow of the power and power relations.

Foucault sees every action and every historical event as an exercise in the exchange of power. He has spent a large bulk of his career analyzing the ebb and flow of power in different situations and with relevance to different aspects of human life. Structure organizes and broadens the web of power. The overall volume of power rises with each individual involved in the play. The society is a huge web, and much of the power tends to be concentrated towards the higher echelons. Foucault sees the exchange of power in very active terms: "Isn't power simply a form of war like domination?" It is difficult to sort out



just who is fighting the war, since Foucault seems to lean towards the war of all against all notions. Power flows simultaneously in different directions and different volumes according to the various terms of 'power relations' in the 'network' of power exchange. Regarding power and truth Foucault says, "Now I believe that the problem does not consist in drawing the line between that in a discourse which falls under the category of scientific truth and that which comes under some other category, but in seeing historically how effects of truths are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false" (qtd. in Adams 1139). He further states that power is not only repression, it is something positive:

In defining the effects of the power as repression, one adopts purely jurisdiscal conception of such power, one identifies power with a law which says no power is taken above all as carrying the force of a prohibition [...] what makes power hold good, what makes it accepted is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse.  
(1139)

Foucault's ideas gravitate toward the ultra-highly complex and similarly politicized, leaving one to wonder what the real-world impact of his notions might be.

Foucault opens up a new way in the post-deconstructionist impasse of literary theories by reaching beyond the traditional hierarchy of history over literature. Following Nietzsche, Foucault denies that history can ever be objectively known. Historical writing can never be a science. It always becomes entangled in tropes (Selden 102). "Any form of writing," claims Nietzsche, "can not present truth." Nietzsche denies that there is any reality behind the appearance of the world. "All discourses, including history," according to Foucault, "are produced within a real world of power struggle [. . .]. Claims to objectivity made on behalf of specific discourses are always spurious: there are no absolutely 'true' discourses, only more or less powerful ones" (qtd. in Selden 102).

According to Foucault, every discourse is meant to obtain power. In other words, every discourse is involved in power. He views that discourses are rooted in social institutions and that social and political power operates through discourse. Discourse is the ordering force that governs every institution. Hence, the discourse is inseparable from power. Discourse is a means of achieving power. The social, moral and religious disciplines always control human behavior directly by means of discourse. So people at times cannot do whatever they feel like doing. The discursive formations have enabled institutions to wield power and domination by defining and excluding 'the other'. Such discursive formations determine and constrain the forms of knowledge and types of normality of a particular period. These discursive practices have also the power. Truth is being told, with 'facts' to back it up, but a teller constructs that truth and chooses those facts. In fact, the teller of story or history also constructs those very facts by giving a particular meaning to events. Facts do not speak for themselves in either form of narrative; "the tellers speak for them making these fragments of the past into a discursive whole" (qtd. in Hutcheon 56). According to Foucault, truth is not outside power, or lacking in power. It is rather a thing of this world which is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraints in a society. So each society has its own regime of truth. Furthermore, the power diffuses itself in the system of authority and the effects of truth are produced within discourses. But the discourses in themselves are neither true nor false. Foucault argues, "Truth is linked in a circular relation with system of power which produces and sustains it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it" (qtd. in Adams 145). Thus, Foucault sees truth as a product of relations of power and it changes as systems change. Both literature and history are narratives and they are in the form of discourses. They are entangled in the power relations of their time. Literary works are not secondary reflections of any coherent world – view but the active participants in the continual remaking of meanings. In short, all the texts, including history and literature, are

simply the discourses which seek the power of ruling class – the power to govern and control. Hence, the dividing line between history and literature is effaced.

### **New Historicism: Stephen Greenblatt and Louise Montrose**

Foucault's notions of 'power' and 'discourse' were particularly formative to develop a critical approach to literature known as 'new historicism' in the early 1980s. These literary critics, new historicists like Stephen Greenblatt, Louis Montrose, Jonathan Goldberg, Kermode, H. Aram Veenser and others are more interested in the relationship between history and literature. They tried to dismantle the bridge between literature and history widened by New Critics and Structuralists. As with Old Historicism, New Historicists argue that we can not know texts in isolation of from their historical context. But unlike Old Historicists, New Historicists insist that an interpretation is subjectively filtered through one's own set of historically conditioned view-points. Hence, there is no 'objective' history. Here, for the purpose and interest of this research Greenblatt and Montrose's notions on relation between history and fiction will be studied.

Greenblatt begins his most theoretical statement about New Historicism: *Towards a Poetics of Culture*, by stating that his methodology is at best a practice rather than a doctrine: "One of the peculiar characteristics of the 'new historicism' in literary studies is precisely how unresolved and in some ways disingenuous it has been – I have been – about the relation to literary theory" (1). He points out some of the influences on the school (Michel Foucault and European anthropological and social theorists) while distinguishing the approach from both Marxist critics like Frederic Jameson and post structuralist critics like Jean-Francois Lyotard. Greenblatt argues that both Jameson and Lyotard employ history in an effort to support one theoretical viewpoint that in turn leads to their monolithic and contradictory versions of capitalism. History functions in both cases as a convenient anecdotal ornament upon theoretical structure, and capitalism appears not as a complex social and economic development in the West but as a malign philosophical principle. (5)

Greenblatt argues that New Historicism, by contrast, works to remain always attuned to the contradictions of any historical moment, including those moments dominated by capitalism. On the issue of the relation between private and public or between the aesthetic and political realms, Greenblatt argues that "the effortless invocation of two apparently contradictory accounts of art is characteristic of American capitalism in the late twentieth century and an outcome of long-term tendencies in the relationship of art and capital; in the same moment a working distinction between the aesthetic and the real is established and abrogated" (7).

The result of such attunement to the contradictions of any given historical moment leads Greenblatt (and other New Historicists) into a number of basic premises: one should begin with specific details, anecdotes, and examples in order to avoid a totalizing version of history; one should proceed from such details to illustrate how they are tied up with larger contradictory forces in a given time period, no matter how apparently innocuous the detail may seem at first; one should remain self-conscious about one's methodologies, thus resisting "a historicism based upon faith in the transparency of signs and interpretative procedures;" one should be suspicious of liberatory narratives: everything is, on some level, caught up in the circulations of power in a given time period; and all cultural products, whether they are high art, political documents, personal letters, or trash, are a part of larger discursive structures and, so, can offer clues to the ideological contradictions of a given time period" (12). In introduction to *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*, Greenblatt differentiated:

[W]hat he called the New Historicism from both the new criticism, which views the text as a self-contained structure, and the earlier historicism which was monological and attempted to discover a unitary political vision. Both of these earlier modes of analysis, according to Greenblatt, engaged in a project of uniting disparate and contradictory elements into an organic whole,

whether in the text itself or in its historical background. The earlier historicism, moreover, viewed the resulting totality or unity as a historical fact rather than the product of interpretation or of the ideological leanings of certain groups. (Habib 763)

The goal of new historicism for Greenblatt is to put cultural objects in some interesting relationship to social and historical processes. He distinguishes new historicism from the old principally by the convention that the new correctly holds that at no stage of history is there one single political vision but rather completely ones, and that the cultural environment which the old historicism regarded as an historical fact is, instead, a creation of the historian. In an interview with Harvey Bloom Greenblatt says, “One simple way to describing new historicism is to say that it’s interested in the symbol dimensions of symbolic practice” (2).

Louis Montrose, a prominent new historicist views literature and history as fully interdependent. He thinks ‘new historicism’ has been constituted as an academic site of ideological struggle between containment and subversion. “Within the context of the containment – subversion debate my own position has been that a closed and static, monolithic and homogeneous notion of ideology must be replaced by one that is heterogeneous and unstable, permeable and processual” (404). He further argues that the key concern of New Historicist critic is the ‘historicity of texts’ and the ‘textuality of history’. He explains on what he means by the historicity of text and textuality of history: “All texts are embedded in specific historical, social and material context. Literary texts too are the material products of specific historical conditions. Literary texts, therefore, must be treated along with its historical context. Likewise, by the textuality of history he means that access to a full and authentic past is never possible” (410).

Montrose, in his study of Elizabethan drama, focuses on how Elizabethan culture involves bringing oppositions and otherness into visibility so as to reinforce the norms of

the dominant Elizabethan power. This type of cultural structure is dispersed across a whole range of texts, from literature to travel writing. Montrose, thus, sees the impossibility of subverting the dominant culture when he says that “a text creates the culture by which it is created, saves the fantasies by which it is shaped, begets that by which it is begotten” (qtd. in Brannigan 169). Montrose emphasizes that literary texts act out the concerns of ruling class by reproducing and renewing the powerful discourses which sustain the system. According to Montrose, we live in history and that the form and pressure of history are made manifest in our subjective thoughts and actions, in our beliefs and desires” (*Redrawing the Boundaries* 394). Our knowledge and understanding is part of history.

