

I. General Introduction

Edgar Lawrence Doctorow's a ground breaking novel *Ragtime* won the National Book Critics Circle Award and enthralled both readers and critics around the world. Reading E.L. Doctorow's *Ragtime* illuminates history as fiction and fiction as history.

Doctorow is the author of several critically acclaimed novels that blend history and social criticism. Although he had written books for years, it was not until the publication of *The Book of Daniel* in 1971 that he obtained acclaim. His next book, *Ragtime* was a commercial and critical success. Highly-regarded and controversial, Doctorow's work is characterized by serious philosophical probings, a subtle and diverse prose style, and placement of historical figures in unusual, sometimes bizarre, situations and settings. His novel stretches the limits of the literary genres on which he draws. In developing his own poetics of engagement, Doctorow seeks a fiction that is both politically relevant and aesthetically complex and interesting. By blurring the distinctions between fact and fiction, Doctorow's fiction seeks to disclose and to challenge the hegemony of enshrined or institutionalized discursive practices.

Edgar Lawrence Doctorow was born in New York City, America on January 6, 1931 and grew up in the Bronx in a family where people read constantly, where reading was essential to a normal day's life. He received a B.A. from Kenyon College in 1952, attended graduate school at Columbia University, and spent two years from 1953 to 1955 in the U.S. Army stationed in Germany. From 1956 to 1959 he worked as a staff reader for a motion picture company. He later explained to an interviewer, his first novel, *Welcome to Hard Times* (1960), was inspired by this job experience: "I had to read one rotten western after another, and it occurred to me that I could lie about the West in a much more interesting way than any of these people were lying" (*Ragtime* v). In *Big as Life* (1966), Doctorow turned to

another genre: science fiction. Despite the fact that he had deliberately cast his first two novels in literary forms not usually heralded by critics, both books received high praise.

Meanwhile, Doctorow was pursuing a successful career in publishing. During five years at the New American Library from 1959 to 1964, he was promoted from associate to senior editor. In 1964 he was named editor-in-chief of the Dial Press. However, the appearance of his third work of fiction, *The Book of Daniel* (1971), established Doctorow as a major American novelist, and from that point he decided to give himself fully to writing.

Taken together, Doctorow's books offer a rich imagining of the American past, prompted in part by his concern about having missed out on history. [He has commented more than once about the peculiarity of his own generation central experiences of our times—too young to painfully feel the depression, or fight in World War II, and too old at thirty to be drafted for Vietnam'.] *The Book of Daniel*, a novel nominated for a National Book Award in 1972, took its cue from the Rosenberg trials that were part of the anticommunist fervor of the 1950s.

Doctorow's next work, *Loon Lake* (1980), was part fairy tale, part thriller. The story of a young man cast adrift during the depression, it exposed the hidden fault-lines of class, sexuality and violence in the American bedrock.

World's Fair (1986), which won the National Book Award, was yet another mesmerizing Doctorow time capsule; an eerie evocation of a New York City boyhood of the 1930s, seen simultaneously through the eyes of the child himself and through those of the adult who recollects that childhood. Doctorow followed *World's Fair* with *Billy Bathgate* (1989), for which he won the National Book Critics Circle Award, the PEN/Faulkner Prize, and the William Dean Howells medal of the American Academy of Arts and Letters. A virtuoso tour-de-force that chronicles the adventures of an urban Tom Sawyer who is

apprenticed to the notorious Dutch Schultz gang, *Billy Bathgate* was declared 'a modern classic' by John Le Carre.

Between novels, Doctorow has also found time to write the play *Drinks Before Dinner* (1978), which was originally produced by the New York Shakespeare Festival. Furthermore, he has taught at Sarah Lawrence College, Yale University School of Drama, Princeton University, and New York University, where he currently holds the Glucksman Chair in American Letters. He is the recipient of numerous honorary degrees including those from Kenyon College and Brandeis University. He currently lives and works in New York.

Although Doctorow admits that time and its passage has been his key framing device, he has trouble with the term historical novelist. His idea of an historical novel is a novel that makes literary history. For the past thirty years he has taught literature and writing, twenty-three of them spent at New York University. He often answers questions with examples from the work of great writers, delivered with the folksy charm of an afternoon radio host whose ease with his role makes everything he says seem matter-of-fact.

Growing up a boy in the Bronx during the depression, Doctorow came upon these writers early and often. Although his father ran a music store, he was a fan of books and named his son after the poet Edgar Allen Poe. Doctorow's mother was a pianist.

It is reliable that Edgar Lawrence Doctorow is widely recognized as one of America's great masters of the historical novel. He is the author most recently of *The March* (2005), a fictional account of General William Tecumseh Sherman's infamous military rampage from the burned-out ruins of Atlanta to the Atlantic ocean, and north into the Carolinas, leaving a path of destruction that affected the south for generations. *The March* recently received the 2006 PEN/ Faulkner Award and the 2005 National Book Critics Circle Award and was a finalist for the 2005 National Book Award.

It seems clearly that Doctorow has written the novels about the historical events. The Postwar novelists have written their texts merging imaginary fictional element with history. In first looking, Doctorow's novels may seem historical novel but in reality his novels have merged the historical, real and the imaginary characters. So that, his novel can be taken as historiographic metafiction. *Ragtime* even has merged both kinds of historical, real and imaginary characters.

Doctorow's *Ragtime* (1975) offers scenes from the life of an upper-middle class family in New Rochelle engaged in the manufacture of banners and flags. The novel also touches on immigrant poverty and on the oppression of blacks, which leads one black jazz musician, who loses everything because of the suspicion and malice of whites, to seize control of Pierpont Morgan's library. Emma Goldman, the revolutionary, and Stanford White, the architect, turn up and bow out. The middle-class family declines in cohesiveness and wealth and produces one nihilistic son who makes bombs instead of fourth of July fireworks. The family is finally united by ties of love to an immigrant family, whose fortunes rise as the novel progresses. The novel evokes the atmosphere of a period piece, remaining all surface, offering dazzlingly polished scenes where 'real' and imaginary characters are set like mosaics.

Doctorow has written the history of Ragtime Era (1900-1920) through revisionist perspective bringing ahead to the contemporary marginal issues. Doctorow has shown the racial discrimination between whites and blacks. The novel among many crucial issues especially focuses on the issues that the oppression of blacks by whites, which leads one black jazz musician who loses everything because of the suspicion and malice of whites, to seize control of Pierpont Morgan's library. In the period of Ragtime Era, the whites have brutally suppressed to the blacks which is known through the vandalization of Coalhouse Walker's Model T Ford by the Fire Chief Willie Conklin. The administration does not give justice to Coalhouse Walker because of the biasedness and partiality of administration, the

police arrests to the suffered Coalhouse Walker and gives mental torture to himself. Any court does not hear his appeal and rejects to register his case. So, he can not get the court for justice. So it shows the complete inhuman, mean and wildly behaviour of whites upon blacks. Being compelled he actively fights against whites institution to grant and achieve the rights of black colored people. For the emancipation, freedom and rights of blacks people, Coalhouse Walker has been martyr.

Doctrow has tried to present the Ragtime Era's history as much real as it was through revisionist perspective bringing ahead to the contemporary marginal issues. While writing about realist fiction merging history, history is represented through textual traces. Linda Hutcheon in her *The Politics of Postmodernism* asserts that "The past really did exist, but we can only know it today through its textual traces, its often complex and indirect representation in the present: documents, archives, but also photographs paintings, architecture, films and literature" (75). Likewise the Ragtime Era's history about racism has been fictionalized through textual traces in literary form in the novel *Ragtime* by E.L. Doctrow. Hutcheon further says "Past events existed empirically but in epistemological terms we can only know them today through texts" (78). Thus the past is represented in history. History is taken as foundation to do something. Sometimes history becomes guideline and source according to the context and its meaning. History can be taken as the education to go ahead. Regarding the meaning of history, Hutcheon asserts that: "History's meaning lies not in what hurts so much as in what we say once hurt for we are both irremediable distanced by time and yet determined to grant meaning to that real pain of others and ourselves" (78).

In the postmodern period, history and fiction has become the similar kind of genre. Not only history but fiction also represents the real events of the past and the contemporary period indirectly from which reader can feel the situation what it was and is. History is

assumed as the record of facts about the past events. Facts are events to which we have given meaning. The facts are constructed on the solid ground. Regarding this Hutcheon asserts that:

Among the consequences of the postmodern desire to denaturalize history is a new self-consciousness about the distinction between the brute events of the past and the historical facts we construct out of them. Facts are events to which we have given meaning. Different historical perspectives therefore derive different facts from the same events. (54)

History is denaturalized and presented through narrative representation in postmodern fiction. The event of the past is presented in fictional form through imaginary characters. Historical events can be known through historical traces in today's narrative representation. Hutcheon further says "In historiographic metafiction the very process of turning events into facts through the interpretation of archival evidence is shown to be a process of turning the traces of the past [our only access to those events today] into historical representation" (55). All past 'events' are potential historical 'facts' but the ones that become facts are those that are chosen to be narrated. We have seen that this distinction between brute event and meaning granted facts is one with which postmodern fiction seems obsessed.

The self-reflexive nature of postmodern text points in two direction at once, towards the events being represented in the narrative and toward the act of narration itself. This is precisely the same doubleness that characterizes all historical narrative. Neither form of representation can separate 'facts' from the acts of interpretation and narration that constitute them, for facts [though not events] are created in and by those acts. And what actually becomes fact depends as much as anything else on the social and cultural context of the historian.

It is reliable in the postmodernist representation that the issue of representation in both fiction and history has usually been dealt with in epistemological terms, in terms of how

we know the past. The past is not something to be escaped, avoided, or controlled. Past can not be avoided completely and represented or adopted thoroughly. Nevertheless, we have only access to the past today through its, traces-its documents, the testimony of witnesses, and other archival materials. That is why, we only have representation of the past from which to construct our narratives or explanations. From this we can say postmodernism reveals a desire to understand present culture as the product of previous representations. The representation of history becomes the history of representation. Thus postmodern art acknowledges and accepts the challenge of tradition: the history of representation can not be escaped but it can be both exploited and commented on critically through irony and parody.

Fredric Jameson calls, postmodern parody an empty parody and views pastiche as ironic citation. Hutcheon asserts that "postmodern parody does not disregard the context of the past representation it cites, but uses irony to acknowledge the fact that we are inevitably separated from that past today-by time and by the subsequent history of those representation" (90). We get the continuity of history in different form either in ironic or formal representation.

As a form of ironic representation, parody is doubly coded in political terms: it both legitimizes and subverts that which it parodies. Parody can be used as a self- reflexive technique that points to art as art, but also to art as inescapably bound to its aesthetic and even social past. Its ironic reprise also offers a internalized sign of a certain self-consciousness about our culture's means of ideological legitimation.

It can be concluded that the past or history enlivens through narrative representations. And the past will be known only in its textual trace and self-reflexivity. Historiographic metafiction represents not just a world of fiction however self-consciously presented as a constructed one, but also a world of public experience. We know the past today through its discourse, through the traces of its historical events. On one level, then postmodern fiction

merely makes overt the process of narrative representation-of the real or the fictive and of their interrelations. In postmodernism, through the use of parodic and ironic reference in narratives, the dominant aspects are undermined and the marginalized issues are being raised and rewritten through revisionist perspective.

