

**Citation:** Khan, S. A., Khan, W. A., & Ali, I. (2021). Anticolonial Visions and Fictional Versions: A Comparative Study of American and Indian Postcolonial Novels. *Global Language Review*, VI(III), 81-90. [https://doi.org/10.31703/glr.2021\(VI-III\).09](https://doi.org/10.31703/glr.2021(VI-III).09)



## Anticolonial Visions and Fictional Versions: A Comparative Study of American and Indian Postcolonial Novels

Saleem Akhtar Khan \*

Waheed Ahmad Khan †

Imran Ali ‡

### Abstract

*The research juxtaposes two of the prominent postcolonial literary discourses produced by the nations that resisted the colonial encroachments militarily and, ultimately, gained their independence from the British imperial clutch, America and India. The selected literary works are replete with retrospective representations of the historical landmarks and laden with future ideological aspirations regarding national glory. Remaining awake to the perplexing verisimilitude of postcolonial works of literature, the study aims to explain the pivotal nexus that links the divergent discourses, that is, the anticolonial élan. For the accomplishment of the comparative analysis, two of the novels have been chosen, one for each country, to represent the respective version of resistance: Jeff Shaara's *The Glorious Cause* (2002) from an array of the American fictional narratives and Basavaraj Naikar's *The Sun behind the Cloud* (2001) from the Indian anglophone fiction. After outlining the belligerent disposition of these novels, their thematic schemas have been compared and contrasted to make the postcoloniality of these polemical fictions manifest. It has been made explicit that the novels are essentially similar in their counter-discursive character and dissemination of the anticolonial sentiment despite some peripheral differences. Thus, these novels contribute to the broader postcolonial continuum that comprehensively accommodates varying versions of the textual resistance.*

**Key Words:** Anticolonial, America, India, Representation, Postcolonial, Novels

### Introduction

Postcolonial works of literature are marked by belligerent proclivity having *written-backness* as their nucleus. This anticolonial consciousness has precipitated myriads of ideologically informed and politically motivated nationalist fictions throughout the world. The fictions deconstruct the colonial discourse's fetish fallacies and trigger the "reworlding of the world" (Cheah, 2016 p. 194). Consequently, all the postcolonial fictional narratives appear to be wide awake to the question of colonial history and, accordingly, accommodate enthusiastic teleological trajectories towards the historical landmarks of

resistance against colonial control. The most visibly bellicose among these fictional yields are those about the revolutionary upsurges against the center.

The present paper approaches the postcolonial fictional representations of the American and Indian revolutionary wars against the British colonial enterprises. The British imperial rule was bewilderingly encompassing in its expansionist attempts, and it spread its colonial wings across the globe. Resultantly, it faced an equally accelerated number of retaliatory struggles in the different parts

\* Assistant Professor, Head Department of English, University of Sialkot, Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan.

† Assistant Professor, Head of (Linguistics), University of Haripur, KP, Pakistan.

‡ Assistant Professor, Department of (Linguistics), University of Haripur, KP, Pakistan. Email: [imranali@uoh.edu.pk](mailto:imranali@uoh.edu.pk)

of the world, ranging from the Scottish struggles to the Sudani Mahdist resistance. Among these, the Americans and Indians are the most prominent ones. As Trivedi and Richard Allen describe the pivotal position of this revolution in the history of resistance against the British Empire: "insurrection, which began on 10 May 1857 and ended officially on 8 July 1859, was the most major rebellion against British rule overseas since the North American colonies had inflicted the defeat on Britain and gained independence in 1783" (2000, p. 55).

A prolific yield of fictional works has been produced about the revolutionary wars in the respective countries. However, the researchers have focused on the contemporary novels produced in the twenty-first century. Basavaraj Naikar's *Sun behind the Clouds* (2001) has been taken to represent the Indian literary rendering of the revolutionary war. Focusing on the character of a courageous native king, Bhaskararao Bhave, the novel epitomizes the anticolonial struggle and sentiment of the Indian masses "in a realistic manner" (2001, p. viii). Jeff Shaara's *The Glorious Cause* (2002) narrates the journey of the American colonies, under the leadership of George Washington, from the scattered bunch of settlements to a unified "independent nation" (p. 494).