According to New Historicists, “The idea of a uniform and harmonious culture is a myth imposed on history and propagated by ruling classes in their own interests” (Selden 105). So the new historicists focus not in history but in histories. New historicism, thus, is characterized by, as Louis Montrose says “a shift from history to histories” (*Redrawing the Boundaries* 411). This is to say that history is not a homogeneous and stable pattern of facts and events. New Historicists assert that the historians, like the authors of literary texts, possess a subjective view. They too are informed by the circumstances and discourses specific to their era. So they can no longer claim that their study of the past is detached and objective.

Furthermore, literary texts police the dominant ideas of a particular time by representing alternatives or deviations as threatening. The new historicists tend to examine widely different texts in order to show that those texts play a key role in mediating power relation within the state only to contain, and make safe, that subversion.

### **Impact of Postmodern Historical Theory on Historiography and the Problems of Representation**

Historiography literally means the art of writing history. It is the history of history, or the history of historical writings. Historiography tells us the story of the successive stages of

the evolution or development of historical writings. It has come to include the evolution of the ideas and techniques associated with the writing of history, and the changing attitudes towards the nature of history itself. Ultimately it comprises the study of the development of man's sense for the past.

This is to say that all of our knowledge and understanding of the past exists only in the realm of narratives. Peter Brooks says, "We live immersed in narrative, recounting and reassessing the meaning of our past actions, anticipating the outcome of our future projects, situating ourselves at the intersection of several stories not yet completed" (qtd. in Hutcheon 48). Here, narrative representation – storytelling is a historical and a political act. The past is mediated by the texts. Literary texts in this sense work as a vehicle for the representation of history. It reveals the processes and tensions by which knowing the past becomes a question of representing, i.e. of constructing and interpreting, not of objective recording.

F. R. Ankersmit argues that a contemporary, post-modern historicism what he calls narrativism needs in no way to be a contradiction in terms with the proviso, however that we distinguished between a phenomenon's identity and its individuality. In Ankersmit's terminology the phenomenon called identity is the determinate interpretation given to it at a certain moment in time, while its individuality is the actual phenomenon or it occurred in history. Narrativist historicism is true to the sense that it rejects the metaphysical assertions. Narrativist historicism is historical practice which operates in search of the historical idea, yet which, in doing so, displaces this principle from post modern historicism.

One could even say that the relationship between the old and the new historicism in literary studies is comparable to that between the old and the new historiography as Ankersmit outlines it in *History and Tropology*: "[T]he distinction between the two lies in different views on the historical reality of historical texts and of the relationship between both" (24). Ankersmit further writes:

For the new historiography the text must be central – it is no longer a layer through which one looks (either at a past reality or at the historian’s authorial intention), but something which the historiographer must look at. In the new historiography this new postulate of the non transparency of the historical text leads to a construction on the conflicts, hesitations, ambiguities, ambivalences – in short, on what Paul de Man has styled the undecidability of historical text, in which the non – transparency of the text reveals itself. (128–29)

Recent critiques of historical methodology have inaugurated a radically revised understanding of art, culture and society. History as a literary artifact is the recent notion developed by Hayden White. To raise the question of the nature of narratives, White writes in *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*:

[It] is to invite reflection on the very nature of culture and, possibly, even on the nature of humanity itself. So natural is the impulse to narrative, so inevitable is the form of narrative for any report the way things really happened, that narrativity could appear problematical only in a cultural in which it was absent- or, as in some domains of contemporary western intellectual and artistic culture, programmatically refused. (1709)

“The Historical Text as Literary Artifact” Provides an accessible and engaging synopsis of White’s main arguments in *Metahistory*, beginning with his definition of metahistory as the attempt to “get behind or beneath the presuppositions which sustain a given type of inquiry in the case of historical inquiry” (1710). A key assumption that, according to White, has sustained historical inquiry is the belief that history and literature are two distinct, diametrically opposed, activities, a presupposition shared by practitioners in both disciplines. On the contrary, White argues, because history, like literature, is a verbal structure and the historian, first and foremost, is a writer, the tools that have served literary critics, the tools that compose the linguistic and rhetorical structures of a text, serve the historian as well.



Language in history is never merely a means to an end; it is neither transparent nor neutral, nor does it disappear to allow the pure truth of the history to merge. In White's view, historical narratives are verbal fictions with invented contests. Histories gain their explanatory power by processing data into stories. Those stories take their shape from what White calls 'emplotment', the process through which the facts contained in 'chronicles' are encoded as components of plots. Plots are not immanent in events themselves but exist in the minds of tragic or ironic: "It can only be presented as such from a particular historian's narrative point of view" (1710). The event emerged as a plotted story which takes on meaning when it is combined with other elements in the limited number of generic structures by which a series of events can be constituted.

Hayden White, the postmodernist philosopher and historian, has consistently favoured a structuralist approach emphasizing the primacy of secondary signification in historical writing. White's epistemological relativism collapses philosophy of history and historiography. They only differ in that the former highlights the underlying principles which determine the generation of the text, whereas the latter displays them in the implicit structure on realistic narratives. Similarly, White converges fiction and historiography. Historiographic and fictitious events are rendered meaningful through the same representational strategies which insert the single event into an overacting narrative structure. Thus, White strives to see any "link between the realities of past events within the historiographical text" (*Metahistory*, 427).

Historiography claims to deal with the real, its methods of representation legitimate a specific standard for the conceptualization of reality, past and present alike. Post modern historicism is heterological. Post modernist theory does not look upon historical sources having a wholly fixed and unalterable meaning. Postmodernist historical theory maintains that no objective knowledge of the past is possible because all knowledge is relative, all theories are equally valid and that a text is but an infinite play of significations. Hayden

White would add that the only reason we have for preferring one interpretation over another would be moral or aesthetic.

Postmodernism has made a great impact on historiography. It has developed its own genre of historical writing with mere denunciation of conventional history. It rejects the master narratives as hegemonic stories told by those in power. Moreover, rejecting faith in reason and progress, postmodernist historiography has directed much of its attention towards the irrational, the odd and the magical in human life. Postmodern historiography has, however, promoted good writing as a normal historical practice.

“The study of history that cumbersome but precious bag of clues involves inquiry that attempts to uncover the mysterious of cause and effect, but most of all it teaches us to accept the burden of our need to ask why” (Hutcheon 54). According to Graham Swift, “History is a lucky dip of meanings. Events elude meaning, but we look for meanings and we create them” (qtd. in Hutcheon 54). Thus, the post modern historical theory does not make the useless effort to show relation between cause and effect and to search for the origin due to the effect of Foucauldian theory.

The dominant class, through hegemony – domination by consent – creates an imperative upon the consciousness or the whole way of social life, value systems, beliefs, and attitudes. By doing so, it gets the ink to write those values as general, common and indispensable social values which are constructed by power holder’s discursive ethos and incentives.

The ruling class exercises power upon subordinated or ruled classes not through force and fraud but through shaping the ‘common sense’ of people. For instance, another postcolonial critic Ania Loomba redefines Gramscian notion of ‘hegemony’ by saying that “hegemony is power achieved through a combination of coercion and consent” (29). It indicates that power is exercised by the colonizers not through force alone but through

winning the consent of the colonized. In other words, the colonized willingly accept being ruled because they think the ruling class is superior to them and liable to rule upon them.

The term 'hegemony' is significant for describing the success of imperial power over a colonized people because colonial regimes achieved domination through the consent of the colonized. In other words, power is not totally exercised from above or below, but it is operated by the consent of both of them.

Now it is better to discuss little bit about colonial literature and how the West produced the stereotypical images of the marginalized as 'the other' of Europe. Colonial literature, though it is difficult to give precise definition because of its heterogeneity, reflects colonial ethos. In general, the colonial literature exhibits a tinge of local colonial color, or feature colonial motifs such as the quest beyond the frontier of civilization. They exhibit colonial experiences and perceptions, and are written from the colonized's perspective. It is, as Elleke Boehmer writes, "informed by theories concerning the superiority of European culture and the rightness of empire" (3).

In the heydays of empire, writers felt it necessary to write about new places and the people. They began writing about the people who inhabited the lands the empire claimed; the natives, the colonized. "To colonize meant at first the identification – indeed, the creation – of interests; these could be commercial, communicational, religious, military, cultural" (Said 100). But the problem was that of truly understanding of the alien people, culture, geography and the landscape. They were dumbfounded to see the things in new surroundings, and the attitudes and the behaviors of the people entirely unreadable. They began to represent these people and culture in their own familiar vocabularies, their own metaphors and tropes and the "strangeness was made comprehensible by using everyday names, dependable textual conventions, both rhetorical and syntactic" (Boehmer 15). Boehmer writes that "the available drama is *their* drama; almost without exception there is no narrative interest without European involvement or intervention" (62). Even when the

natives are represented, they are shown as useless, lacking individual identity as human beings. Especially where they were resistant to colonial drama, they were shown in need of leadership, incapable of self-governance and in managing their own resources. As a result, these issues reveal that the idea of evolutionary theory of race was implicated in these writers. The writers were always at the apex of everything, and source of every significant activities.