History is assumed as the records of past events which are based on facts. The facts do not exist unless they are interpreted. The historian interprets the events of history, presents them coherently, and makes 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 the making of history, and, in this sense history is like fiction, a subjective phenomenon. Fiction is also the representation of reality in imaginary form. Furthermore in historiography, historical events are presented in fictional form through its traces by narrative representation. The self-reflexive narrative representation is the nature of postmodern fiction. So that history and fiction are interrelated and similar phenomena. That is why history as fiction and fiction as history is the reliable and relevant in the context of Doctorow's historiographic metafiction *Ragtime*. In the novel *Ragtime* (1975), Doctorow through revisionist perspective has presented Coalhouse Walker's episode in light of 1967s Civil Rights Movement.

II. Reformulations of the Notion of History: Implications for Historiographic Metafiction

Traditional history is written focusing on the central and master issues so that it is called grand narratives. Grand narratives have been taken today as the history of rulers and higher majorities' class people. Those who were in power are only highlighted and described in conventional history excluding marginal aspects. Modern new historians have written the history from marginal perspective including all minorities and marginalized aspects. So the traditional historical account has been linear, exclusive grand narratives whereas the modern new history has tried to become circular, an all-inclusive as well as open-ended record. Latest historians have tried to write with revisionist perspective including all aspects.

Here I have taken three persons' [Hayden White, Linda Hutcheon and Fredric Jameson] views of history and its relation with postmodern fiction which are interrelated at each other and I have proved Linda Hutcheon's view of postmodernism and historiographic metafiction. The idea of postmodernism and postmodern fiction relating with history of

White, Hutcheon and Jameson are described gradually and respectively and concluded with Hutcheon.

A. Hayden White's Notion of History

A historian Hayden White's attempt in *Metahistory* (1973) to seek 'a deep structural content' (ix) in the historical writing of Nineteenth century Europe constitutes an important contribution to a more critical and analytical approach to the history of historiography. Hayden White examines and treats the historical work as a 'verbal structure in the form a narrative prose discourse' (ix). White has used structuralist method and poststructuralist forms of textual analysis. He says, historical accounts normally take the form of stories.

Hayden White purposes a systematic study of figurative aspects in historiographical writing in order to reveal the preconceptual layers of historical consciousness within the very structure of the historiographical text through his metahistory. White characterizes the four modes of historical consciousness through the different figures of speech which organize the semantic dimensions of the respective tropes. Metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony represent the basic categories which predetermine the secondary conceptual level of the historians representational framework. On the secondary conceptual level White identifies three modes of explanation which are embodied in the narrative

techniques, the formal argumentation, and ethical position developed in historiographical discourse.

He uses this model to analyze the evaluation of historiographical style. He assumes a cyclical development through the different tropes which successively fail to establish their exclusive claim to realistic representation. White argues that average academic writing stays within the parameters delineated by the respective dominant trope. He is much interested in the texts which exemplify the margin between two tropes, the classics of historiography and philosophy of history which prepare the shift from one dominant trope to the next and different concepts of reality.

White points out that history proper only starts when the established facts are fabricated into full-scale narratives for purely presentist concerns. White in *The Content of Form* argues, "Historiography serves to project a type of subjectivity on the audience which accepts the formal structures of the text as a sole criterion of the real and almost by definition undercuts radical politics as unrealistic" (57). Through these sentences White illustrates the conciliatory and domesticating capacities of history through the causality principle which explains and justifies the status quo. To subscribe to the rules of history always implies that one assumes good reasons for this to be the way they are.

In the process of describing historiography, he claims that historiography succeeds in constituting the subject in the specific moral

and political position due to its supposedly intermediary, uncanny position between the possible and the imaginary. Distinct from the possible which is the realm of science and the imaginary which is the referent for art and literature, history deals in the plausible, the very similar. The plausible, according to White, is the result of the conflict between the current social constraints expressed in the totality of the symbolic system of a given society on the one hand, and the imaginary, set into being by libido and instincts, on the other. Therefore, White argues, the plausible is in a sense more real for the individual than the truth of science because it relates its desire to the social context and offers a compromise which allows safe orientation and positioning. These remarks make clear that historiography is empirical and speculative at the same time, but its ultimate referent remains the social practice of the citizen who negotiates his or her own position with regard to social authorities.

In a second step, White historicizes and narrativizes his concept in his reflections on the origins of historiography as an academic discipline. He argues that for the first time the past appeared a priori as a well-formed entity which could be revealed by the historian through the application of the rules of evidence. This domestication restricted history to the mode of the middle style and excluded all kinds of religions and irrational events from the historical sphere proper. The matters of state became the reference point for history, thereby limiting the spectrum of potential facts.

For White, only the deideologization of historical studies through the exclusion of the sublime transformed history into a discipline and an efficient political tool.

Charging the dangerous misrepresentation, and an untruth projecting order of history White argues, "if you are going to go to history, you had better have a pretty good notion as to whether it is hospitable to the values you carry into it; this is the function of theory in general – that is to say, to provide justification of a stance vis-à-vis the materials being dealt with that can render it plausible" (164). To make furthermore clear, he urges historians to recognize the sublimity of reality in order to induce a shift in emphasis from the factual basis of historiography to the conceptual and political implications of the structural format or representation.

Emphasizing to the practices a continuum of form and content White himself stays within the limits of academic writing trying to delineate and fix a subject position within the parameters of narratology. White points out that Foucault's aim of the reversed style which cancels itself in its articulation could be understood as an intensification of diegetic pleasure dissolving in the moment of gratification a veritable return of the sublime. The idea of the reversed style is based on the insight that in cases in which the structures of knowledge and language form the main concern of the text. It is crucial to destabilize these assumptions through the mode of

representation in order to prevent an unproblematic re-subjectification of the audience.

The different essays in *The Content of the Form* propose an intricate, threefold epistemology. On the level of the single event/fact White retains an element of positivist stability which stands in contrast to the epistemological arbitrariness that he posits on a second level, the level of the conceptual framework of the historical writing. But on a third level, a higher level of reflexivity, White introduces a new criterion for accuracy in historical writing, albeit in a negative form. He tends to be most appreciative of historians or theoreticians who acknowledge the chaos of the primary historical field and take this meaninglessness as a challenge to construct history in a politically and socially responsible fashion without completely erasing the traces of this construction in their texts. In this view too much transparency as to the chaotic nature of the past leads to the fallacy of deconstruction, the celebration of meaninglessness for its own sake, while too little skepticism about the possibility of referential certainty gives rise to the illusions of positivist historiography.

In recent years, White has focused more on narrativity in literature and on problems of literary criticism. He has tried to reformulate the relationship between fact and figuration as a continuous space framed by the two extremes of factual and fictional speech. In this context he has

reconsidered the relationship between historical events and their representation.

In fact, White argues that the modernist literature has thus far provided the only adequate representation of the particular modern experience of life through such stylistic innovations as the abandonment of one authoritative point of view, the recovery of the middle voice, and the general predominance of a tone of doubt and questioning. This new correlation between a historical period and its paradigmatic sense of representation has succeeded the earlier homology between nineteenth century realism and its historical context. Therefore White criticizes historians who adhere to anachronistic, nineteenth century forms of representation and their subsequent failure to participate in the task of making sense of our contemporary experiences which is the only help we can realistically expect from historians.

White has repositioned himself within the poststructuralist context though in an ambivalent way. He argues for the redemption of narrative on the ground that narrative as much as language is a cultural universal whose truthfulness can only be assessed within its specific social context. Therefore, he concludes that it is absurd to suppose that because a historical discourse is cast in the mode of narrative, it must be mythical, fictional, substantially imaginary or otherwise 'unrealistic' in what it tells us about the world.

The decision to introduce a more dialectical element into his structuralist methodology implies a renegotiation of the status of the fact with regard to the plot structure of the historical text. Once the strict separation of the two levels is canceled, his earlier radical epistemological relativism is undermined. The proposed continuum can be interpreted all the way towards the pole of factual accuracy. Thus, the possibility or representational transparency, shown out the front door, returns through the back. When White reconceptualizes the relationship between text and reality as a multidimensional, processual unfolding under both discursive and non-discursive restriction he reduces his control over his own subject matter the structure of historical consciousness.

Thus, White introduces the notion of negative transparency which requires historians never to exclude completely undecidability from their writing thereby attesting to the possibility of alternative emplotments.

In the eighteenth century there emerged a new way of looking at history which involved new ways of writing history. Although never universally accepted, and increasingly questioned already in the late nineteenth century this outlook dominated historical writing well into the second half of the twentieth century when it was effectively challenged and widely modified. Despite fundamental differences, historians shared with their fellow citizens' assumptions regarding the possibility of a

realistic representation of the past with implications for the power relations between races, nation's classes and sexes.

B. Linda Hutcheon's Postmodernist Notion of History

Linda Hutcheon, a latest literary fellow and critique has written her art with revisionist perspective. Being a postmodernist critique, she has used developmental, teleological narrative model, embracing interventionist agendas with revisionist perspective to express and write the marginal literature including burning issues of marginal aspects.

Postmodern historiographer Linda Hutcheon has used the interventionist agenda that is applicable and probable as well as reliable method to write inclusive literary art as interventionist literary histories.

Basically, it is assumed that literary history has grown out of eighteenth century antiquarian interests. In its earliest form it was often simply a compendium or collection of information about writers, usually in straightforward chronological order. The nineteenth century is generally viewed as the time of greatest achievement in the literary historical vein, and many fundamental principles western literary history as a discipline were established then. It is no coincidence that the same moment in history also witnessed the size of new form of national cultural self-awareness. It is assumed that the physical conservation of historical artifacts also began in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Similarly, the rise of literary history may also have been a sign of a growing mystique of

historical consciousness and an avid attachment to documents and physical traces of the past. Literary works may even be to literary history what relics are to history: sign of the tangible past, open to being found, resurrected and deciphered in danger of effacement and likely to change in meaning with new interpretation. The versions of the story of the past that the present tells have always been associated with questions of cultural authority and thus with politics, especially with some kind of identity politics. Since the nineteenth century the identity has been national, and so the accounts of the history of the nation's literature have played a significant role in the formation of certain national self-imaginings. The concept of the modern nation-state and the discipline of literary history were being born together, they have been mutually implicated from the start. Both the politics of cultural nationalism and the rise of philology, which proved vital to the nineteenth century sense of the specificity of languages.

Today when we think of identity politics, however, we usually think of issues related to class, race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality and a host of other categories with which people self-identity and which are coincident with the boundaries of the nation-state. The last decade has witnessed a proliferation or reproduction of new literary histories not to mention the creation of an extensive body of both criticism and theory that has put historical issues at the very heart of cultural debates once again. Many of

the new histories have been written from the perspective of marginalized groups. Like the historical narratives of nations, those of the newer forms of identity politics create a sense of continuity between past and present, usually with an eye to promoting ideological consensus.

