CHAPTER VIII:

Conclusion

In the post/ postcolonial era, the areas of nationalism and historiography have been revisited by scholars and theorists in great details from time to time and various discursive formulations have emerged in attempting to understand the historicity of the collective sense of the nation and the traditional dis/continuities embedded in this presentist perception of the global self as an extension of a specific territorial space, operating within and without the confines of the cartographic/ cultural contours. Seen from this perspective, the Uprising of 1857 stands to signify a very important chapter in the context of India, through its role in the development and fostering of the Indian national identity for over centuries now.

It has been an event open to multiple readings and has been explored by historiographers as well as creative artists of various times in order to discover therein the traces of the present and the possibility of a future. Within the heterogeneity of its factual historic existence, the Uprising has been variously portrayed to endorse the homogeneous vision of an upcoming nation-state and used as the signifier of nationalism, in its changing definitions across 150 years now. It would perhaps not be incorrect to observe that the
potential for such diverse readings and representations could be embedded in this single historical event through altering perceptions of time and space, not only because it exemplified a study of resistance against foreign domination, but also as it stood to symbolize a confluence of multiple lives, cultures, races and civilizations.

Though from the disciplinarian point of view history and literature may belong to two distinctly separate categories, yet in understanding the present subject position of an individual or a nation, one must undertake a journey through the crossroads of these two academic disciplines, linked inextricably with each other through the usage of narrative. While the latter explores the potentials of narrative by re/structuring the same in various manners, it would be interesting to note that the former too employs narrative in generating awareness about the past, though institutionalized and sanctified through the authenticity of the events it seeks to describe.

Interestingly, with the changing subject position of the narrator, the nature of historiography changes – as for instance, in the case of the Uprising, the story of the “insurrection” and the “Indian Mutiny” narrated by Malleson becomes the tale of the “first War of Indian Independence” in the hands of Savarkar. It is thus seen that through the interpretations offered to the events of the past, historiography attains a quality of altering analyses and therefore may be said to vary from literature only in degree, not in kind.
Conversely, period literature/s which deal/s with the description of certain historical events and people might also be seen as unofficial historiography of a given nation at a particular point in the time past. Contextually, in *Culture and Imperialism*, Edward Said writes about the novel that it is “a concretely historical narrative shaped by the real history of real nations” (Said 92). The same may be ascertained about other forms of literature as well, for no literary representation ever originates in vacuum. A creative artist is moulded to visualize and comprehend the reality of events and situations at a given point of time through his/her individual as well as collective experience of history. Literature thus becomes a huge cultural archive complementing historiography in shaping an individual’s sense of self and surrounding.

In this dissertation, apart from analyzing the perspectives lent to the Uprising by various historiographers at various points of time and their respective contributions towards the shaping of the nationalist identity/ies, a study of fictional representations has also been provided to understand how this historical event gradually came to be assimilated and reflected upon by the creative artists of various ages – Indian as well as English. However, non-fictional representations have also been included because it is perhaps not incorrect to assume that any narrative about a particular experience which may or may not be the same as the reader’s perspective, might be treated as fiction – voicing the point of view of a certain ‘I’/eye narrator, at a particular point of time under certain specific social circumstances.
Similarly, a study of the representation of the Uprising of 1857 in films has also been documented in order to understand the shifting paradigms of comprehending history as it reaches a global audience as also the common people of India – thereby putting forth yet another form of history as interpreted by the camera – the third person omnipotent narrator of lives and times. When brought together, these multiple representations on the silver screen, placed at their own respective times of production as also into the context of the Uprising, show how film makers have appropriated this historical event to appeal to the immediate needs of the global audience – at times as fables employing imaginary characters, and at times as allegories, glorifying real names from the past, such as Rani Lakshmibai and Mangal Pandey.

As discussed in the first two chapters, the Uprising of 1857 needed to be upheld as a symbol of nationalist integrity and resistance against foreign rule in the early 20th century India and after attainment of political independence, it came to symbolize the picture of national solidarity necessary for the development of a new nation-state – the reason perhaps why the centenary of this historical event was celebrated with such grandeur by the new government of independent India in 1957. It would be worthwhile to remember here that G.N. Devy in his celebrated book *After Amnesia* observes – “no organic connection exists between the past and the present”, and further, “the relation with it is romantic, and thrives on fantasy” (Devy 30-31). It was this phenomenological strategy which liberated the Uprising from the confines of historical time and space, and all round attempts were made to link it inseparably with the idea of popular resistance by
people united despite their cultural diversities in the favour of a single independent nation.