The theoretical postulates inform the exploration, explication, and comparison of the selected novels of the postcolonial paradigm. The critical sifting of the novels has been prosecuted for bringing forth the conceptual constants of the epistemological position of postcolonialism, as provided by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin in their various encompassing works (1995; 2003; 2007). Methodologically, a proposal by Ashcroft *et al.* (2003), regarding the juxtaposition of different postcolonial works of literature—for "forming bases for a genuine postcolonial discourse" (p. 18) and outlining "thematic parallels" (p. 26)—has been followed. Moreover, the selection of the contemporary texts is rooted in the idea to explore the ideological vigor of the respective nations from the vantage point of the time of "swing towards fanaticism" (Velmeulen and Akker, 2010, p. 6).

In short, the researchers explore two of the profound postcolonial literary versions, the

American and Indian, to corroborate the argument that the textual resistance has become a universally pervasive trend due to works of literature in English produced both in the settler and non-settler former colonies scattered across the globe. Decolonization has triggered their intellectual autonomy, and the arena for *written back* responses is set. Thus, the article facilitates understanding the conflictual and politicized rhetoric in the contemporary "time of terror" (Dabashi, 2009, p. xiii).

### Research Questions

1. How do Shaara's *The Glorious Cause* and Naikar's *The Sun behind the Cloud* thematize the issue of resistance regarding the respective revolutions?
2. In what ways do these fictional representations reflect the globally shared postcolonial panache?

### Delimitation

The article covers two selected novels from the rich repository of postcolonial American and Indian works. Both the novels have been produced in the contemporary and are representative of mainstream national discourses:

1. Jeff Shaara's *The Glorious Cause* (2002)
2. Basavaraj Naikar's *The Sun behind the Cloud* (2001)

### Theoretical Framework and Method

Theoretically, the study is pivoted on the excellent postcolonial idea of resistance. Primarily, the novels have been read as the fictions of "opposition" (Ramone, 2011, p.33). The phenomenon of physical resistance and its coordinate "textual resistance" (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1995, p. 85) remain at the heart of the paradigm of postcolonialism. The prominent postcolonial theorist, Robert Young, has also stressed the significance of "theoretical practices of the freedom struggles" (2001, p. 159). Moreover, theorizations regarding the global nature of postcolonial ideals also inform the critique. Ashcroft *et al.* have indicated certain shared notions "forming bases for a genuine postcolonial discourse" (2003, p. 18). They identify some crucial "thematic parallels"

(2003, p. 26) between the postcolonial literary yields emerging from many different parts of the world. Said, one of the heralds of postcolonial thought, has also suggested the same idea by framing varying writings under "comparative literature of imperialism" (1994, 18). In this way, the study's argument is premised not only on the theorization of resistance but also strengthens the claim for universality of it with reference to the postcolonial writings.

Methodologically and procedurally, the study operates on two levels. Firstly, the relevant textual material has been culled from both of the selected novels following the norms of textual analysis. Secondly, the extracted data has been streamlined by comparing the features brought forth from both the fictional versions of the revolutionary wars. Therefore, the methodological approach is textual-cum-comparative in its nature. Thus, the rigorous critique of the selected fictional works is the result of this systematic approach that is based on precisely framed theoretical stance and systematically contoured method.