The newer histories often adopt precisely the same developmental, teleological narrative model used earlier by nations. Linda Hutcheon in "Interventionist History" argues:

Yet obviously they or the marginalized Americans live in world very different in economic, social and cultural terms from the one that saw the rise of the European or American nation-state, their globalized world has created a complex and interrelated social context that is multiracial, multiethnic, and multicultural. (403)

Therefore there would seem to be no reason to expect such a model of national literary history to have remained appropriate: after all, it was built on single ethnicities and developed in a very different historical and philosophical frame of reference. As Homi K. Bhabha puts it:

The relative sovereignty of the nation-state and the assumed unity of national cultures, upon which such a perspective is based, are both fundamentally disturbed when the core areas turn into multivalent networks that project the periphery internally. Global migration acquires a new historical and

theoretical importance in the post-or transnational context.

(qtd. in Hutcheon, "Interventionist" 403)

Bhabha argues, these changes have come about because the concept of the majority-ethnic nation-state has broken down.

The new literary history has become an ideal counterpart to political history. About it Hutcheon in her "Interventionist History" argues:

The new history of national literatures ... became an ideal counterpart to political history, and claimed to develop, through the context of all literary phenomena, the idea of how national individuality could attain its identity, from quasi mythical beginnings to the fulfillment of national classicism.

(404)

The earlier model of literary history stubbornly persists not so much in the form of a simple explanatory or causal narratives but most obviously in a teleological narrative of continual and organic evolution. Organically structured on the romanticist's idealist philosophy of history with in emphasis on the importance of origins and its assumption of continuous development, this model was intended to establish an implicit parallel between the inevitable progress of the nation and that of its literature. Hence its power and appeal. It enfolded the great usually European authors "within recurrently renewed structures, visions, stabilities, of them

attesting to the abiding dialectical order represented by Europe itself" (qtd. in Hutcheon, "Interventionist" 404).

John Frow in his strong formulation argues that,

Marginalized groups demand a literary history that understands that histories are fictions of power which can be rewritten that the canon can be retrospectively changed or displaced... that the opposition of the canonical to the non-canonical, which is constructed and maintained by the force of cultural and educational institutions, can be radically transformed (122).

Power creates discourse and finally it is also recorded in history whether false or true. So that marginal people and aspects are kept in shallow so they demand history from their own perspective.

The writing of literary history serves a political interests has often been masked by educational claims or by a rhetoric of scientific objective. Usually the political interests have been those of the nation state, and in some postcolonial literary histories they still are. But what has become increasingly clear is that other forms of group identification also have a stake in how literary history is told: marginalized groups, in particular, insist that it be told with an activist, interventionist dimension which nation builders of the last two centuries have never forgotten either. But what would this kind of interventionary power consist of for literary

histories, which have been described, in tellingly paradoxical terms, as among the most disregarded and influential of books? Of course, these often hefty volumes are rarely read cover to cover, but they are certainly consulted and often used to legitimate a particular historical narrative or "fiction of power" (122).

More important, teleological and developmental narratives suggest the progress that feminist and other interventionist agendas require, just as nineteenth century European nationalist agendas required it. Marshall Brown, argues that: "the literary-historical power of the not yet romantic welcomes teleology for related reasons, its looking ahead and the historical dynamic inherent in the process under way" (6).

The potent combination of the nostalgic impact of origins (the founding moment and linear utopian projection in to the future) that informs this narrative model is one clear reason for its consistent appeal to any group that has felt oppressed by dominant powers, on the level of nation but also of gender, sexual choice, class, race, ethnicity, language, or religion. David Perkins argues, "Like nations, all marginalized groups turn to the past in search of identity, tradition, and self-understanding, their histories do not usually stress discontinuity but the opposite" (qtd. in Hutcheon, "Interventionist" 407). In fact, literary histories not only create continuities but, in the process, confer legitimacy. That was the intent of

the nationalist founders of the form in the past, and it is one of the aims of its interventionist practitioners today.

Charging the older teleological model of history as an intellectually and ideologically bankrupt, Stephen Greenblatt further asks, why we assume that there is only one "immutable narrative of emergence?" why should we "welcome the renewed imposition ... of an ideology that we have just begun to dismantle?" (qtd. in Hutcheon, "Interventionist" 410).

In the same article "Interventionist Histories", Hutcheon tries to reply these questions as follows: "Postmodern and Poststructuralist theory has begun to dismantle the ideology that subtends teleological narratives, but the history of critical theory proves that not all constituencies have welcomed this dismantling" (410-411). Both arguments challenging the traditional history focus upon new history that is circular as well as all-inclusive.

Yet the national developmental model of literary history has not been established and articulated so that the national developmental model of literary history requires further investigation and improvement for development. One way to start such investigation would be to examine how cultural nationalisms have done their nation building work. Some say it is natural law of inevitability, it means automatically it or nation has come or produced. But Hutcheon, in the "Interventionist Literary Histories", opines that, "Nations are not natural, they are constructed and

maintained by communal consent; they fall apart when it is refused" (411). Raymond Williams argues that "idea of nation is tied to placeable bonding; we are for into relationships, which are typically settled in place" (qtd. in Hutcheon, "Interventionist" 411). Nevertheless, it is clear that we also actively acquire a sense of national identity through a shared heritage of cultural, political, and social values to which we must assent.

As Michael Ignatieff succinctly puts it or nationalism in describing our current world, "The repressed has returned, and its name is nationalism" (5). Paul Valery names it simply, 'history' but saw it as equally frightening: "History is the most dangerous product evolved from the chemistry of the intellect ... it causes dreams, it intoxicates whole people, give them false memories, quickens their reflexes, keeps their old wounds open, torments them in their repose, leads them into delusions either of grandeur or persecution, and makes nations bitter, arrogant, insufferable, and vain" (qtd. in Hutcheon, "Interventionist" 412). Both of them emphasize the marginal issues and its form as history.

Charles Taylor argues, "When we speak a nationalism, however, we are dealing not only with a potentially dangerous political power but also with a cultural force whose institutionalized results (and causes) represent and constitute an important sense of both belonging and recognition for a people" (qtd. in Hutcheon, "Interventionist" 412). Taylor tries to clarify that

the need for recognition fuels identity politics as much as it does nationalism and that to withhold recognition can be a form of oppression.

In recent years ethnic nationalism have certainly proliferated or reproduced, paradoxically in the face of globalization's implicit demystification of the ideology of national culture and its emphasis on international and intercultural relationship. Frederick Buell argues, "Globally disseminated literary forms and influences are used, usually covertly, in the evocation or recreation of endangered traditions and cultures" (qtd. in Hutcheon, "Interventionist" 413). Buell suggests that nationalism and globalism coexist today without canceling one another out.

Rob Nixon views, "these new nations are not alone in resorting to the idiom of antiquity, tradition cultural authority, linguistic uniqueness, ethnicity, and territorial integrity" (85). In their formative moments, it would seem nations have always made and often remade their histories, both literary and political. They have often exaggerated their antiquity that is often concealed their newness the imagined community of the nation is frequently based as much on shared forgetting as on shared nostalgic memory.

Many interventionist narratives are teleological and less nostalgic than utopian because their politics are goal-driven: they discuss the past but they aim toward progress and emancipation. And the bedrock narrative

of development that historically guarantees a sense of cultural legitimacy has to be laid down before competing, correcting, even counter discursive narratives can be articulated. Hutcheon includes that the longevity and continuing appeal of the developmental model and its ideological underpinnings have to be understood in context and not condemned outright as signs of backsliding. Gilroy calls "the tragic popularity of ideas about the integrity, and purity of cultures and about how that purity is historically legitimated, needs to be contextualized and historicized, in full view of its very real dangers" (7).

The stubborn persistence of an evolutionary national model in current self-critical literary historical thought is therefore not necessarily a worrisome sign of either retrogressive nostalgia or nostalgia in the age of theoretical self-reflexivity, political naivete about the ideology of historiography. From the point of view of newly decolonized nations or marginalized groups, such a model may have real practical advantages. Of course, many of their literary historians have engaged head on the problems of writing literary history at the end of the twentieth century, when electronic technology has changed the kinds of scholarship that are possible; when the 'literary' has been redefined to include many different categories of verbal discourses, including the popular with concomitant changes in concepts of canonicity; and most relevant here, when challenges to the epistemological status of historiography have

undermined confidence in the institution of literary history itself. Instead, their open-eyed decision at times to retain the developmental model of evolution can be interpreted as a strategic, pragmatic acknowledgement of, first, the shared interventionist drive at the heart of both emerging nations' politics in any century and the politics of identity today and, second, the ongoing validating structures and continuing ideological power that utopian narratives of progress possess in the struggle to articulate a usable past.

C. Linda Hutcheon's Notion of Postmodernism and Postmodern

Fiction:

History is unquestionably one of the most controversial areas of debate among those concerned with postmodernism. Linda Hutcheon tries to show the relation between postmodernism and history. For her postmodern fiction remains historical, precisely because it problematizes history through parody, and thus retains its potential for cultural critique. Regarding the cultural production, Hutcheon's postmodernism originates with the artist as producer.

For Hutcheon, postmodernism remains historical and political precisely through its parodic historical reference; through such parodic reference, "postmodernist forms want to work toward a public discourse that would eschew modernist aestheticism and hermeticism and its attendant political self-marginalization" (*Poetics* 23). As a result of this

claim, Hutcheon's postmodernism is more limited than Jameson's in the range of cultural production that she deems postmodern. There is no poetry in her poetics and it is difficult to imagine what her poetics could tell us about the language poets; in fact there is but a limited range of narratives and images that she designates as postmodern. She in *The Poetics of Postmodernism* argues "that the term postmodernism in fiction be reserved to describe the more paradoxical and historically complex form" she calls "historiographic metafiction" (40). The terms "postmodern fiction" and "historiographic metafiction" therefore exist in a relationship of identity and describe the same set of objects: only historiographic metafiction is postmodern fiction; all postmodern fiction is historiographic metafiction. What this seems to mean then, is that, on Hutcheon's view, there is a great deal of narrative in our postmodernity that is not postmodern; in application, however, she casts her net rather widely and is able to contain a number of apparently incommensurable narratives within her term. Hutcheon, in *The Politics of Postmodernism* argues, "Historiographic metafiction blends the self-reflexivity of metafiction with an ironized sense of history; this mix foregrounds the distinction between brute events of the past and the historical facts we construct out of them" (57). In doing so, such fiction draws one's attention to the problematic status of historical representation. As a vehicle for cultural critique, historiographic metafiction plays a paradoxical role because it "depends upon and draws

its power from that which it contests" (*Poetics* 120). A form of cultural critique may proceed, but it is always aware of its own implication.

Postmodernism is a phenomenon which manifests itself in many fields of cultural endeavor-architecture, literature, photography, film, painting, video, dance, music and elsewhere. Hutcheon, in *The Politics of Postmodernism* notes that: "Postmodern is a phenomenon whose mode is resolutely contradictory as well as unavoidably political, it takes the form of self-conscious, self-contradictory, self-undermining statement" (1). It shows the doubleness or duplicity also. It is critical in itself. Hutcheon again writes: "In many ways it is an even-handed process because postmodernism ultimately manages to install and reinforce as much as undermine and subvert the conventions and presuppositions it appears to challenge" (1-2). It tries to subvert the dominance of majorities and presents the marginalized issue. Arguing about the general uses of postmodern firstly in architecture, Hutcheon writes: "It is one which juxtaposes and gives equal value to the self-reflexive and the historically grounded: to that which is inward-directed and belongs to the world of art, such as parody and that which is outward-directed and belongs to 'real life', such as history" (2). The tension between these apparent opposites finally defines the paradoxically wordly texts of postmodernism.