To sum up, discourses are the embodiment of power. To have knowledge of the other and to describe them in discourse or in imaginative texts is to exercise power over other. The representation of the other nations and other people is directed to validate the self by excluding and subordinating them. Knowledge, thus, implies taking sides and texts become the instrument of power, the vehicle of imperial rule in colonial or post colonial scenario.

## Chapter III

### Blurring of the Demarcation between History and Fiction in

#### Peter Carey's *True history of the Kelly Gang*

##### General Background

The traditional ideas of viewing history as a group of facts which was supposed to exist textually and which was assumed to represent as it really was have been questioned in Peter Carey's *True History of the Kelly Gang*. It is now believed that the past is available to us through the textual traces. Thus, like fiction, history is textualized; therefore, it is a kind of human fabrication. The historian interprets the past, presents it in a written form and makes it intelligible to the readers. History is therefore, always contaminated, oblique and subjective. The assumptions such as the neutrality of the language and the absence of domineering, ideologized narrating voice are contested by new historicism, which takes the present process and limitation of the writing of the past into account. This view of history stresses on the impossibility of an all-embracing and totalizing account of the past. The history cannot be represented in pure form, for it always remains relative to the narrator's prejudices and preoccupations. So the proclamation of universal truth in history can no longer sustain. What is available to us is only different version and perspective of interpretation in history. Different factors manipulate the representation of history.

The traditional notion of viewing official historical discourses as an absolute, authentic and the final version of history has been undermined in this novel *True History of the Kelly Gang*. Carey attempts to encourage the readers to reconsider the interpretation of history. History, like fiction, is subjective and in the creation of which memory plays a vital role. The subjective nature of history gives way to create many other versions of history. Carey, thus, replaces the notion of one absolute truth, in terms of history with multiple truths. He undermines the claim that the official historical discourse is pure and valid. For him, official history functions as a kind of writing affected by the ideology of an era.

Carey views historical writing as a product of individual perception. History is the record of events in the order they occurred. Evidence is a fact, or combination of facts which provide grounds for belief that an historical event or events actually happened. It is common that evidence is available only on certain aspects of what happened and historians then know facts and fill in the unknown elements with their own theories. That is why, different versions of history can and do arise.

There are two versions of history presented in the novel, one created by the mainstream media and the other history based on the Jerelderie Letter written by Ned himself. Mainstream history present Ned as a criminal but Carey in the novel offers a largely sympathetic portrayal of the legendry figure, but he is also resolute about avoiding romanticism. The history in the novel is given meaning through the telling of individual experience that is of Ned Kelly. As novel presents two versions of history one created by mainstream media and the other presented by Ned to counter the mainstream history and bring the reality or truth in forth. Mainstream media always condemned Ned as saying dirt of society, son of dirty poor Irish immigrants the historical record portrays Kelly as a ruthless crook and brutal murderer, thief and so on, whereas the novel portrays him as helper of the poor, premature, rebel against colonialism, kindhearted, scapegoat and betrayed by time and fate. The colonial history of Australia presents Ned as an outlaw. To prove it novel provides various situations and circumstances Carey provides reason why Australians revere Kelly as a hero, despite his outlaw status.

History can not be exact; it can never be science so there is always chance to be omission and addition. History is also like literary text and there is a kind of discourse situated within a network of cultural discourses – religious, political, economic, aesthetic – which both shape it and, in their turn are shaped by it. History itself is a text, an interpretation, and there is no single history. So what the mainstream history presented Ned is not the actual one. The historian who writes about Ned in Colonial period occupies

imperial power and he writes using his power and creates dichotomy. They use economic, political and social policies to maintain control over jurisdictions and people.

Carey rewrites the history of an Australian bushranger and an outlaw Ned Kelly and his gang. As a revisionist writer Carey is very successful in portraying Ned and his Kelly Gang. He makes his protagonist Ned write his own history in order to raise his voice. While doing so he blurs the demarcation between history and fiction. He alters the mainstream history and writes history from the below; he writes about marginalized people and their suffering. He provides an alternative version of Kelly's history countering the mainstream history. He tries to give voice for those unheard realities. Carey's novel analyses the incidents and gives detailed analysis of the late nineteenth century Australia. Carey presents the history of the oppressed people like the Kellys and deals with their problems and explores their race and life. His version of history is a genealogical one.

In the late nineteenth century, Australia was socially divided between squatters and selectors. Squatters used their wealth, eminences, connections and other advantages to enlist the law and the police to their benefit, cause a sense of injustice among the poor selectors. The same-thing happens with the Kellys. Ned gets arrested frequently for various charges.

### **Official History**

Regarding official history, Ned is a born- thief and a bushranger. His father is also regarded as a thief and betrayal. *True History of the Kelly Gang* begins around 1866 when narrator Ned Kelly is twelve years old, "I lost my own father at twelve years of age and know what it is to be raised on lies and silences" (7). Indeed, the story begins even before 1866 with the forcible transportation of Ned's father John Kelly from his home in Tipperary to a prison in Van Diemen's Land (Tasmania), after having been convicted of murdering an Irish landowner for evicting a tenant farmer. Van Diemen's Land is known as the shelter of offensive criminals, and appears to have become the penal colony for the worst offenders, but was initially established only as a supplementary island colony to the mother colony

after New South Wales's establishment. Freed from 'the Demon' at thirty, John Kelly walks across Australia to begin a new life, only to find his circumstances as dire as they ever were. Desperate and starving, son Ned steals his first heifer at the age of eleven. He is forced to quit school to support his family at age twelve, and at fifteen is sold by his mother into an apprenticeship with Australian bushranger Harry Power. So the term thief is associated with him from his birth. In 1869, at the age of fifteen, Ned was first brought by the police court on a charge of assault on a fowl and pig dealer named Ah Fook, Ah Fook says he would report about them, "[y]ou crazy Irish devils you try to kill me" (118). Secondly, with aiding the bushranger Harry Power in some of his robberies, he was held for ten days. However, after witness testimony the case gets dismissed. He is arrested frequently for various charges. He is known as a horse thief.

In the official history Ned is presented as a traitor, who betrayed his master. Harry was caught and imprisoned and rumored in the district that Ned had turned Harry power into the police and Ned was therefore treated with hostility. Harry was well liked and police informants were generally ostracized. People barrack him whenever he rode saying "Ned Kelly were a fizgig a lying traitor he should be wrapped in barbed wire and rolled into the Winton swamp"(182). People used to cross the streets to get away from him; no one would employ him.

It presents Ned not only as a thief and traitor but also as a rapist. Mrs. Goodman charges Ned with intent to rape and breaking and entering and stealing. Thus the *Beechworth Advertiser* wrote it up:

In the neighborhood of Greta for many years there has lived a regular Gang of young ruffians who from their infancy were brought up as rogues a vagabonds and who have been constantly in trouble and Sunday we learnt that though it is but a short time since some of them have been released from goal where they have been serving sentences for horse stealing a little game



with which they are thoroughly au fait they have again indulged in their Pranks. (240)

In mainstream history he is regarded as a robber, he not only robbed people but also robbed two banks. Sergeant Whelan in 1870 came out with two troopers and arrested him for the charge of highway robbery. According to the official record on December 10, 1878 the Kelly Gang invaded a station property near Euora, 27 miles west of Benalla. Twenty two people at the sheep station were rounded up and locked in a storeroom. Then, leaving Joe Byrne to guard the prisoners Ned, Dan and Steve Hart drove into Euroa in a hawker's cart. The Morning Chronicle on December 11, 1878 describes about them and robbery. It describes Ned as very handsome over six fit tall, built in proportion, they went to Mrs. Fitzgerald's house only to get some refreshments and some food for their horses. The newspaper writes, "He spoke a great deal about his mother whom he continued to insist had been unjustly imprisoned and her newborn baby cruelly taken from her. He gave the clear impression that he would give himself up if the government would release his mother" (352). Again, on 16 February 1879 the Jerildire Gazette writes the Kellys are at Jerilderie. They robbed the bank very cunningly. The Kelly Gang held up the town of Jerilderie and robbed the Jerilderie Bank of New South Wales, stealing £2,414. In the mainstream history he is portrayed as a thief but it doesnot mention anything about the reason behind his stealing.

Historical record portrays Kelly as a ruthless crook and brutal murderer. The Kellys seem very brutal in their behavior and try to kill constable Fitzpatrick. On April 1878 Fitzpatrick comes in to their house to arrest Dan. From Fitzpatrick's view point what took place was that when he got to the house he found Dan Kelly there, and arrested him in the presence of his mother and sisters. He was proceeding to take his prisoner to Benalla, when he was asked to permit him first to take a meal, with which request he complied. While the meal was in progress, Ned Kelly, with Skillian, his brother-in-law, and a man named

Williamson, came in, and Ned at once demanded if Fitzpatrick had a warrant for the arrest of Dan. The constable replied in the negative, and then Ned drew a revolver and declared that his brother should not be taken without one. Then, Ned Kelly fired and wounded him in the wrist. Mrs. Kelly hit him with her shovel on his head. The wound in his wrist was very trivial, and the bullet had been picked out with a knife before he reached Benalla. Warrants were immediately issued against Ned Kelly for shooting with intent to murder, and against Dan Kelly, Skillian, Williamson, and Mrs. Kelly for aiding and abetting. When it was attempted to enforce these warrants, it was found that the brothers Kelly had disappeared; but the others named were arrested, tried, and sentenced each to lengthy terms of imprisonment. His mother gets three years of imprisonment for attempt murder of Fitzpatrick.