Apart from rewriting the history of the Uprising as in the book by Surendranath Sen¹, a very interesting instance of such exploration of history from the nationalist perspective was attempted by Amritlal Nagar in his book entitled *Gadar Ke Phool*. Initially published as an initiative of the Department of Information and Public Relations, Government of Uttar Pradesh in 1957, Nagar’s book is written in the form of a travelogue as he wanders through the various small and little known villages and districts of the state looking for the traces and impact of the Uprising, if any, among the common people.

During his journey, Nagar records his conversations with various elderly people of different areas who had grown up listening to the tales of the Uprising from their predecessors, and tries to seek the names of those local martyrs, still revered in their own areas, but lost to the archives of nationalist historiography. He builds up a narrative of pride and glory from the regional legends and folk beliefs and puts forth certain legends—known as well as anonymous, who did not survive in public memories after the failure of the rebellion, such as Balbhadra Singh, Abhiram Ali, Bhawanishankar Dikshit, Ajab Singh, Allahbaksh, Prasad Shukla, Achchhan Khan, Baba Ramcharan Das, Amir Ali and Bujhavan Pandey—all of who are known to have lost their lives fighting against the British rule in the Uprising.
Amritlal Nagar begins his book with a dedicatory verse to the “eighteen year old young warrior/ the unmatched Abhimanyu Sri Balbhadra Singh/ (the thakur of Chehlari)” who was killed in the battlefield while fighting the British army and immortalized in the fond remembrances of his own people (Nagar 04). He moves through the locales of Awadh including the birthplace of Mangal Pandey in the district of Faizabad. It is here that he comes across the name of Bujhavan Pandey – the nephew of Mangal Pandey, who is known to have joined in the rebellion and went missing after the war. Away from the records of mainstream official historiography, Nagar traces the journey of Nanasahib across Awadh into Nepal after the Uprising along with a person named Bhawanishankar Dikshit where he “decided to spend the rest of his life as a sanyasi” and passed away in 1936 (Nagar 21).

It would be interesting to note here that apart from bringing up the names of these martyrs, Nagar also observes how the ancestral gods and goddesses of the local rulers came to be deified by tales relating to the Uprising and concludes that such folk beliefs only re-assert the faith that “even if the kings had lost the battle to the British, their ancestral gods and goddesses had demonstrated their divine powers to the latter” through actions of resistance such as the one at Dariyabad where all the horses of the English army were killed overnight when they tried to convert the room meant for worship at the palace into a stable (Nagar 18). Such stories embedded in the lives of the common people of a region portray their strong belief which animates the past by elevating it above the confines of historical archives.
Regarding the controversy about whether the Uprising may be considered as a nationalist event at all since it was confined to certain areas and took place before India came to recognize itself as a nation in terms of political boundaries, Amritlal Nagar writes—

“though hundred years back, the people did not know their country in terms of cartographic outlines, yet they had the awareness, the sense of self-respect to keep the control of their land with themselves; and if this is not the seed of patriotism, then what is it?” (Nagar 30). About the failure of the rebellion he writes—“in the Uprising of 1857, it was actually our intrinsic weaknesses which were defeated, and after the rebellion, the new youth of India came together variously to put an end to these flaws” (Nagar 15).