History is known through the historical traces in self-reflexive nature of text, in postmodern text. History is denaturalized and presented through

narrative representation in postmodern fiction. Hutcheon clarifying about narrative representation mentions that: "Narrative representation-fictive and historical comes under similar subversive scrutiny in the paradoxical postmodern form I would like to call historiographic metafiction" (14). Through narrative representation she tries to introduce the nature of historiographic metafiction also. Hutcheon also defines the word 'representation' that: "I suppose the very word 'representation' unavoidably suggests a given which the act of representing duplicates in some way, that is normally considered the realm of mimesis" (30). Through the representation the postmodern theory provoked rethinking, revising, rereading and reevaluating etc. About postmodern theory, Hutcheon asserts that: "The postmodern, as I have been defining it is not a degeneration into 'hyperreality' but a questioning of what reality can mean and how we can come to know it" (32). It is the way toward knowing the reality. About postmodern strategies also, she mentions: "many postmodern strategies are openly premised on a challenge to the realist notion of representation that presumes the transparency of the medium and thus the direct and natural link between sign and referent or between word and world" (32). So the self-consciousness technique of representation is the mode of postmodernism. About knowing the past today Hutcheon explains that: "The past is known today through its discourses, through texts- that is through the traces of its historical events: the archival materials, the

documents, the narrative of witnesses... and historians" (34). The historical events are given meaning and represented in fictional form through postmodern genre that is 'historiographic metafiction'.

Historiographic metafiction represents not just a world of fiction however self-consciously presented as a constructed one, but also a world of public experience-discourse.

The postmodern history takes the form of self-representation. The history behind the postmodern view of representation is the matter of construction. About postmodern histories' issues, Hutcheon mentions that: "The new art history has meant that issues like gender, class, race, ethnicity and sexual orientation are now part of the discourse" (44).

Barbara Foley argues that "The postmodern situation is that a truth is being told with 'facts' to back it up, but a teller constructs truth and chooses those facts" (qtd. In Hutcheon "The Politics" 56). In fact, that 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 teller speak for them, making these fragments of the past into a discursive whole. So that facts and fictions are similar phenomena in the context of historiographic metafiction in which history is fictionalized through parodic [words] twist.

Though the past is only known to us through textual traces is not the same as saying that the past is only textual. The point of postmodernism,

Hutcheon asserts is that: "Past events existed empirically, but in epistemological terms we can only know them today through texts, past events are given meaning by their representation in history" (78). So that epistemologically the events are interpreted through the meaning which is reliable and relevant as well. Furthermore, Hutcheon mentions: "History's meaning lies not in 'what hurts' so much as in 'what we say once hurt' - for we are both irremediably distanced by time and yet determined to grant meaning to that real pain of others and ourselves" (78).

The historical document can't give the transparent meaning to a past event but through textually transformed traces of that past is interpreted to get meaning. Historians through their history writing try to inform about the present situation to their reader. So that reader can feel themselves now about the past. Historians create such environment in their text through interpretation. Only one event is tried to verify by historian so that it would be plausible and reliable. About mentioning such events, Hutcheon argues that: "Historians never seize the event directly and entirely, only incompletely and laterally-through documents, that is through texts. History does not so much say what the past was; rather it says what it is still possible to know and thus represent- of it" (83). It makes clear that even historians interpret the event to give meaning. So that history is fictionalized through literary devices such as simile, metaphor, images in prose or verse form. Making it furthermore clear, she remarks, "The

historical document can no longer pretend to be a transparent means to a past event; it is instead the textually transformed trace of the past" (83). Clearly it seems that even historical documents should be interpreted to derive meaning fairly. Fair reliable and relevant interpretation only helps to know and feel the reality in present.

The traditional history, which is known as grand narrative, is one sided written only in the favor of majorities excluding marginal issues and the all minorities. So that it seems necessary to destabilize such history the grand narrative and to write the all inclusive an open-ended history through marginal perspective. That is why history could be an all-inclusive, open-ended genre. To write the new inclusive history from marginal perspective, it would be better to reread grand narrative. So to reread and to reevaluate the traditional history or grand narrative postmodern parody is a better literary device, it (parody) even helps to represent the marginal issues thoroughly. So, parody helps to rewrite the present history through marginal perspective. Hutcheon argues that: "Parody signals how present representations come form past ones and what ideological consequences derive from both continuity and difference" (89). It even makes clear that parody is the device to know the past. It even informs that parody is the conscious making device to the present and future generation about their past or about history. It proves the statement

of Hutcheon that: "Parody works to foreground the politics of representation" (90).

Defining parody, Hutcheon remarks that: "The postmodern parody is a kind of contesting revision or rereading of the past that both confirms and subverts the power of representations of history" (91). Parody thus helps to reread the grandnarrative and to subvert the power of representation. So that it would be easy to write the history from marginal perspective even including the essential central historical aspects. Some critics say postmodern parody disregard the context of the past representation it cites. But Linda Hutcheon takes it simply and comments: "Postmodern parody doesnot disregard the context of the past representation it cites, but uses irony to acknowledge the fact that we are inevitably separated from that past today-by time and by the subsequent history of these representations" (90). About parody Hutcheon furthermore remarks that:

Parody can be used as a self-reflexive technique that points to art as art, but also to art as inescapably bound to its aesthetic and even social past. Its ironic reprise also offers an internalized sign of a certain self-consciousness about our culture's means of ideological legitimation. How do some representation get legitimized and authorized ? And at the

expense of which others ? Parody can offer a way of investigating the history of that process. (97)

The above statements prove the importance and work of parody. It is furthermore better to explain Hutcheon sayings that: "Postmodern parody is both deconstructively critical and constructively creative, paradoxically making us aware of both the limits and the powers of representation, it even 'de-doxifies' our assumption about our representations of the past" (94). Thus parody deconstructs the grandnarrative through the use of irony and constructs the new history through marginal perspective. From this we can know that postmodern art uses parody and irony to reread and to re-evaluate the history and to further create new inclusive history. Hutcheon about this mentions that: "Postmodern art uses parody and irony to engage the history of art and the memory of the viewer in a re-evaluation of aesthetic forms and contents through a reconsiderations of their usually unacknowledged politics of representation" (96). Postmodernism offers precisely that 'certain use of irony and parody'. Parody is a means of knowing the past. It embodies irony to acknowledge the facts. Hutcheon further says that; "Parody becomes a way of ironically revisiting the past-of-both art and history" (99). So, in postmodernism, parody is a better device to know the past and foreground representation.

Thus in postmodernism, parody and irony are the better device to destabilize the exclusive grand narrative, the history of majorities and to

rewrite the history from marginal perspective as the history in the form of an all-inclusive open ended genre.

In the postmodern period, history and fiction has become the similar kind of genre. Not only history but fiction also represents the real events of the past and the contemporary period indirectly from which reader can feel the situation what it was and is. History is assumed as the record of facts about the past events. Facts are events to which we have given meaning. The facts are constructed on the solid ground. Regarding this Hutcheon asserts that:

Among the consequences of the postmodern desire to denaturalize history is a new self-consciousness about the distinction between the brute events of the past and the historical facts we construct out of them. Facts are events to which we have given meaning. Different historical perspectives therefore derive different facts from the same events (54).

History is denaturalized and presented through narrative representation in postmodern fiction. The event of the past is presented in fictional form through imaginary characters. Historical events can be known through historical traces in today's narrative representation. Hutcheon further says "In historiographic metafiction the very process of turning events into facts through the interpretation of archival evidence is shown to be a

process of turning the traces of the past [our only access to those events today] into historical representation" (55). All past 'events' are potential historical 'facts' but the ones that become facts are those that are chosen to be narrated. We have seen that this distinction between brute event and meaning granted facts is one with which postmodern fiction seems obsessed.

D. Fredric Jameson's Rebuttal of Hutcheon

For Jameson, postmodern narrative is ahistorical playing only with pastiche images and aesthetic forms that produce a degraded historicism. Jameson's postmodernism focuses on the consumer. In *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, Jameson provides an analysis on modernist aesthetics, for clearly sees as no longer viable modernism's protopolitical projects of defamiliarization, "with their familiar stress on the vocation of art to restimulate perception, to reconquer a freshness of experience back from the habituate and reified numbness of everyday life in a fallen world" (121). Jameson claims that this remarkable aesthetic is today meaningless and must be admired as one of the most intense historical achievements of the cultural past. When Jameson speaks of modernism, he retains a notion of the aesthetic formulation of its producers. Jameson's shift to the axis of consumption is signaled in his characterization of himself as a "relatively enthusiastic consumer of postmodernism" (298). Despite this characterization, his sympathies

clearly lie with a lot modernist project because of its relation to utopian thinking.

Jameson thinks, in postmodernism the individual subject is displaced by the fragmentation of the subject so that there would disappear the individual subject. Regarding this he argues that "The disappearance of the individual subject, along with its formal consequence, the increasing unavailability of the personal and unique style, engender the well-nigh universal; practice today of what may be called pastiche" (64). He thinks we can not find original unique style rather a systematic and deliberate mimicry of the past and its style and norms. About modern literature, he remarks that: "The explosion of modern literature into a host of distinct private styles and mannerisms has been followed by a linguistic fragmentation of social life itself to the point where the norm itself is eclipsed: reduced to a neutral and reified media speech" (65). He thinks modernist style has become postmodernist codes. And the stupendous proliferation of social codes in postmodernism has turned into professional and disciplinary jargons.

The originality has lost and parody finds itself without vocation and pastiche slowly comes to take its place. Defining pastiche Jameson writes that:

Pastiche, is like parody, the imitation of peculiar masks, speech in a dead language; but it is a neutral practice of

mimicry, without any of the parody's ulterior motives, amputated of the satiric impulse, devoid of laughter and of any conviction that alongside the abnormal tongue you have momentarily borrowed some healthy linguistic normality still exist, pastiche is thus blank parody, a statue with blind eyeballs: it is to parody what that other interesting and historically original modern thing, the practice of a kind of blank irony. (65)

Pastiche has eclipsed parody in postmodern. Pastiche has taken parody's place. Jameson sees in the postmodern narrative a crisis in historicity, as ahistorical and only the unholy mimicry of the past. He sees only pastiche in postmodern narrative. He sees postmodern situation as a symptom of the waning of historicity in narrative. He argues that "we are condemned to seek history by way of our own pop images and simulacra of that history, which itself remain forever out of reach" (68). Thus the simulacra, word connotation, images have become the historical source in narrative representation. History has been presented as narrative representation which is degraded historicism for Jameson.

The utopian imagination has been an important part of Jameson's thinking since *The Political Unconscious*. The "collective struggle to wrest or to achieve forcibly a realm of freedom from a realm of necessity" (*Political* 19) signals his commitment to the political value of utopianism

as a form of praxis. Indeed, the conclusion of *The Political Unconscious* titled “The Dialectic of Ideology and Utopia”, outlines a programme for cultural analysis that goes beyond the negative hermeneutic of ideological demystification vis-à-vis texts in order simultaneously to decipher “the utopian impulses of these same still ideological cultural texts” (296).

Jameson remains committed to the Marxist narrative of liberation – the end of class, but he does not see the end of class as the end of ideology.