### **The British Imperialism**

The British version of imperialism exemplifies the unwarranted expansionist predilection that marks the character of the militarily dominant countries. The English conquered various regions in the different continents across the globe: from America to India and New Zealand to South Africa. Levine's is a detailed description of the range of the British multidimensional encroachments:

Over the course of the nineteenth century, Britain added 10 million square miles and 400 million people to its colonial holdings. By the end of the century, it would still be the largest of the European empires, scattered across the globe in a bewildering variety of political and administrative forms. (2007, p.82)

The facts provided in the passage above provide a glimpse of the expanse of the empires established and run by the English people through different times and in the different regions of the world. The self-appointed apostles of the enlightenment project spared nothing in the range and line of their power.

[Ferguson \(2002\)](#) nostalgically narrates the rise and decline of the British rule spanned across the seas and states. His account of the British colonial management is marked colored with a sense of the lost glory. He begins by covering the trajectory of the rise of the colonial control that remains unprecedented in terms of its expanse and elegance in human history. Having covered the loftiness, he turns to narrate the post-decolonization status of the archipelago that stands in the world as a wrecked ship's "flotsam and jetsam" (p. 247) found scattered in an ocean. An interesting point about his narrative is that he ignores all the brutalities practiced by the English forces who went rummaging half of the world.

On the contrary, he applauded the establishment of empires in the various parts of the world for their role in disseminating the values of liberalism, practices of institutionalization, and the fruits of democracy in the world. Ironically, at the same time, he denounces the communist regimes for their crime of inflicting "incalculable misery" (p. 247) and unrestrained carnages upon their colonial subjects. Thus, Ferguson's is a typical reductive colonial narrative of the establishment of empires and subjugating peoples.

[Judd \(2004\)](#) has approached the history of empire concerning the Indian context. He brings numerous anecdotes to accomplish his broader narrative of the intriguing "history of the Raj". His approach is patterned on the chronological axis, and, therefore, he narrates the initiation, culmination, and collapse of British rule in the region in a temporal sequence. He also acknowledges the room for an alternative approach and "sharply different ways of seeing the experience" (p. 191). He aims at a resolution of the "big and complex questions" (p. 191) apropos "350 years" (p. 200) of the Raj in the Indian Territory that is marked by multifarious "dilemmas, and contradictions" (p. 192). Ultimately, treading the path of the proponents of the colonial discourse, he reduces the exploitative act of colonial control as "interaction" (p. 200) between two peoples. Accordingly, the interaction is a productive one that triggered many different positive sociopolitical results. In this way, Judd's study of the empire eschews the cruel machinations of the English.

[Tharoor \(2017\)](#) presents an act of intellectual retaliation in his famous critique of India's so-called benevolent British rule. His downright denunciation of the colonial loot of the subjugated country has been epitomized in the very title, *inglorious empire*. He has deconstructed the pro-imperialist discourse by manifesting its inherent contradictions and exposing the hypocritical nature of the colonial intelligentsia. Developing an encompassing critique of all the claims of the proponents of imperialism — political contribution, legal reforms, and social enlightenment— he unpacks the falsified rhetoric regulating the discourse of justification. In this regard, the thrust of his argument is to be found on the economic exploitation of the region that pushed the country back from prosperity to poverty. He has got a lot of empirical data on his service, and his arguments are substantiated with archival pieces of evidence. His unequivocal stance is given way thus:

The economic exploitation of India was integral to the colonial enterprise. Furthermore, the vast sums of Indian revenues and loot flowing to England, even if they were somewhat less than the billions of pounds Digby estimated, provided the capital for British industry and made possible the financing of the Industrial Revolution. (2017, p. 56)

His wide stance is grounded in the thorough study of all the factors that indicated the systematic loot and the exploitation of the region's rich resources by the English colonizers who pushed a progressing economy to regression. Tharoor's outlook is an anticolonial one, and he indicts the imperialist forces for the crimes done in the name of humanitarianism during the colonial period.

All three scholars—Niall Ferguson, Denis Judd, and Shashi Tharoor— have approached the British Empire. However, they differ conspicuously in their attitude regarding legitimacy or illegitimacy of it. Ferguson and Judd defend the empire by singing its songs, whereas Tharoor rejects the mantra of the colonial writers who try to turn a cruel clutch into a helping hand. In short, these studies portray various, even contrasting, façade of the empire.