Mainstream history has presented Ned as a cruel hearted person, murderous and stony. In 1878, the Kelly Gang killed three policemen in a shootout outside Melbourne. He is described as a merciless murderer who unforgivably chose to take up arms against society in history. It defines Ned as very inhumane as it writes: "He had mutilated Sergeant Kennedy and claimed he had cut off his ear with his knife before murdering him. Moreover, he had forced his three mates to discharge their pistols into the bodies of the police, so, all would be guilty of the crime the same as he" (313). According to official history he only represents himself and his family; what he does is only for his benefit. They plan to derail the train to kill thirty policemen but they failed on their plan, because of the loss of lots of people.

Ned was declared outlaw who could be shot on sight and was entitled to no more mercy than a rabid dog. Their blood price was advertised in every paper it was as well known as the price of stockmen £ 1 a week and drovers £ 40 a year the Kelly Gang were worth £ 800. In November, Kelly Gang members were legally declared outlaws under the Felon's Apprehension Act of parliament. Reward was increased at this time to £2,000 that

means £500 for each offender and police or civilian legally shoot the gang members on sight. Up to February 7 to 10 NSW increased reward each worth £2,000. That money is huge amount for that time in Victoria. Though government did its best and increase reward the gang nevertheless managed to evade capture for sixteen more months.

Mainstream history takes them as self-centered as they only think about themselves. They want to make themselves safe so they ordered people to obey them. The Kellys wrote coffin letters and sent it to people. They gave order to the people of every part i.e. north eastern Victoria, Murray, Mansfield to the East, the Great Dividing Range to the South. The nature of the letter is to threaten the people and warn as official history claims:

Any person who aids or harbours or assists the police in any way or employs any person whom they know to be a detective or cad also those would be so depraved as to take blood money will be outlawed and declared unfit to be allowed human burial. Their property will be either consumed or confiscated and them and all belonging to them exterminated off the face of the earth. The enemy I cannot catch myself I will give a payable reward for. I wish them men who joined the Stock Protection Society to withdraw their money and give as much more to the widows and orphans and poor of Greta district where I spent and will spend again many a happy day fearless free and bold. (394)

They give fair warning to all those who have reason to fear them to sell out. If anyone neglect this and abide by the consequences, that will be the worst. At last Ned writes "I do not wish to give order full force without giving timely warning but I am a widow's son outlawed and must be obeyed" (395).

### **Counter History**

History is the record of events in the order that occurred. Evidence is a fact, or combination of facts which provide grounds for belief that an historical events actually

happened. It is common that evidence is available only on a certain aspects of what happened and historians then known facts and fill in the unknown elements with their own theories. This is why different versions of history can and do arise.

History is subjective and is not an exact science by any means. Historians make own interpretations, based on acceptable methodology. Person who holds power only can write history and such history only sings a song of evocation for him. As power creates truth, history arises in such tyrannical society about Ned and his Gang became truth for them. Those historians write history which is beneficial for them. He can twist the truth easily and write according to their wish. For that they make Ned very notorious and dishearten one who can do everything for money. But it was not mere fact. Therefore no history that is about Ned is reliable and objective one. Every history is guided and expressed by historian's motif.

Peter Carey's Kelly is an essentially good person whom circumstance has forced into a life of crime, a criminal with a heart of gold. The artifacts will further reveal the factual story of the fateful environment, political, legal and social characteristics that created Ned Kelly and the Kelly Gang. But the hero of *True History* is at war with a system not merely for personal gain but also to effect political change, and he, therefore, might better be likened to Founding Fathers. Peter Carey portrays Ned Kelly as a decent young man, who is pushed into rebellion by the bullying of the corrupt and incompetent local police force. He is hardworking, clean living, optimistic, strong willed and free-spirited. Peter Carey does not downplay Ned's criminal background rather he puts this to the foreground. Much of the novel is taken up with his apprenticeship with a bushranger. He puts this behind him, however until his family is persecuted by the local forces, property owners and police.

He is regarded as a horse thief from the very beginning of his life. He has been sentenced to goal for the crime which he hadn't done and sometime the crime even not happened. In 1877, the warrant against Ned is issued for the theft of Whitty's horses but four weeks later the police issued another against Dan Kelly and Jack Llyod on the basis of

evidence that they resembled the people who sold some of Whitty's stolen horses. It seems their charges get changed according to time and without any evidences. If anything wrong happens in the society they relate it with Kelly and accuse them for everything that takes place in locality. Ned and his step father, George King, an American, plan to do job together. They scheme to borrow fifty horses from Mr. Whitty in a night. George King seems very tactful and skillful, "George King needed no mare or stallion or oats or whip or halter to start them horses walking he needed nothing but himself and he drew them away from the plains of Myrrhe and Kilferra using nothing more than their own curiosity"(233-34). Ned has never seen such a picture as this previously. It is for the first time he has been a thief. Before this he gets punishment for the work that has not been done by him: "Never having been a thief before I were surprised to discover what a mighty pleasure stealing from the rich could be" (234). It proves Ned's innocence and ruler's brutality and injustice. It shows the authority is guided by tyranny; there are no places for marginalized people. Only power determines the truth. It is powerful people like justice Redmond Barry, Constable Flood Bill Frost, Constable Hall, who determine truth, and whatever they say is the truth for all. They can even issue the forge notice and claim for the poor like the Kellys. Marginalized people's voice is unheard in the official history. Rather they are misrepresented there.

Ned is very honest and loyal towards his duty and responsibilities; he can never betray anyone. Englishmen want to arrest Power as he is an outlaw but they fail to do so. They take Ned as Power's offsider. If Ned told them about Harry and helped them to nab him, they would let him free. They provide different incentives for betrayal but he also denies it, he refuses to trade in human flesh. He is an Irishman and hears about the stories of the Irish so he says "He hit me once again but I could endure much worse than this without succumbing for I were raised on stories of Irishmen being tortured and would not go home a traitor" (121). They decided the fight between Ned and police with condition that if he loses he has to forfeit Harry Power and if he wins he will be released form all charges that are on

him. Ned wins the fight but the situation is still the worst one. The policeman beats him time and again but he has caliber to tolerate worse than this. The Police detain Ned for nearly two months but the case against him gets dismissed for lack of evidence. Then they do their best to lure Ned's mother Ellen Kelly. An Englishman offers five quids to Mrs. Kelly for introducing Power to them. But she denies them; though she is poor she does not betray anyone. Further, they try to tempt her giving the example of poverty but with anger and pride she says:

“The example I would give my children is that nothing is as low as trading a man's life for money now get off my land before I put the dog on you.

That kelpie has a taste for eating horses droppings but I warrant he would prefer a fat policeman's arse.” (171)

It shows that she prefers to live in poverty rather than betraying others for the sake of money. Even she does not care about the power of the policeman and scolds them. It shows how brave she is. When they fail to lure her, then they try their best to tempt Ned. It shows the brutality of English colonizer's; even they cannot fulfill their promises and words given to the poor. They are holding power so they can do whatever they want.

Ned is very sound in his character. He never drinks, smokes and indulges with women. But he is once arrested for drunkenness and charges for intent to rape. Joe has the habit of opium and Steve and Dan smoke and drink some- times but he never smokes and drinks. “I sit alone watching the blue sky and missing you and your ma while all are busy in drinking and merry making and celebrating your birth” (346). Police make him what he is not. His non -drinking habit further proves as he denies drinking saying “I never drink” (112) when his stepfather George King asks him for. Mrs. Goodman seems interested in Ned but Ned seems reluctant towards her then she becomes angry with him and charges him and his Gang for intent to rape.

Charge against them for attempt murder of the constable Fitzpatrick is a fake one. They were only trying to protect their sister. The Kellys and their friends emphatically deny the truth of Fitzpatrick's statements, and complain very bitterly that their relations are unjustly cast into prison on his unsupported evidence. One version is that no shooting at all took place, but that Fitzpatrick had concocted the whole affair in a spirit of revenge, because certain improper advances which he had made to one of the female members of the family had been rejected with considerable warmth; Fitzpatrick misbehaves with his sister Kate, he pulls her roughly onto his knee. Ned can not tolerate it and shows himself plainly at the door and orders Fitzpatrick to let her free: "get my sister off your effing lap" (270). Kate seems sure that he will marry her as she says "You must not none my brother will be nicer when he hears we are to be married" (270). It shows how innocently he traps the Kelly girl. Then Ned discloses Fitzpatrick's reality that he's engaged to others also made one pregnant. And he is cheating Kate too. Another was that Fitzpatrick never had Dan Kelly in charge, and that the arrest was resisted because of the absence of a warrant, and in a scuffle Fitzpatrick slightly wounded himself with his own revolver; and a third was that Mrs. Kelly took no part whatever in the affair, not being in the house at the time – that Skillian and Williamson were miles away at the time, and that Dan and Ned Kelly were alone concerned in what took place. All the people helped him though Fitzpatrick had betrayed them. Fitzpatrick speaks words of thanks to Ned: "I have to say you are as decent a man as ever I met and I want you to know that I know you saved my life tonight and I did not deserve my life to be saved I am very sorry to have lost your respect for there is no man's respect I would rather have" (272). Next day there is warrant sworn against them for attempted murder. Boys are in the safe places where they could not be found. But rest of the family is in Eleven mile Creek who have to suffer. When his mother is arrested, Ned claims that "the police took her and the baby as easy as plucking mushrooms in a cow paddock" (276). It shows their animalistic nature. She gets three years imprisonment and she cannot keep her baby with her. It

disheartens Ned. It is justice Redmond Barry who declares so and Ned expresses his anger towards him: “[H]e were a cruel and heartless” (280). Fitzpatrick betrays them; he soon forgets his words. He is a wolf in sheep’s skins.