In *Postmodernism*, Jameson writes a cultural history in which the potentially political urge of postmodernism is co-opted in much the same way that the protopolitical urge of modernism is diffused and eventually institutionalized. This lost moment of postmodernism, which for Jameson is the 1960s functions as the break that helps mark the difference between modernism and postmodernism. Jameson’s sixties represent a time when the institutionalization of previously unacceptable modernism occurred. His nostalgia for the sixties emerges vividly in the figures he uses to characterize postmodernism – primarily drug use and pollution.

Postmodernism is “the bad trip” of the sixties’ utopian project and ‘the sixties gone toxic” (117). For Jameson, the sixties represent a time when an element of modernist aesthetics, fresh perception, was still possible.

The contradiction in Jameson’s description then seems to be that the very moment that signals the end to modernism’s position as the cultural dominant reinscribes the modernist aesthetic of fresh perception. Jameson

early in *Postmodernism* states what he sees at stake: “utopian representation knows an extraordinary revival in the 1960s; if postmodernism is the substitute for the sixties and the compensation for their political failure, the question of utopia would seem to be a crucial test of what is left of our capacity to imagine change at all” (xvi). And it is precisely change that, for Jameson, can no longer be imagined in postmodernism, since aesthetic production of affect and hence of political effect. As Jameson puts it:

In the wholly build and constructed universe of late capitalism, from which nature has at last been effectively abolished and in which human praxis – in the degraded forms of information, manipulation, and reification – has penetrated the older autonomous sphere of culture and even the unconscious, the Utopia of a renewal of perception has no place to go. (121-22)

In marking the line between modernism and postmodernism, Jameson sets out a series of oppositions. Fueled by the demands of capital constantly to make it newer, both modernism and postmodernism attempt to respond to the processes of modernization – new technologies that modify the mode of production. Jameson characterizes that:

Modernism is incomplete modernization, while postmodernism is the result of complete modernization. In incomplete modernization, one could experience the New within culture

somewhat organically; in effect, the New was still new. But in the contemporary moment, the complete modernization of postmodernity, our relation to the New is more formal; now, the New is no longer new. (310)

Another periodizing feature for Jameson is the end of great modernist individual styles that have been replaced by postmodernist codes. The result is that postmodernism is no longer capable of achieving the critical distance necessary for parody and ends up recombining previously articulated styles. The result is pastiche. Pastiche itself is the effect of the transformation from a society with a historical sensibility to one that can only play with a degraded historicism. Historicism is the name Jameson assigns to what he sees as an aestheticization of historical styles devoid of the political contradiction that those styles embodied at their particular moment.

For Jameson, intimately linked to this degraded historicism has been postmodernity's reshaping of subjectivity. Working from the sense of late capitalism, Jameson links the shifts from market to monopoly to multinational capital with their corresponding aesthetics – realism, modernism and postmodernism. In the realism of the last century, novels may have told confident narratives of the individual but in the twentieth century the middle class monad or unified or unified subject has fallen away. If alienation defines and is the dominant affect of the modernist

subject recording its rupture and tensions, then schizophrenia is Jameson's figure for what he sees as the vastly increased tendency toward the dissolution of the subject in postmodernism. For Jameson our contemporary moment, with its materials production of pastiche images, erases history and thus encourages a breakdown of the temporality necessary to focus the subject and "make it a space of praxis" (27). Jameson insists that the schizophrenic subject is a historically specific phenomenon, a move that distinguishes his sense of the death of the subject from that of deconstruction, which would maintain that the subject was always already an "ideological mirage" (15).

These features that distinguish postmodernity from modernity our relation to the New, the shift from individual styles to codes, and the transition from the alienated to the schizo subject all register the determining last instance of the movement from monopoly to multinational capital.

E. Postmodernism and Hutcheon's Notion of Historiographic Metafiction

Postmodernism is a phenomenon, it takes its form of self-conscious, self-contradictory, self-undermining statement. Mostly postmodernism undermines and subverts the conventions and presuppositions.

Postmodernism not only challenges and de-naturalizes the dominant conventions but it represents the new history through marginal perspective by using parody and irony. So that Hutcheon thinks history is represented

in the postmodern literary genre, historiographic metafiction by merging both kinds of historical and fictional event. Furthermore, clarifying it, she asserts: "Historiographic metafiction represents not just the world of fiction, however self-consciously presented as a constructed one, but also a world of public experience" (34). About knowing the past, she again expresses that: "we know the past today through its discourses, through its text, that is through the traces of its historical events: the archival materials, the documents, the narratives of witnesses ... and historians" (34). So we only have the access to the past today through its traces its documents, the testimony of witnesses, and other archival materials.

The issue of representation in both fiction and history has usually been dealt with in epistemological terms in terms of how we know the past. Regarding this Hutcheon argues that, "The point of postmodernism is that the past events existed empirically and ontologically but in epistemological terms we can only know them today through text, past events are given meaning, not the existence by their representations in history" (78). We only have representations of the past from which to construct our narratives or explanations. The history of representation can't be escaped. About this Hutcheon asserts that: "Postmodern art acknowledges and accepts the challenges of tradition: the history of representation can't be escaped but it can be both exploited and commented on critically through irony and parody" (55). Parody is a way

of rereading and reevaluating the history and to further create the history through marginal perspective by using irony. Hutcheon simply defines parody: "Postmodern parody is a kind of contesting revision or rereading of the past that both confirms and subverts the power of representations of history, parody furthermore becomes a way of ironically revisiting the past of both art and history" (91).

Historiographic metafiction is a self-conscious about the paradox of the totalizing yet inevitably partial act of narrative representation. It overtly de-naturalizes received notions about the process of representing the actual in narrative-be it fictional or historical. It traces the processing of events into facts, exploiting and then undermining the conventions of both novelistic realism and historiographic reference. It implies that like fiction history constructs its objects, that events named become facts and thus both do and do not retain their status outside language. This is the paradox of postmodernism. Through narrative representation both history and fiction are merged in literary form and embodied in postmodern historiographic metafiction. So that history as fiction and fiction as history in terms of historiographic metafiction is reliable and relevant as well.

It is difficult to imagine what could ever ensure a reader's historiographic formation that Jameson requires before he will grant any political vocation to the contemporary fiction that turns to history, rather than simply that aesthetic past, as its interest opens a site wherein

historical thinking becomes a possibility. Only a possibility and perhaps not always the possibility Hutcheon hopes for in her understanding of *The Poetics and The Politics of Postmodernism*.

Hutcheon, in *The Poetics of Postmodernism*, emphasizes that:

"Historiographic metafiction blends the self-reflexivity of metafiction with an ionized sense of history; this mix foregrounds the distinction between brute events of the past and the historical facts we construct out of them" (57). In doing so, such fiction, draws one's attention to the problematic status of historical representation. Hutcheon argues "that the term postmodernism in fiction be reserved to describe the more paradoxical and historically complex form" she calls "historiographic metafiction" (40).

E.L. Doctorow's *Ragtime* has the prominent and apparent features of historiographic metafiction. Hutcheon's use of parodic reference is also applicable because irony and parody have become the rhetorical weapons of choice for cultural minorities for those marginalized by dint of or by means of sex, race, ethnicity, sexual choice, religion. It was not just postmodernism, in other words, that saw the potential in both parody and irony for the articulation of an effective counter discourse. In postmodernism, through the use of parodic and ironic reference in narratives, the dominant aspects are undermined and the marginalized issues are being raised and rewritten through revisionist perspectives. Jameson directly and indirectly is similar with the idea of Hutcheon fiction

especially the postmodern fiction that is historiographic metafiction. In terms of historiographic metafiction, postmodern parody is a kind of contesting revision or rereading of the past that both confirms and subverts the power of the representations of history. So, Linda Hutcheon notion of postmodern parody is a better means to fictionalize the history and historicise the fiction through the representation.

Jameson characterizes postmodern parody as "blank parody". Hutcheon does not approve Jameson's assertion of postmodern parody and nostalgia are merely narcissistic symptom which "laments a loss of sense of history in today's art" (*Politics* 113). But she considers parody and nostalgia are "double-voiced irony" (114) or double encoding to question or to challenge the dominant ideology and then to construct the present history through representation.

III. History as Fiction and Fiction as History: Reading Doctorow's *Ragtime*.

Time defeats us in two ways: it bullies us by pursuit, and it mocks us with evasion. We grow older; we are consumed. Yet, at the same time, the events that practice on our mortality, that 'do us in', are themselves disordered, senseless, refusing to cohere. E.L. Doctorow is a remarkable novelist precisely because he confronts the mockery of time directly and attempts to master it with footwork fancier and more playful.

Ragtime is a text that illustrates Doctorow's ideas of history as spelled out in the 'False Documents' essay: "There is no history except as it is composed ... that is why history has to be written and rewritten from one generation to another, the art of composition can never end" (Trenner, 24). The novel is not so much about the Ragtime Era as about how we view that era and how we might compose and recompose it. We can say that Doctorow's fiction by blurring the distinctions between fact and fiction, seeks to disclose and to challenge the hegemony of enshrined or institutionalized discursive practices.

The sense of directly engaging history- 'The real-world act' Doctorow calls it in the *Ragtime* bringing to the contest intelligence and wit. The specific period that Doctorow stakes out begins in 1902 and ends when, to an increased tempo, he ties up his few remaining strings hastily and neatly at the close of World War I. Like so much in the novel,

however, the slicing of time is a many sided metaphor as well as a reality, a framework for comic distortion as well as a metaphor. Looking through the eyes of one of his characters, the author says, "It was evident to him that the world composed and recomposed itself in an endless process of dissatisfaction" (118). The perception is made even more graphic in the image that follows, where time becomes the surface of an ice-covered pond in winter: "But the boy's eyes saw only the tracks made by the skaters, traces quickly erased of moments passed, journeys taken" (119). The reconstruction and division of history is obviously a tentative, slippery business, impossible as it is humanly inevitable.

Similarly, historical description is both simple and complex, paradoxical. "There were no Negroes. There were no immigrants" (4) writes the author, in seeming confidence of his ironic meaning. But the limited irony is inadequate and a page later he is quite content to reverse and rearrange: "Apparently there were Negroes. There were immigrants" (5). Even the statement with which Doctorow finally summarizes the uniqueness of the period reverberates with ambiguity: "... the Era of Ragtime had run out, with the heavy breath of the machine, as if history were no more than a tune on a player piano" (319). It reminds the reader of an earlier statement and a related image. "He listened to the Victrola and played the same record over and over, as if to test the endurance of a

duplicated event" (117). The duplications of both art and life are comprehended in that allusion.

In making meaning out of history, ambiguity is a kind of richness that can't safely be trimmed away. And Doctorow does as little trimming as possible. He merely pushes an ambiguity in one or more directions. The blackness of the Negro, for example, is related to the blackness of the silhouette portraits fashioned by Tateh, the street corner artist and these connect with the self-imposed blackness of Younger Brother, who becomes-in blackface-a minstrel of revolution and a bomb artist.

Still, if random history is to be disciplined, it will be put in order only by sacrificing history, by substituting in its stead a human design. In *Ragtime* he executes a more comic and audacious maneuver.