### **Anticolonial Revolutionary Struggles**

The natural response to colonial encroachments and imperialist advancements is the anticolonial

resistance that attempts to thwart the unwarranted oppression. The history of the colonial rules is punctuated with rebellions by the colonized people. These revolutions are scattered throughout centuries, from medieval ages to contemporary times, and from America to Africa across the globe. Ashcroft *et al.* write, explaining the role of the acts of resistance:

It is significant that no society ever attained total freedom from the colonial system by the involuntary, active disengagement of the colonial power until it was provoked by a considerable internal struggle for self-determination or, most usually, by extended and active violent opposition by the colonized. (2007, p. 43)

The statement explains the primary trigger behind decolonization: revolutionary struggles by the native population. Decolonization was not a simple political decision made by the colonizer; instead, it was a consequence of the retaliation that made the colonizer surrender. This is also true in the former British colonies, most of whom won freedom by taking arms against the exploitative colonial control.

[Middlekauff \(1982\)](#) has glorified the revolutionary struggle against the red coats in the American context. He enthusiastically narrates its details, causes, and the fighters' contribution. His linear narrative is more enthusiastic than analytical in its nature. From the very beginning point of the struggle, "The Act Crisis" (p. 60), to the point of fruition, "Independence" (p. 251), every step is narrated with a visible emotional fervor and color of sentimentalism. The kernel of the narrative has been put in these words: "The war had reinforced them and, unconfined but disciplined and managed by men with a new sense of the fruitfulness of largescale operations, they would make America a thriving nation" (p. 246). The passage succinctly presents the argument for the struggle and disrupts the British case. Thus, Middlekauff has unequivocally contended for the legitimacy of American ideals and revolution.

Bipan Chandra *et al.* describe the Indian revolutionary struggle of 1857, "an unsuccessful but heroic effort to eliminate foreign rule" (1987, p. 1), as the most significant step towards liberation. They positively portray the native freedom-fighters and

idealize them as heroic characters. For instance, Rani of Jhansi has been glorified with passion. Accordingly, the English have been demonized for forcing the natives in many ways, like "secret designs to promote conversions" (p. 4). That failed, but still "formidable challenge" (p. 12) to the imperial seat was held as the symbol of courage for the lovers of liberation till they won freedom in 1947. Moreover, it remains a historical point that helps define the nation's integrity. Summarily, Chandra et al. ignore the defeat and focus the significance of the struggle from the symbolic perspective that strengthened the natives morally.

### **Postcolonial works of literature**

The colonial encounters, processes of decolonization, and experiences of the post-independence social interactions have fathered a variety of literary writings that are placed under the umbrella term of Postcolonial works of literature. Variety is one of the significant features of these literary yields, and this characteristic, versatility, is rooted in many social, linguistic, political, national, religious, economic, racial, and historical factors. Depending upon the peculiar experiences and exposures, various groups have produced different kinds of postcolonial literature. However, all these literary streams from different parts of the world share some essential features.

[Thieme \(2001\)](#) explains the project of the postcolonial works of literature by identifying the shared ideal of all of its varieties, that is, challenge to the colonial literary imagination. He discusses how postcolonial literary works attempt to dismantle the epistemic establishment of colonial literature. Studying and theorizing various retellings of the English classics – from the fictions by Dickens to the dramas by Shakespeare – he envisions postcoloniality of the kind of works of literature. At the very outset, he stresses the contesting nature of these writings: "'Writing back', 'counter-discourse', 'oppositional literature'" (p.1). He also explains the "strategies", "so numerous and varied" (p. 170), that help the works to get the postcolonial color. Thus, the malleability of the so-called canonical texts remains at the center of his discussion of the essence of the postcolonial works of literature.