Every bad thing that happens in society is linked with Kellys. The Government did its best to arrest them; it offered £100 reward for their apprehension, and every effort was made by the police to capture them. It was then known that they had "taken to the bush" and there was a general impression that they were concerned in several cases of road robbery that took place about that time in remote portions of the district; but, reckless and daring though they were known to be, it was never for a moment thought that they were capable of the fearful crimes by which they were shortly to make.

Kelly people wrote coffin letters to be sent to people because they were forced to compose it. On 26<sup>th</sup> of October Kelly Gang has got formed after the shooting deaths of three police officers, Sergeant Kennedy, Tom Lonigan and Scanlon. On 29<sup>th</sup> of October, government issued notification of a reward of £800 for the arrest and conviction of the Kelly gang. And in November they were legally declared outlaws under the Felons Apprehension Act of parliament. Reward was increased at this time £2,000 that means £500 for each offender and police or civilian legally shoot the gang members on sight. Though the government did its best, they are not able to capture Kellys because of their sympathizers. On 10 December 1878, the Kelly Gang invaded a station property near Euora, 27 miles west of Benalla. Twenty-two people at the sheep station were rounded up and locked in a storeroom. Then, leaving Joe Byrne to guard the prisoners Ned, Dan and Steve Hart drove into Euroa in a hawker’s cart. Then reward published in government Gazette at £2,500 total. Up to February 7 to 10 NSW increased reward each worth £2,000. That money is very much for that time in Victoria. Though government did its best and increase reward the gang nevertheless managed to evade capture for sixteen more months. But at last of the letter Ned writes “I do not wish to give order full force without giving timely warning but I am a



widow's son outlawed and must be obeyed" (395). As the reward money increases and there are lots of spies on them they have to do it.

Ned kills three police officers in self defence; the murder is not intended one but it is inevitable "We had nothing decent to protect ourselves I said all we wanted were their weapons [. . .] we never wished them, dead" (359). They only want to have modern weapon. Ned tolerates authority's tyranny as much as he can and also requests officers to surrender but the situation is reversal. They doesn't do so one of the police officer named as Kennedy tries to shoot Ned and Ned fires him, "He wheeled round raising his arm to shoot but I fired first" (292). He has not fired anyone until he is forced to. Everyone has desire to live and everyone struggles for existence. Ned kills them only to protect himself; if he has not killed them they will surely kill him. Every one has desire for life; every creature struggles for their existence as Darwin puts forwards his theory--fittest of the survival. If Ned has not killed them they would surely finish him off as one of the police officer's saying is quoted: "If I come across Ned Kelly I'll shoot him like a dog" (286). It shows their brutal attitude towards Kelly and they resemble as animals. Ned is destined to kill them as there is no other option except this:

I was compelled to shoot them, or lie down and let them shoot me it would not be wilful murder if they packed our remains in, shattered into a mass of gore to Mansfield, they would have got great praise and credit as well as promotion but I am reconed a horrid brute because I had not been cowardly enough to lie down for them under such trying insults to my people certainly their wives and children are to be pitied but they must remember those men came into the bush with the intention of scattering pieces of me and my brother all over the bush. (300)

Ned is very kind-hearted, merciful and helpful though he is defined as a brutal murderer and self centered in official history. He is unlike ruler who is guided by tyrannical ideology,

hypocrisy and holding physical force he is very amicable and honors his enemy too. Ned feels pity for Kennedy and regrets: “[w]hen he finished writing I told him I were very sorry more sorry than I could ever make him know. You are a brave man said I” (292).

It is the police who make them popular; they come up with the explanation of their great popularity. The Kellys are loved by all; the poor are their sympathizers, they also help poor; they rob the bank in order to help the poor. As the police writes: “There was thousands of Kelly sympathizers throughout the North East and this were why no one could arrest us” (365). They are being fed and hidden by a great army of friends. It proves that the Kellys are not bad as described by mainstream media. If he were not helpful, amicable, no people would prefer to help him. It is only because of his good nature, he gets co-operation. All the downtrodden people have the same plight and problem as Ned has. Injustice prevails in the society which forces people to choose alternative path. At first Ned has belief on justice but as they get penalty for the crime that even not happened and his mother get imprisonment for the false charge imposed by drunken police Fitzpatrick, loses his faith on justice.

There is no doubt that Ned is driven to crime by circumstances such as poverty as well as a corrupt police and judicial system --the evils of English colonialism. His exploits are designed both to right and wrong and to ensure his popularity with his own people even while they punish and humiliate those who would keep these people in their place. All the time what he wants is justice. He never wants to threaten others and especially the poor. He is the helper of the poor. For the poor people he is savior of their life and land. People remember his help, as Steve says to him “You brung my da sufficient cash to make the rent o yes you did Ned Kelly then you done it twice more each time when the government was about to seize our land” (250). He and his gang robbed the bank also for noble cause. In 1879, January Kelly friends and sympathizers arrested and held without charge for up to three months under mere suspicion of assisting the gang evades police. This action caused a groundswell of support for the gang and resentment of the government's misuse of power.

They decide that funds must be raised to help sympathizers who need bail money. They make needed bail money. They make a plan to hold a bank of Jerilderie. At that time there was agricultural crisis in Australia and they helped agricultural laborer by providing money and physical help. For this they robbed Euroa bank. It is the tyrannical nature of the rulers that makes him an outlaw, as Ned opines: "I wished to be a citizen I had tried to speak but the mongrels stole my tongue when I asked for justice they give me none" (394).

Ned Kelly wrote the Jerilderie letter when he was on a rampage and on the run in 1879. He wrote the letter for publication. He wanted people to read it, to know his version of the events that made him an outlaw or bushranger. This was not the only letter that Ned wrote but it is by far the most famous. It got the name 'Jerilderie Letter' because Ned and his gang seized the town of Jerilderie, hoping to make the local newspaper editor print the letter. Sadly for Ned, the editor got away.

One thing seems certain - he hated the police for the way they treat his mother and sisters, and he wants to protect them. The Kelly women are an important part of the sympathetic interpretation of Ned. Ned did not like the police pushing his mother and sisters around and wrecking their house shoving the girls in front of them, using them as a shield in their search for Ned. He is clearly concerned at the way the police treat his family:

I heard how the Police used to be blowing that they would not ask me to stand they would shoot me first and then cry surrender and how they used to rush into the house upset all the meat dishes break tins of eggs empty the flour out of the bags onto the ground and even the meat out of the cask and destroy all the provisions and shove the girls in front of them into the rooms like dogs so as if anyone was there they would shoot the girls first – but they knew well I was not there or I would have scattered their blood and brains like rain I would manure the Eleven Mile with their bloated carcasses and yet remember there is not one drop of murderous blood in my veins[. . .]. (332)

The second bit of the Jerilderie letter is just as wild. Ned's words flow like hot lava – maybe that is why there is virtually no punctuation. Ned wants nothing to get in the way of his flow; he is raging about people who help the police who are hunting for him: “I shall be compelled to make an example of them [. . .] take blood money will be outlawed [. . .] their property either consumed [. . .] exterminated off the face” (394).

Peter Carey's *True History of the Kelly Gang* is an eloquent explanation of how courts, at the time, dispensed with justice and why all Antipodeans of Irish extraction feel that we have handcuff tan marks. In Carey's revisionist point of view, Ned's activities are determined by heredity on one side and official bigotry and corruption on the other his criminal deeds were motivated by gallantry. Carey portrays the mainstream history as unreliable. Carey makes Ned write his own history. In order to do that he creates a fictional character Mary Hearn a girl of Ned who encourages him to write his own autobiography. It is Mary who suggests Ned to write his own history in order to raise his voice, “dear said she I would be very pleased if you would write down what you told me previously” (316). As Mary encourages him to write he does. He accomplishes first page then second and third. Often Mary comes to read, sometimes her eyes are filled with tears and sometimes to exclamation of anger as she says “There were not a soul alive who could read these words and blame me” (317).