Narrated history either understates or overstates. Therefore, Doctorow does both-and pulls his distortions center stage. He proclaims them. He delights in them. He comments about them. On the more intimate level of personal history, we have the families of Father-Mother-Younger Brother and eventually revealed, their immigrant counterparts in the family of Tateh-Mameh. Their namelessness and the anonymity of Doctorow's staccato prose emphasizes a presentation as flattened as Tateh's silhouettes. The American history, of the melting pot, of the middle class life, of making sacrifices or making good in technological, democratic U.S.A. Whatever the intricacies of their roles, they follow prescribed

allegorical destinies as surely as characters in Hawthorne. Heartbreak or joy may lie just beyond their outlines, but it is only the suggestion that Doctorow wants. Otherwise he controls by refusing them dimension and keeping their very excesses within an obvious comic understatement. Even the black Coalhouse Walker Jr. and his Sarah begin as limited, contained personal histories-though their tragedy is that they become part of a larger, more public history.

America is a multiracial society where different kinds of people live. We can raise different issues representing the contemporary situation of American Ragtime Era (1900-1920) in the novel *Ragtime*. So, among many issues I want to highlight the issue of racism or social injustice in the turn-of-the century America from Coalhouse Walker's episode [vandalization of his automobile Model T Ford]. E.L. Doctorow's depiction of the Coalhouse Walker episode in the novel *Ragtime* (1975) ironizes racism in the turn-of-the century America.

Still there is racial discrimination in America especially between the so-called major higher class people whites and the marginalized class blacks. Doctorow, here through the depiction of Coalhouse Walker's episode tries to show the racial discrimination between Whites and Blacks in American society in the period of Ragtime Era (1900-1920). White people take blacks as savage, uncivilized and wild. Though the blacks are abled and civilized whites do not accept it. Whites would not want to see

the development of blacks. Such situation is there in the case of blacks which is seen in the following lines: "He was not unaware that in his dress and as the owner of a car he was a provocation to many white people, he had created himself in the teeth of such feelings" (174). Coalhouse Walker is a genuine person who has developed his skill and personality that is the cause of provocation for whites. It makes clear that white people were jealous, violent and distasteful towards blacks.

One Sunday afternoon, Coalhouse Walker drives his Ford towards Firehouse Lane. While he reaches by Firehouse, he puts his Ford switching off the engine, setting the brake and stepping down to the side of the road so that it would not hamper or disturb to other running automobiles. Then he goes to the Firehouse department. Walker was hopeful that police would care his car. He also puts two black boys for the care of the car and goes to Firehouse. When he comes back, he finds the car has already been damaged by the scandals. The fire engine and horses are withdrawn. The road was empty of volunteers and his car has stood off the road in the field. He comes towards the car which is vandalized by scandals. Damaged car is seen: "It was spattered with mud, there was a six-inch tear in the custom pantasote top and deposited in the back seat was a mound of fresh human excrement" (177). It is surprising that in short period, the car has already vandalized, there is no one in the road while sometime before volunteers were there. About desecrating car,

Walker informs and appeals to Fire Chief honestly that the car is damaged so that he wants his car cleaned and the damage paid for. Listening Coalhouse's matter or complainant, "The chief began to laugh and a couple of his men came out to join the fun" (177). Instead of sympathizing and respecting Walker's appeal, the Fire Chief mocks and insults by grinning. It is the irony upon all the colored or black people. It is a inhuman behaviour upon Coalhouse. Just that time a traffic van comes there in which two officers are carried, one of them the traffic policeman to whom Coalhouse Walker appeals. The traffic policeman hearing Walker's appeal looks at the car going into the field and comes back to the Firehouse. The traffic policeman asks the Fire Chief whether he or his boys do any desecratin. The Fire Chief insulting and accusing to Walker replies to the traffic policeman that: "The nigger here parked his dammed car in the middle of the road right in front of the Firehouse. We had to move it, it is a serious business blocking a fire station, ain't that so, boys? The volunteers nodded righteously" (178).

Hearing the reply of the Fire Chief, the big policeman came to a decision. He took Coalhouse aside and said that, "Listen, we'll push your tin lizzie back on the road and you be on your way. There's no real damage scrape off the shit and forget the whole thing" (178). Even the traffic policeman makes hopeless to the Coalhouse but still Coalhouse Walker appeals to the policeman that "I was on my way when they stopped me,

they put filth in my car and tore a hole in the top, I want the car cleaned and the damage paid for" (178). Thus Coalhouse Walker appeals time and again to the authority but he is unheard. The policeman is indifferent towards his suffering.

The policeman becoming furthermore cruel upon Coalhouse Walker says that: "If you don't take your automobile and get along out of here, he said loudly, I'm going to charge you with driving off the road, drunkenness, and making an unsightly nuisance" (178). Still being full of confident and patient Coalhouse Walker further appeals that he doesn't drink, he did not drive his car off the road nor slash the roof nor defecate in it so he wants the damage paid for and an apology. Though, Coalhouse Walker honestly appeals, it becomes meaningless to the cruel and partial policeman. We can see the full of biased behaviour upon blacks by whites from the policeman's following statement while Coalhouse Walker is begging an apology and paid for damage car that: "The policeman looked at the Chief, who was grinning at his [Coalhouse] discomfiture, so that the issue for him was now his own authority, he said to Coalhouse I'm placing you under arrest you'll come with me in the wagon" (178). Coalhouse Walker had become helpless because of the partiality of authority. The partial authority has made him helpless. It clearly shows the suppression of blacks by whites in public general and more importantly the biased inhuman and cruel behaviour of white people's authority and

administration upon blacks. It is seen through the administration's complete indifference or negligence towards Walker's appealing. The vandalized car is the direct and reliable proof of crime of Fire Chief upon Coalhouse Walker.

It is not only the injustice and suppression upon Coalhouse Walker but to the whole Blacks. The administration is one-sided that gives justice and works only for whites which does not hear the appeal of blacks, it is seen through Walker's case. So it becomes clear that the white's authority and administration is suppressing to the blacks inhumanly and brutally. Walker's car is vandalized and he is charged with drunkenness, making an unsightly nuisance and arrested also to himself. What kind of justice is this? Is this justice or what? Has Coalhouse not the right of appealing to the policeman? Have blacks not the right to appeal the case in administration? Is there not equal justice upon Blacks? So, misbehaving of Fire Chief and policeman upon Coalhouse Walker is the challenge and irony upon all the blacks. In the visible direct proof too, Coalhouse Walker is not heard, while in other informal case how the blacks are treated that can be imagined by ourselves. We can say blacks are treated inhumanly. It seems that the people who are in power subdue to the public general who are marginal powerless people mercilessly and give many kinds of torture. So powerful people have created their history. So, history in the fictional form is the function of power. Coalhouse Walker's car is

vandalized and arrested himself, is this justice? Are the colored people not the men? Is it good to behave to the colored people thus in inhuman manner? Have they not human right to live a dignified human life?

Coalhouse Walker has been worried and serious through the case of his car's incident. The next evening the household experiences an oddness of a visit by Coalhouse Walker that was not a Sunday. Walker tells story of his car's incident in detail calmly and objectively to Father and Mother sitting in the parlor. There is seen a kind of pathetic condition. After hearing the matter of Coalhouse, Father suggests him that:

If you are intended to pursue your claim in the case, you should engage a lawyer. There was such a thing as the power of subpoena for witnesses. Coalhouse asked, Are there any colored lawyers here? Father said, I do not know of one, but any lawyer who loves justice will do, I should think (180).

It is difficult and unimaginable condition for the colored people. In such situation, how to live freely? When to breathe the air of freedom? So, a general living standard with common basic human values is not given to the colored people. Everything is difficult to get to the black people. There is not given the access in legal procedure, socio-economic activities for colored people in America. Such condition is seen from Coalhouse Ford's incident:

The Model T Ford had been thoroughly vandalized whether by the volunteers or others it was impossible to determine. It sat with its front end in the tall weeds at the edge of the pond. The wheels were sunk in the mud. The head lamps and the windshield were shattered. The rear tires were flattened, the tufted upholstery had been gutted and the custom pantasote top was slashed to ribbons. (180)

It makes clear that a mean inhuman and fully cruel behaviour has been done upon Coalhouse Walker. It is wonderful and partial that Coalhouse's problem is not heard by administration through his peaceful and legal means of appealing to the authority. He suffers more from this case. Nobody cares about this. All authorized personages in every court neglect and refuse to hear and register Walker's case. Such situation is seemed through the following lines:

It was widely reported when he was achieving his notoriety that Coalhouse Walker had never exhausted the peaceful and legal means of redress before taking the law into his own hands. He went to see three different attorneys recommended by Father. In all cases they refused to represent him. He was advised to recover his automobile before it was totally wrecked and to forget the matter. (183)

From the above lines, it becomes clear that all the mechanisms of laws are only for the majority class people. Minorities are always marginalized and suppressed by every means. Minorities are obliged to live enduring majorities' injustice upon them. Minorities are in shadow. Principal or main aspects for justice are the equal opportunities in consuming the rights from judicial, legislative and executive body in every country or nation. If there are not equal opportunities to consume the legislative, executive and judicial right to all people, there generates a complete inequality and disorder. Such situation is seemed in America between minorities the marginalized and majorities.

Colored people are taken as the material which could be bought and sold by the mainstream wealthy people. The colored people have deprived from the employment opportunities. So, they are made poor and uneducated. That is why they have been compelled to serve the rich majority classes for their [black] living. It seems that the colored people are like the goods or things of money. Money could buy and sell them which becomes furthermore clear from a lawyer's saying: "When a property owner in this city walks into court with a Negro a charge like this is usually dismissed" (184). It is the irony upon colored people because they are taken as things which are dealing or behaving in terms of money. Judicial body is seemed partial because the attorney wants money as bribe indirectly. Coalhouse Walker even consults with black attorney in Harlem

also. The Harlem attorney advised him: "There were ways to divert the case to other jurisdictions but these were expensive and time-consuming, and the outcome was not at all predictable. You have the money for that? This is a expensive proposition the lawyer said" (184).

It seems that poor people have been deprived from justice. On the one hand, it is the irony upon capitalism. Capitalism measures even the justice interms of money. Capitalism and its policy itself is the irony upon poor colored people. Poor people are challenged to survive by capitalism. The following lines are remarkable and a finest bitter irony upon racism: "It seemed to be his fault, somehow, because he was Negro and it was the kind of problem that would only adhere to a Negro. His monumental negritude sat in front of them like a centerpiece on the table" (186).

It becomes clear that white men would behave to the colored people with full of biased manner. Whites would look black with the biased and partial eyes. Pre-impression of whites upon blacks is negative. It has been proved by whites behaviour upon black. Is the blackness of all innocent colored people their guilt? Are they [blacks] the race for insulting and mocking for whites? Are they not human being? Such vary questions may arise, whatever the case, the majorities are suppressing and subduing to the minorities. In deliberately even the innocent Sarah has been preyed on the hand of majority classes' administration. So higher class people the so-called majorities who are in power are completely indifferent toward the

rights of minorities. The so-called higher class has not any sympathy towards the pathetic status of marginal class people.

Thus majority class has been indifferent towards colored people. There is not any cure for them. They have been deprived from everything. Coalhouse even loses his fiancée Sarah after running the many court though his problem is unheard. Coalhouse is helpless who represents the helplessness of all the blacks colored people. The white people and their authority have made blacks helpless. From every judicial body he is rejected and discarded treating meanly and in inhuman manner. So, he becomes very sad and being compelled starts to attack his opponents Firemen Chief and other. The black colored people are suppressed brutally and diplomatically. They are treated as bad as wild animals. So colored people were compelled to be radical. They were obliged to revolt against majority for freedom and equality. So, there raised the firing flow of revolt by colored people against suppression in 1920s which was called black's radicalism. Such radicalism was their [blacks] obligation against majority class.