[Madsen \(2003\)](#) complies with an anthology that includes essays aiming at the identification of the "recurring postcolonial themes" (p. 1). However, the focus of the works is more on the issues relevant to the American social circles: multiculturalism, diaspora, and hybridity. The anthology range also encompasses the American ethnic works of literature: Native Americans, Chicana, Afro-Americans, Asian Americans, Chinese expatriates, Hawaiians, Puerto Ricans, Haitians, Latin-Caribbean, Canadians, and Vietnamese. The list shows the inclusive and representative nature of the work that covers almost all the varieties within the American context. Thematically, it covers various aspects ranging from fragmentations to co-existence, influenced by American cultural formations. The metanarrative of the American culture as the melting pot has been countered by showing the unavoidable fissures present in its very structure. Madsen sums up the argument with the proposal for a broader comparative study of these American voices of dissidence with "the 'classic' postcolonial situations of Africa, India, and the Caribbean" (p. 25). Thus, the study engages with some intriguing intersectional issues concerning postcoloniality within the American context.

As explained earlier, postcolonial works of literature are artifacts created in response to varying experiences of the various colonial enterprises. [McLeod's beginning \(2010\)](#) is a thorough study of the roots and fruits of creative and critical writings. Historically, he believes this literature to be the latest stage of the Commonwealth literature. For him, it was a development "from 'Commonwealth' to 'postcolonial'" (p. 6). He acknowledges that the "problematizing" (p. 239) perplexities running through these literary-critical works. However, he stresses that these confusions cannot undermine the inherent significance of the postcolonial works that have revolutionized the intellectual domain by bringing the most desired paradigm shift. So, McLeod's introductory work presents the strength and significance of the debates regulating postcolonial thought.

Jain and Singh (2004) focus on the polyvalence of the postcolonial works of literature coming from various continents and countries. In other words, it explains the dual nature of the contesting capacity of

the kind of literature: contest with the colonial discourse and also within. They are wide awake to the chequered history and tentacular nature of textual works: "the history of postcolonial works of literature does not reflect any linear development" (p. 9). The work includes critiques of the various colonial works, African novels, and Indian fictions, ranging from Raja Rao and Arun Kolatkar to Chinua Achebe and Wole Soyinka. Specific meta-critical reflections also negotiate various ideas of the substantial theorists like Said and Spivak. Thus, the work provides an encompassing and inclusive set of highly erudite critiques from various postcolonial perspectives.

All these works regarding the definition, nature and expansion of the postcolonial literary circles have some shared notions about the essential points: 1) versatility is the soul of postcoloniality, 2) resistance is at the heart of the kind of writings, 3) spatio-temporal factors play their role in the creation of these literary works, 4) all these are primarily counter-discursive creations and so on. Therefore, the depth and breadth of the literary field are beyond the covering capacity of any single descriptor. In short, the proliferation and profundity of postcolonial works of literature bespeak their significance.

### **Anticolonial Resistance in Jeff Shaara and Basavaraj Naikar's Fictions**

The selected novels, Shaara's *The Glorious Cause* and Naikar's *The Sun behind the Cloud*, stand as the consummate examples of the postcolonial fictional narratives as they both incorporate all the paraphernalia required to make an accomplished work of intellectual resistance, ranging from characterization to thematization. Despite being set in different spatial and temporal contexts, the novels exhibit the same postcolonial combative approach vis-à-vis the British colonial adventures. Thus, the texts transcend the Spatio-temporal and socio-cultural boundaries when expressing the anticolonial ethos.

The first and foremost thematic component that exhibits the anticolonial stance of the writers is their adherence to the notion that the very act of colonization is utterly unjust and unjustifiable.