*True History of the Kelly Gang* is the history of history and about the historical writings previously written approximately 125 years ago. It comprises the one's sense of the past. The narrator, Ned reminds the history of his own and it is true history and written for his unborn daughter to let her know about him and his people's story, what the Kellys suffered. This is very true, “This history is for you and will contain no single lie may I born in Hell if I speak false” (7). Ned claims as this history as true. As the past is mediated by the texts, literary text in this sense, works as a vehicle for the representation of history. No objective knowledge of the past is possible because all knowledge is relative, all theories are

equally valid and that a text is but an infinite play of signification. In this novel, it seems that novelist Carey rejects the master narrative as hegemonic stories told by those in power. In this sense *True History of the Kelly Gang* can be taken as a postmodern text of historiography which rejects the history which has been created by the colonizers and presents a real life story of an outlaw Ned Kelly who spent most of the time of his life in prison. Carey believes that history is subjective phenomenon. In order to underline the objective nature of history, he uses memory as a tool to present the alternative version of Australian history. The past exists in one's memory, and any historical writing, in this sense, is a construct of human subjectivity.

Ned writes about his and his people. They are all oppressed by the police: “[. . .] We Kellys was so constantly oppressed by Flood and Hall and Farrell that Fitzpatrick were [. . .]” (266). To write about them is to give voice to marginalized group. Carey writes history about the people neglected by the mainstream media, about poor and marginalized. He writes the history from the below, i.e. of a bushranger, thief, murderer and outlaw. He wants all to hear the unheard story of the Kellys, their unbearable plight and suffering. What they endure in their life from the very beginning and what's the people's attitude towards Irish immigrants including the Kellys.

### **Interrelation among Discourse, Power and Truth in the Novel**

Any literary text is situated within the institutions, social practices, and discourses that constitute the overall culture of particular time and place, and with which the literary text interacts as both a product and a producer of cultural energies and codes. It is not possible to deal with a text in isolation from its historical context, therefore, we have to attend to the historical, cultural, social and political condition of its production, its meanings, its effects, and also of its later critical interpretations and evaluations.

The discourse of an era, instead of reflecting preexisting entities and orders, brings into being the concepts, oppositions, and hierarchies of which it speaks: these elements are

both products and propagators of power, or social forces; and that as a result, the particular discursive formations of an era determine what is at the time accounted as knowledge and truth, as well as what is considered to be humanly normal as against what is considered to be criminal, or insane. Ned, the central figure of the novel is portrayed as a ruthless crook and brutal murderer by the record and it is done by using power. That history is possible to exist only in written form or discourse and discourse itself is involved to power. Discourses are rooted in the authority especially police threaten them using their power. They impose their ideology against the Kellys. Sergeant O'Neil threatens Mrs. Kelly while she goes against him and slaps him for his misdeeds: "I will issue one more warning, Mrs. Kelly" (11).

Colonialism is the use of economic, political and social policies to maintain or extend control over jurisdictions and people that lie outside the nation exercising such power. In this novel English people use all power to make Ned and his people suffer. They charge fine for him for the crime that he has not committed but because of his bad financial condition he is unable to offer money. He works as an unpaid laborer of an Englishman for penalty. As every discourse is situated within the circumstances and operates in society. Colonial discourses make Ned a criminal. The text produced during colonial period is in favor of colonizers and written from their perspective. It is invocation towards colonization. Only those texts can survive which invoke colonialism. Colonization began early in 1788 in Australia. After decolonization in America, British make Australia a penal colony. They don't want people who go against imperialism. As institutions of power are institutions of inscription, written documents are also the outcome of power relation. History produced by mainstream history is regarded as true and authentic one and Ned as outlaw, cold hearted murderer. As Foucault believes that power creates truth, it is colonial power which (mis)represents. They distort the facts and write about him which can fulfill their motives and be helpful for them.

Colonial motives behind distorting fact and declaring Ned an outlaw has some motives. They want to frighten the Australians, stop them from resistance against colonization and prolong colonialism. If they oppressed him and killed him as punishment they would easily frighten others by showing his example and could prevent others from following their path and supporting them.

Ned raises his voice for independence of Australia. His revolt is for independence and identity as well. Kelly has a national Australian identity. The British started their colony since 1788 and ruled over Australia up to 1901; his revolution is revolution against colonization; his war is war of independence as Jefferson's in America. Ned is a national hero and his war is fought for federation and liberty. At last his dream comes to be true in 1901 after twenty-one years of his death. He was hanged in 1880 in Melbourne after declaring him an outlaw. During colonial time every Australian is bound to remain silent, they cannot write exact reality because of colonial discourse and power.

The rulers are misguided by the tyrannical ideology. Kelly had bore the cruelty although there was no-fault of them. On the basis of power, the government had played the inhumane role. Sergeant O'Neil had filled the boy's imagination with thoughts that would breed like maggots on a summer day. Sergeant even began to increase his harassment of Ned's father rousing him from bed when he were drunk or fast asleep, he also needled and teased him when he saw him in the street. It's his word which gives Ned more pain and wound "the memory of the policeman's words lay inside me like the egg of a liver fluke and while he went about his growing up this slander wormed deeper and deeper into his heart and there grew fat"(13). Sergeant mocks at their poverty as well: "[H]e would mock the way he dressed his lack of shoes and coats" (14). Sergeant shows very nasty behavior to him. In April 1878 a warrant was issued for the arrest of Ned's brother Dan Kelly on a charge of horse theft. At first they accused Ned of stealing a mob of calves. The very next day his brother Dan was ambling peacefully through Oxley township he were dragged from his

horse by Constable Flood then frog marched into the laundry of the police camp where the cowardly Flood threatened to plunge his face into the boiling sheets. The same Constable Flood that seduced their sister Annie now torturing to Dan. Flood seems as brutal in his activity as it is proved by Ned's saying "he tortured my young brother until he pleaded for his life he scalded his arm he thrust his government revolver against Dan's empty belly saying he would arrest him for stealing horses from the pound" (229). Dan pleads for his innocence but Flood warns him to see those mares back in the pound by next morning otherwise there will be an adjectival war with Dan. After saying those he set Dan loose.

Kellys are living hard life and their hard circumstances were made by English people who picked the eyes out of the country with the connivance of the politicians and police. Against their force there is no defense at all. In cell his friendship developed with constable Fitzpatrick. And he let him know about the oppressive nature of the officers: "They make us servants at their adjectival dinners even though that aint permitted by the rules these b.....ds do not care they are the bosses of the effing colony" (174). Fitzpatrick tells Ned what he heard about Englishmen are planning to declare Mrs. Kelly a person not suitable then they'll annul her lease. Kellys are unwanted because they want to establish their own nation and colonizer never want this, their motive is clear when Fitzpatrick states: "They don't want your family in the district that's what they said Ned" (173). It proves that authority always tries to make them out, how severe the Englishmen are. Englishmen did their best to extend control over Ned they offered Jack Lloyd £500 reward for introducing Harry and spread rumor that Ned forfeit Harry and he is sucking on the bail.

Social institutions and that social and political power operate through discourse. The discourse, therefore, is inseparable from power because discourse is the ordering force that governs every institution. It enables institutions 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 mis-informative. Discourse also tells



us of the propriety or impropriety, rightness or wrongness, of something and consequently influences our attitude, opinion and behavior.

For the poor, Ned is savior of their life and, English people make him a scapegoat. They order Ned to initiate fight with Patt and Jimmy. Later on they arrest Pat and Quinn. They are brought to the court; there Ned can not betray his family so he speaks on the favor of uncles. But later on he realizes that these are to make his friends and family hate him all the more. He knows it from Hall: "speaking very whispery he said he could not help it either but before the year were out he would get me locked in Partridge Goal" (186). All the time they hatch conspiracy against Ned. They take advantage from his compulsion. They make a case against him: "In Wangaratta Court they swore their lies against him claiming to know the mare was stolen by information in the Police Gazette but the report of the stolen horse was not gazette until 25th April that is five days after Hall tried to murder him" (194). It shows the rulers are guided by the tyrannical ideology. The Kellys have bore the cruelty although there is no fault of them. As power determines the truth rulers do so. Though Ned is on Beechworth goal on the date the mare were stolen and they can convict him of horse stealing then or ever. But using their power they found him guilty of receiving a horse not yet legally stolen and for this he has given three years hard labor.

It shows that they are so much oppressed by the rulers. What the Kellys do is at one side and what authority made them is another side. Mainstream history always tries to represent them as bad as they can. There is no sense of justice for the Kellys. There is no law for them because they are poor, downtrodden and popular as thief, robber, and murderer. Every wrong that happens in their locality is attached with them; they are responsible for those mishappenings. This is the synonymous for them. Even the green log will burn when the heat is high enough. They tolerate as much as they can. Constable Flood of Oxley stole their horses but the thief is beyond the law, such injustice put Ned in a rage nothing would ease but danger he craved it like another man might lust for the raw burn of poteen. It shows

truth is not outside power, or lacking in power. It is rather a thing of this world which is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraints in a society. So each society has its own regime of truth.