Among many attacks, Coalhouse Walker has attacked to Firemen and in their institutions to take revenge from majority class. Coalhouse has created a kind of frightening situation to the suppressor higher class people attacking them that is seen further more clearly from the following lines:

"On the day of mass funeral for the victims of the Emerald Isle Fire, he

went to hear the eulogies, half the city turned out" (219). So, there has been created a problem by discarding and misbehaving to colored people by the majority.

Firehouses are the target of attack. The letter signed by Coalhouse Walker is left by two black people at the office of the local newspaper in which Coalhouse Walker writes that:

I want the infamous Fire Chief of the volunteers turned over to my justice. I want my automobile returned to me in its original condition. If these conditions are not met I will continue to kill Firemen and burn Firehouses until they are. I will destroy the entire city if need be. (211 - 12)

It makes clear that Coalhouse is much furious with the suppression of white higher class to the colored people and himself in the case of his automobile. He is so much furious that he is challenging the administration and the whole majority class by his violent activities. While the white people's administration does not give justice, he is obliged to give justice by himself. It was also necessary to bring equality. But in such attack and struggle innocent people should be saved from both sides who are struggling at each other. Everybody can say and it seems clearly that there is vast great social injustice in American society. Colored people are treated as savage wild animals by majorities so they have been obliged to wage war against the so-called higher class white's people.

In the company of Emerald Isle Chief, Willie Conklin would treat the colored people inhumanly. He would pinch them. He tried more to torture them. So Coalhouse Walker started to attack in these companies that is why many people died. From this case other people of major class also hated Conklin because he helped to provoke anger to the colored people instead of discouraging to attack. So, Conklin has been an irritating character even for whites:

He was hated as the stupid perpetrator of events leading to the death of men whom he ostensibly commanded. On the other hand among many certain elements he was scorned as someone who knows how to bait a Negro but not to put the fear of God into him. (219)

It seems ironical that the whites try to discourage nigger to attack them instead of respecting equal rights for all the people as the solution of problem. Still, whites want to suppress to the colored people keeping them backward in the dark side. Such brutality of whites upon colored black people gave birth to black's radicalism with the representation of Coalhouse Walker.

The authority from local body to central body is one sided that has only given justice to whites excluding blacks. Even the media is also one-sided which is fully influenced and controlled by majority class people. The press should take permission with the administration to publish the

news of black's radicalism also. It means only the negative side of blacks should be published by press after conferring with the administration. It becomes clear from the following lines:

It turned out that within an hour of the explosion he, or some other black men, left identical letters at the offices of the two local news paper. The editors after conferring with the police chose not to print them. The letters were written in a clear firm hand and told of the events leading up to the attack on the Firehouse. (211)

Thus, everything including even the press is in the grip of white authority. Nobody is free and autonomous.

The revolt of Coalhouse Walker gives the glance of 1960s Civil Right Movement in America. In this 1920s revolt, many workers, white people, Firemen are killed, Firehouses are destroyed in the explosion. The revolt creates chaosness in the city:

And now the city was truly in panic. Children did not appear for school. Cries of outrage were directed against the city administration and against Willie Conklin. A delegation of Fireman marched to City Hall and demanded to be sworn in as police duputies and given arms to defend themselves. The flustered mayor sent a telegram to the Governor of New York appealing for help. (221)

It has been generated a kind of fear and frightening situation in the mind of people. So that people are in confusing state.

Only after the great destruction and chaosness the newspaper are allowed to publish the news about black revolt: "The story of Coalhouse's second attack made the front pages of every newspaper in the country, reporters in droves came up from New York" (221).

While the revolt goes out of control from the administration and the administration can't give security to the people, the white people come in the street carrying pistols and rifles. In such condition Negroes are stayed in home behind locked doors: "In fact Negroes were to be seen nowhere in the city, they stayed home behind locked doors. That night police arrested on the street several white citizens carrying pistols and rifles". (222) Such situation has given the glance of civil war, in one hand and more emphasingly the racial war.

The situation is so much out of control that everything had been destroyed by explosion, there was chaosness and disorder with frightening situation. Though the militia were patrolling the streets there had already been explosion and many people were injured and killed. A kind of pathetic condition was seen. It can be realized from the following lines:

The hospital emergency room reported a higher than usual number of household accident victims. People were burning themselves, cutting themselves, tripping on rugs and falling

down flights of stairs. Several men were brought in with gun wounds inflicted in the cleaning and handling of old weapons.

(237)

Only after such great damage of wealth and death of people, the authority pretends the hearing and caring of Coalhouse Walker's case. Finally the authority being compelled brings a crane to take out the Model T Ford from Firehouse Pond: "A crane was moved to the site and the automobile dripping from its tires water and slime pouring out of its hood" (237). The wrecked automobile itself proves the injustice upon Coalhouse Walker. The following lines are furthermore explicable which clearly shows the discarding and unhearing of Coalhouse Walker and as a whole of blacks: "But now the authorities were embarrassed. The Ford stood as tangible proof of the black man's grievance, waterlogged and wrecked, it offended the sensibilities of anyone who respected machines and valued what they could do" (237).

Together with injustice upon Coalhouse Walker, we can see irony upon capitalism with the particular line, "it offended the sensibilities of anyone who respected machines and valued what they could do" (237). Generally it is assumed that Americans worship the machine but it has been wrecked and water locked. So it is paradoxical and ironical upon their values of capitalism also. As the waterlogged and wrecked automobile is put in public place, people in large number come to see it.

Because of the large number of the people, the police have to cordon off the area. It proves the formal injustice upon Coalhouse Walker. But still whites are not serious about black's rights. Mayor and Board of Alderman's thinking about black people shows the brutality and inhuman behaviour upon blacks by whites in the following lines:

Feeling that they had compromised themselves the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen issued a new series of condemnation of the colored madman and said that to negotiate with him in any way at all, to face him with less than an implacable demand that he surrender himself, would be to invite every renegade and radical and black man in the country to flout the law and spit upon the American flag. (237)

As the situation goes out of control, the authority tries to solve the problem negotiating with black colored man Coalhouse Walker. Still white people do not respect the equal right for blacks to live a dignified life. From the ideas expressed by Mayor and Board of Aldermen everybody can feel that the white people think them superior and all-in-all upon black people. They take them as ruler and blacks as slave. They think as if they are by birth ruler. The revolt of Coalhouse Walker is taken as madness by whites. Can every revolutionary person be maddened? Is it apt to say mad to Coalhouse Walker? If so every black revolutionary are mad? Is the revolt for the basic fundamental right madness? It can't be so. All people

are equal whether they are black or white in color. People should not be treated differently and unfairly on the grounds of race, sex, color, religion. All are equal. All are people.

Doctorow challenges J.P. Morgan's library as a store of grand narrative together associating with ironic signalling towards blacks by whites. Challenge is shown through the statement by a curator of library and hatred of blacks by whites can be understood thorough the sayings of a white colonel in the following lines:

Do you know the value of Mr. Morgan's acquisition! We have four Shakespeare folios! We have a Gutenberg Bible on Vellum! There are seven hundred incunabula and a five-page letter of George Washington's! the colonel waved his finger in the air. If we don't care of that son of a bitch, if we don't go in there and cut off his balls, you'll have every nigger in the country at your throat! Then where will you be with your Bibles? Whiteman paced back and forth. (273)

Though it is a challenge upon grand narrative mostly it is the hatred upon blacks together the frightening heart of whites with blacks the marginalized people. The new literary history written about marginal issues is challenging and undermining to the grand narratives. History should be an all-inclusive. That is why, the new literary history is successful to include central and essential aspects of grand narratives

together bringing ahead to the marginal issues. As a result history can be an all-inclusive and open ended genre as well.

On the process of vengeance, Coalhouse Walker takes in his control to Pierpont Morgan's library while he can't get him for hostage. So that the administration would be compelled to fulfill his demands: the restoration of his Model T Ford in just the condition when it was before vandalized, mostly to grant the equal rights of all the black people with full of respectation and lastly the punishment to Willie Conklin.

Coalhouse Walker remains constant in his demands for the restoration of his Model T and the life of its vandal. As J.P. Morgan responds to Coalhouse's demands for the restoration of his Model T and the life of its vandal. Morgan sends the following message to the District Attorney: "GIVE HIM HIS AUTOMOBILE AND HANG HIM [Coalhouse]" (287). The District Attorney is at first reluctant to give into a coon" (287), but eventually the Model T is restored and Coalhouse leaves the museum walking unarmed on the sidewalk, where "the police fire at will until his body jerks about in the street, as if trying to mop up its own blood" (301-2). Thus, Coalhouse Walker is murdered. He has sacrificed his life for blacks' rights. He has been martyr for blacks freedom.

Even Coalhouse Walker's fiancée Sarah has been preyed on the hand of Whites administration. Indeliberately, an innocent girl has been died. While Sarah dies just then Coalhouse Walker's death is determined by

himself. He is an honest, dutiful person who tries his best to make conscious to the blacks about their rights. He revolts against the suppression of whites upon blacks. He seems committed in his ideas and commitment which is seen from the demand for restoration of Model T Ford. He revolts to grant and achieve the right for the marginalized black people. Coalhouse thus has struggled and sacrificed his life to grant the rights of all marginalized black colored people.

Coalhouse Walker's revolt or struggle informs not only blacks but to the whole marginalized people to be conscious about their rights. So that they [all marginalized people] would try their best to grant and achieve the rights of them for their civilization. Furthermore Walker's revolt also warns to all the rulers to grant and respect the equal rights of marginalized people.

Thus, *Ragtime* is a novelized version of early twentieth century history of America which tries to show the reality about the contemporary racial history of Ragtime Era (1900-1920) using both real and imaginary characters. The phenomena based on reality of contemporary period is depicted in an imaginary fictional form. So that the novel *Ragtime* is historiographic metafiction.

America is formed by the combination of fifty states. So that it is called the United States of America, where the multiracial, multicultural societies have lived. So multi dynamic society is got in America. Mainly

the white people were assumed of mainstream or of majority class. The majority class people's representatives participate in making rule and order of law. So they only include their favourable aspects in the law excluding marginal people. White people's representation was only accepted in every field of American administration. Minorities and marginalized are treated as slave in brutal inhuman manner. Though sixteenth president of America Abraham Lincoln proclaimed the eradication of slavery system from America, it has only limited on letter in the page of history. Likewise third president of United States of America Thomas Jefferson's slogan of Equality: 'Life liberty and persuit of happinness as the basic fundamental rights by birth endowed by the God to all the people' has been mocked by majorities' inhuman behaviour upon minorities and marginal people in America. Even the law is made partial and biased towards minorities in United States. So, there has been held many revolutions. All marginalized people held the meaningful and relevant revolt in 1967 in the name of Civil Right Movement to grant and achieve the right of equality for all people including even marginal whites, blacks and everybody who are the citizens of America.