Naikar's protagonist, Bhave, unequivocally pronounces that "Kaffirs came to this country under the pretense of carrying on trade" (2001, p. 52). He, the protagonist, believes that the captures are the consequence of sheer "sedition" and "treachery" (2001, p. 52). His conviction finds expression at many places throughout the text:

You Britishers forgot your original policy of doing business in our country. You went back on your words. Hence I had to start the mutiny to show you how wrong you were to snatch our freedom and country from us. (Naikar, 2001, p. 216)

These statements show the deception with which the colonial capture was accomplished and the anguish felt by the native population resulting from the realization of the fraudulent encroachment. Naikar's characters are evident on this fundamental point of the unwarranted nature of the colonial enterprise that has deprived them of their fundamental human right of being free. Nana Saheb's speech at the beginning of the congregation of the native kings and princes also reflects the same sentiment.

This realization of the illegitimacy of the colonial project is also an integral part of the consciousness of Shaara's characters. Washington, the leader whose name stands synonymous with the revolution, speaks back to the British administration without mincing the words: "We are saying to England, your system does not work here. We will build our system, and we *will* make it work" (Shaara, 2002, p. 285). Benjamin Franklin, another leading figure of the revolutionary struggle, shares the view and expresses it in these words:

You have sent out troops, you have destroyed our towns. You plan even now the further destruction of our nation. That is the authentic voice of your king. Forgive me, your lordship, but his actions speak far louder than your lordship's words. (p. 38)

Franklin questions the legitimacy of colonization of the American Territory and masses and denounces the cruel ways with which the control was established and, also, being sustained. The words of these two great leaders represent the collective consciousness and sentiments of the American people apropos the colonial control of their Territory.

The natural consequence of disbelief in colonization is belief in all the anticolonial efforts, ranging from promoting the sense of freedom to the actual act of resistance in armed retaliation and guerrilla attacks. Both the nations, American and Indian, stood militarily against British colonialism and shook it to its core, threatening the stability of the imperial center. These novelists, Shaara and Naikar, have vociferously vindicated these revolutionary struggles by praising the acts with the best laudatory expressions.

In Naikar's novel, the struggle against unlawful colonialism is called "the first war of independence" (2001, p. 63) and the "liberation movement" (2001, p. 63). He does not doubt that the war is "righteous" (2001, p. 64); one can only be described as the most desired "patriotic fight" (2001, p. 233). Bhaskararao Bhave, the principal symbol of resistance and representative of the native population, announces with unmatched courage: "I refused to be governed by the alien law" (2001, p. 215). He challenges the English system and creates a binary to clarify their collective choice: "we have to go by our native laws" (2001, p. 215). The text is replete with these expressions of the desirability of the war against the usurpation of the native area and resources.

Shaara gives way to the sense of the need of the war to overthrow the exploitative system by explicitly calling the struggle the "war of independence" (2002, p. 285), a sacred "mission" (2002, p. 67), and more zealously "the Revolution" (2002, p. 239). He firmly believes that the "war [is] about an ideal" (2002, p. 285). All these acclamatory terms—mission, revolution, and ideal – bespeak the intensity of the passion with which the novelist wants to reinforce the message of the anticolonial struggle fought by the Americans to rescue their country from colonial rule. The instances of the rendering of vindication of the war can be multiplied as they run like a refrain throughout the text of Shaara's novel.

Another aspect that further strengthens the postcolonial image and the anticolonial predilection of the novelists is the contrastive characterization of the colonizers and the colonized people. In both the novels, the native characters have been painted with a visible touch of idealism, whereas the colonizers have been described in a derogatory manner.

Consequently, the colonizers and the natives function like foils in these novels and create a binary; and, of course, both novelists have explicitly favored the native characters by rejecting the colonizers. Thus, the British characters have found negative representations in the novels. Significantly, the writers have severely demonized the red coats as they work as the frontline of the system that produces the colonial setup.