Authority is guided by the will to power as Nietzsche believes that every individual is guided by will to power. They just want to hold and have power because having power they get right to dominate the poor as the way they want. They try to establish their own monopoly. It is clear that the mainstream history has glorified the authority but the reality was always hidden and always suppressed by the history which was written through the perspective of power. Such historical truth is itself a product of relations of power and of the systems in which it follows and it changes as system change. This is bitter reality in the historical writing. All the means of communication – oral, written and visual, and all the media – are under the control of power. In such situation the voice of downtrodden colonized is never heard. The same condition is faced by the Kelly people during the long and conditioned journey towards various places. As New historicist conjunctures historical and visible and enable marginal or unheard voices to emerge, the voices of minority and inequalities between power holders and common people in the discourses are most sharply disclosed through it. So, Ned's effort renders to disclose the hidden facts, through which the Kellys suffered.

Fitzpatrick comes to their house to arrest Dan without arrest warrant, and the situation turn opposite. Fitzpatrick gets injury and he is drunk at that time. The Kelly people help him though he does not deserve any kind of help. But later on he accuses them for attempt of murder. It is power which determines the truth. Though Fitzpatrick is drunk at that time court gives its verdict depending on his accusation and proof. They sentence his mother for three years imprisonment, and others for assisting her. Here, in the novel *True History of the Kelly Gang*, we find that power diffuses itself in the system of authority as guiltless Ned, Dan, his mother, Bill Skilling all have been proven as guilty for attempting to kill Fitzpatrick. Power

can do everything; it can prove false as true and true as false. But Skilling, Maggie's husband who hasn't done anything more than carry children to safety but on the basis of Fitzpatrick's lies he is charged with aiding and abetting attempting murder. His mother also gets the same charge and the police takes her and the baby also. In providing Ned's side various skirmishes from the basis of his notoriety. After the death of officers, the police are given emergency powers to enter premises, search and arrest, without a warrant, anyone who was suspected of helping the gang. Innocent people were arrested and held for weeks on remand. Public sympathy for the police vanish and resentment set in, even among who previously had faith in law.

History cannot be represented in pure form for it always remains relative to the narrator's prejudices and preoccupations. In the newspaper their photo was published. They distorted the fact and even their photo also. In paper there is a drawing of a demonic kind of man. They want to show demonic instinct and arises horror on people, they are persuading people to hate and fear a man they never met. It is power which twists the fact. And power can determine the truth. The authoritarian who wrote that news made the Kellys Irish madmen. It defines Ned as very inhumane as it writes "I had mutilated Sergeant Kennedy he claimed I had cut off his ear with my knife before murdering him. Moreover, I had forced my three mates to discharge their pistols into the bodies of the police, so, all would be guilty of the crime the same as me" (313). It becomes the history. But these historical facts are only perspectives, determined by power. These all are interpretations, and there is no ultimate truth. This writing cannot present truth. Everyone has a will to power. The only thing that all men want is power and whatever is wanted is wanted for the sake of power. The person who expresses distorted fact about it is also using power. It is the discourses which are the embodiment of power. That writing cannot be free from the social and political sphere of an era. So the rulers are guided by power and they are against the Kellys.

Ned has faith on others and has always been betrayed. Officially their plan is to derail the train but they are not success on their aim because of a school teacher. A school teacher named Thomas Curnow win Ned's trust and allows going free. Joe warns Ned not to be friendly with anyone and trust them. But Ned thinks he cannot harm them because he is cripple. It makes Joe angry and he says: "Ned aint you the one who give his copy to that cow in Jerilderie said he and in the lantern light I seen his awful eyes" (405). Joe has doubt on Curnow so he warns Ned but Ned is very gullible. Later on Joe's suspicion turns to be true, he out-wittes him as successfully as the hero of any fairy tale, and carries the proof. And he informs the guard that Kellys are there. Finally he is able to save the train and betray the Kelly gang. Curnow does it only to be a hero as every individual is guided by will to power. He also wants to be superior and he helps the police to catch and kill the outlaw. As his wife scolds him for his deeds saying coward he says: "me a coward? Then who saved those policemen while you were weeping in your bed?" (514). Again she says what he has done; he says: "what I have done is become a hero" (515). It clearly shows human desire to attain power.

While making Ned write his own history Carey presents a fictitious character Mary Hearn, Ned's beloved. As far as a 'true history' is concerned Ned never has the time in his short life to settle down with a wife and a child. Something that Carey chooses to ignore because, after all, adding a few false characters is bound to enhance the story. That it did, to the detriment of historical fact. But this is a piece of fiction, and it has brought Ned to the attention of the world. But here in the novel it is Mary who insists and encourages Ned to write his own history to raise his voice she says: "I would be very pleased if you would write down what you told me previously" (316). It is inevitable for Ned to write his own story to let others know about his sufferings and the injustice that the authority inflicted upon him.

Carey presents other histories as well in the novel. He presents the history of Mary's father in order to make the book interesting and handle the situation easily. The situation in

which he finds difficulty to provide exact truth at that moment he uses imagination. In the novel there is much description of Mary and Ned and their romantic life. It is Mary who helps them in every step, even she helps them after the bank robbery, and it is she who makes the master mind of using money.

In the novel where Carey does not provide us factual event and evidence very cleverly twists the story. Carey presents the story of James Whitty, a wealthy man, and with the help of devil he becomes wealthy. At first Mr. Whitty is also poor like his father and mother, but it is the devil which helps him and he becomes wealthy; devil offers marbles to him and by throwing it; he can make his wish fulfilled “he has only to throw one of them marbles through a certain window and he will be granted any wish he cares to make” (93). He presents Harry as a story teller and who tells fictitious story to Ned. Carey again creates a character named Shan to create fantasy. This boy has ability to be at one place and not to be at the same time. There is doubt on Shan being a human boy as Harry says: “Shan were not a human boy but a substitute that had been left” (136).

Colonial history is the misrepresentation of Ned. History produced by Carey is a counter history. It throws light on the misunderstanding of Ned Kelly’s life. During the imperial period writing in the language of the imperial center is inevitably produced by literate elite whose primary identification is with the colonizing power. Thus, the texts produced in the colonies during the colonial period are frequently produced by representatives of the imperial power. Post-colonial studies attempts to consider and define relation between the settler or colonial – invader races and groups and the first nation races and groups which articulated the newly emergent voices of nationhood after colonialism. Like the real nineteenth – century Australian Outlaw, Carey’s Ned is part of the class of Irish Peasants transported to Australia, indebt to the colonial government, and pursued relentlessly by a murderous police force. Post colonialism deals with many issues for societies that have undergone colonialism. It attacks on colonial discourse. But the dilemmas of developing a

national identity in the wake of colonial rule, the ways in which writers from colonized countries attempt to articulate and even celebrate their cultural identities and reclaim them from the colonizers; the ways knowledge of colonized people have served the interests of colonizers, and how knowledge of subordinate people is produced and used; and the ways in which the literature of the colonial powers is used to justify colonialism through the perpetuation of images of the colonized as inferior. Even Carey would not have been able to write the same thing before 1901. Post-colonialism forms a powerful intellectual and critical movement which renews the perception and understanding of modern history.

No previous knowledge of Australian literature, culture or history will be assumed. We will be exploring these works through narratological and post-colonial critical perspectives among others, and setting them alongside a variety of Australian. *True History of the Kelly Gang* is a novel about power, about history writing, and about the oral tradition of story-telling. Narrator of the novel Ned Kelly tries to describe an actual historical and political event. In Carey's novel Kelly's life is told through arts. It thematizes the postmodern concern with the radically indeterminate and unstable nature of textuality and subjectivity.

There are many truths that are ignored by the mainstream history. They concealed the real history and the truth because it is written by the persons in power and for people in power and it is for their benefit. The fiction thus helps to unravel those parts of history which are neglected or concealed in official version. The politicians try to homogenize history. So they take alternative versions to the official history as threat for they may contradict with their versions of truth. The fiction can serve as a resistance against this effort of the politicians. Carey tries to disclose the truths that are hidden in official version of history through his historical fiction. By doing so, he resists the official authoritative view about the Kellys.

The novel is based on Jerilderie letter and this is Ned's history written for his daughter and he claims it to be true as the title of the novel suggests. In the very beginning he addresses it to his fictitious daughter, "My daughter you are presently too young to understand a word I write but this history is for you and will contain no single lie may I burn in Hell if I speak false" (7). There is not any evidence that proves Ned's getting married to a woman named Mary and having a daughter. Most of his life was spent in jail and bush ranging. In any record there is no mentioning of his wife and his daughter.

Carey rewrites about the Kelly Gang and its history, and he gives new approach to them. Carey believes, present and past, fictive and factual: the boundaries frequently be transgressed. Historian cannot be aloof from the society and the circumstances in which it is written so the historian who wrote about Ned before 125 years ago are also guided by the will to power and the discourse which they create cannot be free from the atmosphere and their bias. So, no history can be as factual as science and there is no fact at all. They hide the fact and represent the distorted fact. So history is also like fiction where the writer's or historian's imagination plays a vital role. There is no history where is no omission and deletion. That means history is also imaginative like fiction. So history and fiction are similar, they are the two parts of a same coin. In this sense, this novel is a metafiction or metahistory.