The revolt of Coalhouse Walker is patterned after the Civil Right Movement of 1960s in America. The form of revolt is similar with the revolt that occurred during the Civil Right Movement. Both 1920's Walker's and 1960s revolts were held for the achievement and granting the

equal rights. The revolt of Coalhouse Walker in 1920s seems to be held especially for granting the equal rights of Blacks but the Civil Right Movement of 1960s is the revolt of all the marginalized people. That is why, it was called the Civil Right Movement. But in the history of America the blacks are seemed to be suppressed and fully marginalized. So, it can be said that the Civil Right Movement was held granting especially the rights of Blacks and other marginalized citizens as well. So the black radicalism of 1920s and 1960s Civil Right Movement seem similar in some extent.

Regarding 1920s black radicalism, as textualized in *Ragtime* Fredric Jameson thinks that it degenerates into a pastiche. According to Jameson, Coalhouse Walker's radicalism of 1920s is the imitation of 1960s revolting style. So it is only pastiche which is not sufficient to liberate the blacks. The discrimination was, is and will be there. According to Linda Hutcheon, revolt is necessary for equality and emancipation, it has meaning in history, so it is not invain, it is for freedom. The form of revolt is apt because it ironizes to major classes' history, their style of rule, their rules and regulation. Instead of imitation as pastiche, Huctheon says it is parody that is reliable for colored people's emancipation. Hutcheon emphasizes that they [colored people] should revolt systematically and patiently thinking seriously to their history to make their revolt historical

and meaningful. Rights can be achieved and should be achieved. As a result all people will be equal in the American rule of law.

According to Jameson the radicalism of 1920s by Coalhouse Walker against white oppression upon blacks is a poor parody of 1960s and it is not powerful for the emancipation of blacks. That is why it is pastiche rather than parody. Blacks were suppressed in the past and will not be emancipated in the future also and still such condition is prevalent though the law of equality is proclaimed in 1967's Civil Right Movement. In such situation past and future will be similar. So in such revolt against racism seems a kind of irony according to Jameson that is called an anachronistic irony. In this condition according to Jameson, power is less or insufficient that is why black's emancipation can't be possible. So, it is pastiche of the past. Doctorow has followed 1960's style to write 1920s black radicalism that is pastiche for Jameson. It can't ironize to the grand narrative sense of history to further create new inclusive and open-ended history in the chain of dissatisfaction because this irony is powerless irony as pastiche only, such imitation as pastiche only degenerates the past. For Fredric Jameson' the narrative pastiche of *Ragtime* novel is evidence of the postmodern loss of historical referent-a loss of connection between the writer's and readers now and the past, and hence, a crisis in historicity. The historical subject remains out of reach to us problematizing interpretation'. (qtd. in Parks Polyphony, 459).

For Linda Hutcheon, the revolt against white oppression by Coalhouse Walker in 1920s is reliable and powerful as well. Doctorow's adaptation of 1960s style while writing about 1920s, black radicalism is parody for Hutcheon. According to Hutcheon, the imitation of 1960s revolting method gives emancipation to the suppressed blacks. So, the parody of 1960s gives emancipation to the marginalized people in the sense of writing back their voice of dissent back into history textbooks, where it is absent. Hutcheon describes postmodern parody, as ironic quotation is the liberating agency. And the postmodern historiographic metafiction is the best postmodern genre to get emancipation challenging the dominant ideology. According to Hutcheon, the postmodern historiographic metafiction, through the use of parody, blends the self-reflexivity of metafiction with an ironized sense of history. Jameson in *Postmodernism* asserts that "the postmodern parody and nostalgia are merely narcissistic symptom which lament a loss of a sense of history in today's art (35). But Hutcheon, in *The Politics of Postmodernism* considers, "Parody and nostalgia are double-voiced irony (114) or double encoding" (117). Thus parody questions and challenges the dominant ideology and then plays the vital role to construct the present history through representation. Jameson takes postmodernism as ahistorical and pastiche of the past. So that Jameson says *Ragtime* is bad novel. But Linda Hutcheon says in terms of historiographic metafiction "Postmodern parody

is a kind of contesting revision or rereading of the past that both confirms and subverts the power of representation of history" (95). So, Hutcheon says *Ragtime* is a typical of 1967's Civil Right Movement.

Whatever the case, it has been cleared that Coalhouse Walker has significantly sacrificed his life for granting and respecting black people's rights. He has struggled against the brutal suppression of whites upon blacks and social injustice. So, Coalhouse Walker is a principal character in the novel *Ragtime* who has been martyred for blacks freedom and equality.

Power creates discourse that is represented as history. The ruling class people, who are in power create history. So that 'history is the construct of power', or, 'histories are fictions of power'. The people who are in power make history favourable for them. In such condition, minorities are not included. So, it is necessary to write an all-inclusive history as open-ended genre from marginal perspective challenging the grand narratives through ironic signaling and parodic representation. History enlivens by fiction. Histories are fictionalized through literary form. The translation is never a straightforward process. The same event is interpreted in many versions.

Regarding history and fiction, Doctorow writes in his essay *False Documents* that "Facts are images of history, just as images are the facts of fiction" (161). The historian writes historical facts manipulating the real

events in fictional form. "There are no facts in themselves" said Nietzsche. For a fact to exist we must first introduce meaning" (qtd. In Doctorow's "False Documents" 160). That is why, 'history as fiction and fiction as history' in Doctorow's *Ragtime* is contextual and relevant as well.

E.L. Doctorow, in the novel *Ragtime*, has written the history of Ragtime Era (1900-1920) through revisionist perspective. Challenging the grand narrative, Doctorow has presented successfully and effectively the Ragtime Era's political [racial economic ...] history bringing ahead to the contemporary marginal issues through ironic and parodic representation by deconstructed narrative in the novel *Ragtime*. The grand narrative is challenged by revisionist historiographers. Only deconstructed narrative can destabilize the hegemony of official history enough to open up new possibilities for interpretation. Destabilizing the official history by deconstructed narrative, Doctorow has written the history of Ragtime Era bringing ahead to the contemporary marginal issues in the novel *Ragtime*. In history minorities and marginalized aspects should include together with central aspects so that marginal issues come ahead. As a result history can be an all-inclusive genre. In fact, history should be an all-inclusive open-ended genre as well. So that postmodern historiographic metafiction can become a better genre to challenge the hegemony of official history.

The overall emphasis of the narrative is the racial discrimination between whites and blacks in the turn-of-the century America. Doctorow

has written Ragtime Era's history by mixing literature [Coalhouse's episode] with history and history with literature. The contemporary prevalent racism of Ragtime Era from 1900 to 1920s, has been presented successfully by Doctorow through the episode of Coalhouse Walker.

Coalhouse Walker, has represented the marginalized blacks, who struggles actively against white people's oppression upon blacks.

The overall narrative shows that the white has oppressed blacks by every means and Coalhouse has resisted it. Coalhouse fights against oppression to grant the rights of blacks. Coalhouse Walker sacrifices his life to grant and achieve the rights of all the black people. It shows that right is got only from struggle. No one gives right easily and lightly.

History has also proved that there has been held many revolution in the world to get right of equality. So that Walker's struggle seems essential to the contemporary situation to get and grant the rights of blacks. Walker's struggle is the current blow to all majority classes' rules and regulation.

Walker's struggle against oppression warns to every biased or partial ruler to keep balance in social justice respecting the freedom and equal rights of everybody otherwise there will be raised firing flow of revolt to grant and achieve the rights by marginalized people. We can also say that Walker's struggle is meaningful for the achievement of black's rights. Revolt was essential against brutality of whites and to run the rule of law and order with social justice upon every citizen of the states whether s/he is black or

white. It also informs to cancel the discriminatory rule and law upon blacks and to bring the law of equality upon all people whatever their color. Discrimination should completely be avoided. And the rule of law and order should be established respecting the equal rights of all the people.

IV. Conclusion

The study tries to prove 'history as fiction and fiction as history' in the context of reading Doctorow's *Ragtime* thereby bringing to light the issue of racism in the turn-of-the-century America from Coalhouse Walker's episode. E.L. Doctorow's depiction of Coalhouse Walker episode (vandalization of the Model T Ford) in the novel *Ragtime* (1975) ironizes racism showing the discrimination between whites and blacks in the turn-of-the-century America. Coalhouse Walker has sacrificed his life for the emancipation, freedom and equal rights of blacks colored people struggling against whites' oppression upon blacks. Blacks are marginalized. The traditional notion of grand narrative which is exclusive, one-sided majorities' history should be destabilized through the use of ironic and parodic reference to bring to light the marginal issues including essential central historical aspects so that history would be an all inclusive, open-ended genre. The study calls for a reconditioning of traditional historiography through Doctorow's writing back of the history of black radicalism in the history of the Ragtime Era. Doctorow has written the history of Ragtime Era by highlighting the contemporary marginal issues through revisionist perspective, in the light of 1960s Civil Right Movement ironizing to the grand narrative sense of history through parodic representation in the novel *Ragtime*.

Deconstructing the racism in the turn-of-the Century America, Doctorow has written Ragtime Era's (1900-1920s) history in fictional form through revisionist perspective in the light of 1960s Civil Right Movement. History enlivens through narrative representation. Linda Hutcheon thinks that the past will be known only in its textual traces and self-reflexivity. Doctorow has written Ragtime Era's history mixing with literature and literature with history. History is known through its discourse which is represented through the traces of historical events in postmodern fiction. Furthermore historiographic metafiction represents

not just a world of fiction however self-consciously presented as a constructed one, but also a world of public experience.

History is assumed as the records of past events which are based on facts. The facts do not exist unless they are interpreted. The historian interprets the events of history, presents them coherently, and makes 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 the making of history, and, in this sense history is like fiction, a subjective phenomenon. Fiction is also the representation of reality in imaginary form. Furthermore in historiography, historical events are presented in fictional form through its traces by narrative representation. The self-reflexive narrative representation is the nature of postmodern fiction. So that history and fiction are interrelated and similar phenomena.

Works Cited

- Brown, Marshall. *Preromanticism*. Stanford, California: Stanford UP, 1991.
- Doctorow, E.L. *False Documents from Poets and Presidents: Selected Essays, 1997-1992*. London: Macmillan, 1994.
- _____. *Ragtime*, 1975. New York: Random House, 1994.
- Duvall, John N. "Troping History: Modernist Residue in Fredric Jameson's Pastiche and Linda Hutcheon's Parody". *Style* 33.3 (Fall 1999): 372-90.
- Frow, John. *Marxism and Literary History*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
- Gilroy. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge: Mass Harvard UP, 1994.
- Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
- Hutcheon, Linda "Interventionist Literary Histories: Nostalgic, Pragmatic, or Utopian?" *Modern Language Quarterly* 59.4 (December 1998): 401-17.
- _____. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- _____. *The Poetics of Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Ignatieff. Michael, *Blood and Belonging*. Harmandsworth: Penguin, 1993.
- Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke UP, 1991.

____. *The Political Unconscious Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act.*

Ithaca: Cornell; UP, 1981

Nixon, Rob. "Of Balkans and Bantustans: Ethnic Cleansing and the Crisis in National Legitimation." *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation and Postcolonial Perspective*. Eds. Anne Mc Clintock, Aamir Mufti and Ella Shohat. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1997: 80-100.

Trenner, Richard, ed. *E.L. Doctorow: Essays and Conversation*. Princeton: Ontario Review Press, 1983.

White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1973.

____. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987.