As contrived in the novel, Naikar's fictional world, the native Indian people are the "heroes" (2001, p. 53) whose grace is unquestioned. Appasaheb, Bhave's brave father, expresses the essence of the Indian ethos by flaunting zealously "do not be afraid of anybody or anything in life. Never be a slave to anyone" (2001, p. 17). They appear in the text as the "great lovers of freedom," and during the anticolonial war, they "heroically" (2001, p. 92). A cursory look at all the characters shows that heroism appears to have been the integral and most prominent part of their personalities. Thus, Naikar contrives all the characters to claim their superiority over their British counterparts.

Likewise, Shaara paints the American image with the brightest colors. According to him, Franklin is "an icon, the consummate American, a symbol of a dynamic people who would throw off their chains" (2002, p. 158). The praise is limited to the leading figures and is collectively shared by the soldiers and freedom fighters. As Washington proclaims after the great victory at Trenton: "the victory you won on this ground was won by every man in this line" (2002, p. 127). On the one hand, the statement extends the attribute of greatness to all the people who contributed to the cause, and on the other hand, it shows the generosity of Washington, the supreme leader, who wholeheartedly acknowledges the role of the lower ranks in the grand struggle. So, overall the portrayal of the American characters, be it a character of leaders or a common soldier, is marked by positivity and praise.

Vilification of the colonizers, the English who stand foil to the native people, is another manifest feature found in the novels. According to Naikar's mouthpieces, the colonizers are "the red-faced monkeys" (2001, p. 29) and the "strange-looking soldiers" (2001, p. 33). They have been dubbed as "the

snake of British power" (2001, p. 108) who are operating in the guise of "the Company Sarkar" (Naikar, 2001, p. 109). They have frequently been mentioned as the "monsters" (2001, p. 185) or the "British monsters" (2001, pp. 192-232). While depicting their monstrosity and cruel behavior, Naikar creates the scene when they enter as the victorious soldiers in Naragund:

They rummaged all the cupboards and boxes and found countless and precious items like silken garments, silver vessels, golden ornaments, and large quantities of silver and copper coins. They were thrilled by the considerable wealth they could lay hands on so quickly. (Naikar, 2001, p. 134)

Once the region entered to bring the so-called enlightenment, the colonizers played merely like the looters who had no sense of sympathy or moral responsibility. Their attitude reflects the utter moral degradation and ethical chaos surrounding their very being. So, Naikar's English characters are villainy personified and degradation incarnate.

This savagery and villainy have also been attributed to the British soldiers by Shaara. An extreme level of antagonism is found in the expression when Shaara explains the hypocritical courtesy of the British people as "the seductive graciousness of the spider" (p. 255). In the same vein, he makes his mouthpiece, George Washington, describe the negative temperament of the English thus:

This is no more than barbarism, inflicting permanent scars on the innocent. It is the dying gasp of an oppressor, brutality out by an army who knows its defeat hangs above. There is no other reason for it, no reason to torment people whom you claim to embrace. (2002, p. 473)

Barbarism is their defining feature and oppression the trademark. They move on the path of brutality without remorse and humane feelings for the innocent victims. Resultantly, their cruelty has pushed victims to take arms against these cruel monsters and retaliate in the same way.

Along with the array of similarities, specific differences are found in the selected novels' textual representations. Firstly, the Americans stood victorious in the revolutionary war, whereas the

Indians failed and succumbed to the Raj. While American leaders become national heroes who rule the country, the Indian kings turn beggars: "what is this? The king who protected thousands of people, who fought for his religion and kingdom is lying here like a beggar in the most pathetic condition" (Naikar, 2001, p. 206). Secondly, the British and Americans are fighting more on the political ground, whereas in the case of India, religion is playing its due role in the conflict. As Nana Saheb's proclamation evinces: "I have been commissioned by God to punish the kaffirs annihilating them and to re-establish the Hindu and Muhammadan kingdoms as formerly" (Naikar, 2001, p. 53). Lastly, the Indians are unanimous on considering the English as the foreign exploiters, whereas many American Royalists still think of themselves as the English who are supposed to obey the English king. Therefore, the "staunch loyalists" (Shaara, 2002, p. 46) doubt the actions of the revolutionaries thinking "who dares to fire at the king's troops" (Shaara, 2002, p. 5). These are some of the differences visible between the fictional narratives analyzed in the article.