The title of the novel itself is ironic one. As Carey writes this novel from revisionist or new historicist perspective and believes that there is no objectivity in history writing, no one can present the exact truth and further believes it as mere interpretation of writer. By providing such ironic title Carey undermines reader's tendency to study history for getting objective truth. Now a question arises: how can it be possible to give such title to his novel? Does post-colonial discourse describe normal processes of cultural and political change through conquest and domination or does it engage human responsibility in the novel? Is the thing described by Ned is real one? As Nietzsche believes every individual is guided by will

to power Ned Kelly also might want to achieve power. We can feel the sense of power on Ned's writings also. What is the motive behind his writings? It is to obtain power, he wants to make his people known about his suffering during colonial regime and make them to hate the colonizers.

To give voice to the marginalized people like Ned Kelly Carey presents Ned in a midway between fiction writer and historian to blend history and fiction. History for Ned is both history and [his] story. In other words, *True History of the Kelly Gang* is a work of fiction, and the same time, a record of Australian history i.e. Kellys history, and it is Ned's position between historian and fiction writer that blurs the demarcation between history and fiction.



## Chapter IV

### Conclusion

Peter Carey's *True History of the Kelly Gang* blurs the frontier that differentiates history from fiction. Carey views both history and fiction as a story, a human construct. Not only fiction, but history too is a creation of human subjectivity. As in fiction, the prejudices and preoccupation of the narrator function in the writing of history. *True History of the Kelly Gang* stresses the fact that history can never be represented in an objective and unbiased way; it rather remains relative to the historicity of the historian. History is organized by the historians as fiction is written by the fiction writer. The historians are the ones who make history coherent and intelligible, through the use of points of view and interpretations that are always partial, provisional, and, in the final analysis, as subjective as artistic constructs. The subjective nature of history gives way to create other versions of history. Carey underlines such fact by presenting an alternative version of Kelly Gang history.

In *True History of the Kelly Gang* Carey presents the realistic picture of the history through the medium of literary devices. Carey focuses on the historical occupation of late nineteenth century Australia, especially of the Kelly Gang. The leader of Kelly Gang, Ned, in the novel narrates his story to his unborn daughter to let her know about his and his people's suffering. Kelly is always condemned by the mainstream media so Carey writes about him to give voice to Ned including other marginalized people. Here he attacks the notion of official history, which sees history as truth. He presents another version of history to readers through *True History of the Kelly Gang*. This novel is based on the letter written by Ned known as Jerilderie Letter. He wrote this letter to be published and let people know about his reality and the reason behind his criminal life. It is a type of genealogical history which analyses power relations and is about the ruled not about the rulers, i.e. it is about the victimized.

The Kellys are suffering in two ways for being the Irish and being the Kellys. They are Irish immigrants and English people are treating them badly. All the time they are suppressed by English, either it is police officers or mother's suitors. All husbands of Ellen Kelly except John Kelly are English. And the English people turn out as a curse upon them. Kelly women are always exploited by the police. It may be a cause for the anger of Ned to the police. The Kelly Gang kills three officers and are declares as outlaws and are deprived of all civil rights. Murder of the police is not the intent one but they are obliged to kill them in self defiance.

Ned Kelly was a real person, an outlaw who has caught the imagination of the Australian populace. Carey gives voice to the marginalized group. Peter Carey as a revisionist has rewritten the history of the Kelly Gang. The main objective of his writing is to bring the hidden and twisted truth at forth. For this he has rejected the master narratives and writes about the defeated ones and from the perspective of lower class. As a genealogist he gives us minute detail of Kelly's history ignored by the mainstream media and the cause of the every event and its effects on the Kellys.

It is the paradigm shift in Australian history through which marginalized people like Kellys get relief from the suffocation laid down by the mainstream history through the medium of *True history of the Kelly Gang*. Yesterday's history which was created by the colonizers and today's history revisionist which is about the marginalized experiences of the colonized has such a huge gap. There was vast glacier between appearance and reality in canonical history but, Carey tries to clarify the hidden truth. The Kelly history, which was the most horrible and painful history of the Australians now comes into existence through this text. It is golden opportunity for the Australians to know the hidden and suppressed history of the colonizer's through the medium of literary text.

The new historiographical approach, which is the revisionist approach, tries to express the reality of the Kelly in Australia during the late nineteenth century. The minority

and subaltern social groups such as former slaves, working classes, convicts, and women have raised the voices because of the advent of postmodernist theories like New Historicism, Post colonialism and Feminism. So the hierarchy in terms of history has been shattered. The silent and suppressed voices also made the separate identity in the society. The unheard history which was taken the 'silent cry' no longer remains the intact situation. Thus, the minority history, culture and heritage have made a separate and unique identity.

Carey refuses any claim to absolute truth in the official version of the history of the Kellys. He even interrogates the validity of the official history of late nineteenth century Australia. He rather views it as a discourse created by people in power. During the nineteenth century English colonizers who were in power in Australia tried to falsify the history of the patriots like Ned to prolong colonialism in Australia. The official history written from the perspective of English colonizers hid the reality behind Ned's activities and intentions. Peter Carey, a post colonial Australian writer tries his best to explore such unexplored motives of Ned, who, according to Carey, fought against British colonialism.

## Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed. USA: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1993.
- Adams, Hazard, ed. *Critical Theory since Plato*. Rev. ed. New York: Harcourt, 1992.
- Ankersmit, F.R. *History and Tropology: The Rise and Fall of Metaphor*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Aristotle. *Poetics*. Trans. S.H. Butcher. Adams 50–66.
- Banville, John. "The Wild Colonial Boy." *The New York Review of Books* 48.5 (2001): 1–9.
- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literature, Criticism and Theory*. 2nd ed. Harlow: prentice Hall, 1999.
- Boehemer, Elleke. *Colonial and Post colonial Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Brannigan, John "History, Power and Politics in the Literary Artifact: New Historicism." *Introducing Literary Theories: A Guide and Glossary*. Ed. Julian Wolfreys. Edinburgh: Edunburgh UP, 2001. 169–84.
- Carey, Peter. *True History of the Kelly Gang*. Australia: University of Queensland Press, 2001.
- Daiches, David. *Critical Approaches to Literature*. 2nd ed. Calcutta: Longman, 1997.
- Donald, Ben Mc. "Carey's Kelly." *Christian Century* 14 (2002): 6–12.
- Edric, Robert. "Remaking of Ned." *The Gurdian* 47.4 (2003): 19–32.
- Fitegerald, Michael. "Truth and Consequences." *Times Pacific* 43 (. 2000): 1–12.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. Trans. Robert Hurley. Vol. 1 New York: Random House, 1990.
- - -. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith London: Tavistock Publications Ltd, 1972.

- Garret, George. "Use of Language in Carey's *True History of the Kelly Gang*." *The Washington Post* 38 (2001): 12–19.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. "Towards a Poetics of Culture." *The New Historicism*. Ed. H. Aram Veesser. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- , ed. *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*. Norman : Pilgrim Books, 1982.
- Grester, Robin. "The Ned Kelly Myth and Australian Identity." *Lancet* 357.9253 (2001): 401–32.
- Gupto, Arun. *Healing Thoughts on Tender Theory*. Kathmandu: New Hira Books, 2004.
- Habib, M.A.R. *A History of Literary Criticism: From Plato to the Present*. New York: Blackwell, 2005.
- Hoover, Dwight. "The New Historicism." *History Teacher*. 25.3. (1992): 56–65.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Jones, Malcolm. "Reviews of *True History of the Kelly Gang* by Peter Carey." *Newsweek* 199.1576 (2001): 20–22.
- Kemp, Peter. "Carey's Kelly at Last." *The Sunday Times* 132.45 (2003): 5–7.
- McHoul, Alec and Wendy Grace. *Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Montrose, Louis. "New Historicism." *Redrawing the Boundaries: Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992. 392–418.
- Morgan, Wendy. "Trading a Fine Line in Carey's Kelly." *Social Alternatives* 20.1 (2001): 71–72.
- "Nietzsche, Friedrich". *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. Paul Edwards, et al. Vol. 5. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- . "On the Use and Abuse of History." *Critical Theory since 1965*. Eds. Florida: Florida State University Press, 1980. 152–96.

- Quinn, Anthony. "Robin Hood of the Outback." *The New York Times* 42-39 (2003): 15–48.
- Robey, David. "Modern Linguistics and the Language of Literature." *Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction*. Eds. Ann Jefferson and David Robey. 2nd ed. London: Batsford, 1986. 46–72.
- Rogers, Jane. "True History of the Kelly Gang by Peter Carey." *The Observers* 24.14 (2001): 6–19.
- Scurr, Ruth. "Present Picks for the Best fiction and nonfiction books of 2001." *The Times* 158.47 (2001): 4–18.
- Shreedharan, E. *A Textbook of Historiography 500 BC to AD 2000*. Delhi: Longman, 2000.
- White, Hayden. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
- White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1973.