The above discussion substantiates the point that both of the novelists have an apparent postcolonial predilection that, in turn, gives the text an anticolonial flavor and political color. The establishment of the illegitimacy of the colonial capture, justification of the revolutionary struggles, projection of the native fighters as heroes, demonization of the colonizers— all these factors contribute to the postcolonial formation of these fictions. The novelists have committedly produced the counter-discursive texts to write back to the colonial rhetoric of supremacy. Moreover, they share their basic anticolonial élan and the passion for resistance, albeit some minor differences are found in socio-cultural particularities. Summarily, throughout the texts of the novels, resistance, the most cherished of all the postcolonial themes, is all-pervasive.

## **Conclusion**

The analyses and juxtaposition of these fictional narratives have manifestly evinced their inherent postcoloniality. Essentially rooted in the bellicose nationalist and ideological paradigms of the



respective nations, these novels dismantle the colonial rhetoric of legitimacy of the expansionism of the British Empire and question all the discursive propositions. Repudiation of the act of colonization as a sheer exploitative encroachment, ratification of the revolutions, demonization of the British soldiers, and acclamation of the revolutionaries: these are the manifest discursive projection found in these American and Indian novels about the wars of independence fought against the British colonial control. The basic premise has been affirmed that the

novels are primarily akin to each other, due to their disruptive and deconstructive discursive pattern vis-à-vis the imperialist rhetoric, despite the marginal difference of secondary or tertiary level, due to the geographic positioning, temporal difference, and cultural divergences. Thus, both the aspects, explication of the thematic pattern and identification of the shared stance, have been discussed following the theoretical framework, and the targeted research questions have been resolved in the light of the theoretically informed textual analysis.

## References

- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (Eds.). (1995). *the postcolonial studies reader*. Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2003). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in postcolonial literatures*. Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2007). *Postcolonial studies: The key concepts*. Routledge.
- Chandra, B., Mukherjee, M., Mukherjee, A., & Panikkar, K. N. (1987). *India's Struggle for Independence*. UK: Penguin.
- Cheah, P. (2016). *What is a World? On Postcolonial Literature as World Literature*. Duke University Press.
- Dabashi, H. (2009). *Post-Orientalism: Knowledge and power in a time of terror*. USA: Transaction Publishers.
- Ferguson, N. (2008). *Empire: The rise and demise of the British world order and the lessons for global power*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jain, J., & Singh, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Contesting postcolonialisms*. Rawat Books.
- Judd, D. (2004). *The lion and the tiger: the rise and fall of the British Raj, 1600-1947*. Oxford University Press.
- Levine, P. (2007). *The British Empire: Sunrise to sunset*. UK: Longman.
- Madsen, D. L. (2003). *Beyond the borders: American literature and postcolonial theory*. London: Pluto Press.
- McLeod, J. (2010). *Beginning postcolonialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Middlekauff, R. (1982). *The glorious cause: The American Revolution, 1763-1789*. Oxford University Press.
- Naikar, B. (2001). *The Sun behind the Cloud*. Harper Collins,
- Ramone, J. (2011). *Postcolonial theories*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shaara, J. (2002). *The Glorious Cause*. Ballantine Books,
- Said, E. (1994). *Culture and Imperialism*. 1993. New York: Vintage.
- Tharoor, S. (2017). *Inglorious Empire What the British Did to India*. UK: Scribe Publishers.
- Thieme, J. (2001). *Postcolonial Contexts: Writing back to the Canon*. London, Continuum.
- Trivedi, H., & Allen, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Literature and Nation*. London: Psychology Press.
- Vermeulen, T., & Van Den Akker, R. (2010). Notes on metamodernism. *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture*, 2(1), 5677.
- Young, R. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction*. Blackwell.