Nagar turns the tables upon R.C. Majumdar of whom he writes—“he felt that this drama of 1857 was limited to the people of Delhi, Bundelkhand, Bhojpur and Bihar, especially crafted by the sepoys of Awadh, as if the rest of the nation was seated at the Star Theatre in Kolkata watching these evil deeds of the upcountry Indians feeding upon barley”, and adds further justifying himself—“neither am I in favour of concealing the weaknesses of the nation, nor do I wish to console or cheat myself about the glory of the Uprising; but I also do not wish to mislead, discourage or choke my own people by putting all my emphasis upon the faults and maintaining a blind eye towards the positive attributes” (Nagar 60). This is where he joins the nationalist agenda of the Indian government in re-exploring the Uprising of 1857 at the turn of the century, by integrating it, through the form of travel-narrative with the soil and the loka.
Interestingly, Nagar explains history as a developing phenomenon originating within the local people as he notes how time generates certain names which then come to be associated with the Uprising – one such example being Baba Ramsanachi of Dariyabad, whose tomb is revered as being that of one who died in the Uprising, but who, as it is later discovered, is in no way related to this historical event. This is where historiography ceases to remain confined to the facts and shows a continuous metamorphosis to assimilate more than archival records by being open to imagining and imaging. While the loka adds to the glory of history by imagining associations, the image of a historical event undergoes gradual transformation in magnitude as these beliefs come to be passed from one generation to another – thereby, making historiography a dynamic process of ever-growing convictions rather than a static record of calendar dates and names.

One such example is the name of Maniram Dewan of Assam, which soon came to be closely linked with the history of the Uprising, though he finds little mention in this context, when compared to the towering images of Mangal Pandey, Rani Lakshmibai, Tantia Tope and Nanasahib. In his book entitled *Assam in Indian Independence*, Arun Bhattacharjee writes – “when the news of the outbreak of the Sepoy Mutiny reached Assam, Maniram Dewan, the hero of India’s First War of Independence, welcomed it. He thought of organizing a similar uprising in Assam with the object of re-establishing the Ahom rule…” (Bhattacharjee 11). According to the records, Maniram Dewan was executed at Jorhat in 1858, and Bhattacharjee observes “the soil of Assam became red
with the martyr’s blood. Maniram died. But his blood did not go in vain” – thereby linking Assam as a representative state of the North-East India actively with the ‘first war of Indian independence’ and intensifying an image of an integrated nation even in the 19th century (Bhattacharjee 14).

It would be worthwhile to remember here that an Assamese film entitled *Maniram Dewan* by Sarbeswar Chakraborty was awarded the President’s Silver Award in 1963, and also contextually, the crucial role played by Assam in the second Indo-Chinese War as the site of foreign attack upon the newly developed nation stood at the border of this state in the North-East. With due regard to the person and the region, one is reminded of what Bhabha says in this context in his book entitled *Location of Culture* – “the political unity of the nation consists in a continual displacement of the anxiety of its irredeemably plural modern space – representing the nation’s modern territoriality is turned into the archaic, atavistic temporality of Traditionalism. The difference of space returns as the Sameness of time, turning Territory into Tradition, turning the People into One” (Bhabha 213).
The institutionalization of a certain time and space specific event in the past calls for continuous mention of the same by emphasizing the importance of the event in order to make it a part of the collective national consciousness of a nation. Apart from celebrating the centenary of the Uprising, many other such efforts were undertaken by the new Government of India, one of them being issuing of commemorative stamps in the memory of these martyrs. It would be important to remember in this context that immediately after independence letters were the only means for the common people to remain in touch with near ones living in distant lands.

Viewed from this angle, the department of Philately played a vital role in making the names of Rani Lakshmibai, Nanasahib, Tantia Tope, Begum Hazratmahal and Bahadur Shah Zafar a part of almost every household. Some of the earliest stamps to be issued by the postal department were a 15 paise stamp of Rani Lakshmibai and a memorial stamp of the Uprising issued in 1957. This tradition of commemorative stamps was revived in 2007 to mark the 150th anniversary of the Uprising when two more such stamps were issued depicting scenes from the battlefield describing ‘the first war of Indian Independence’.

While the history textbooks of the new learners of independent India carried the message of the Uprising as a nationalist movement, this education was supplemented by popular books meant for children such as Amar Chitra Katha, which published two such volumes called *Rani of Jhansi – The Flame of Freedom* and *Mangal Pande – He Fired the First*
Shot. With their slogan which claims to be “the route to your roots”, at the very beginning of each volume the publication declares – “when they look back at their formative years, many Indians nostalgically recall the vital part Amar Chitra Katha picture books have played in their lives...that first gave them a glimpse of their glorious heritage”. Beginning its journey in 1967, this publication now forms a network of multiple stores all over India and facilitates the delivery of books worldwide, catering to the age of globalization and diaspora – thereby becoming an important instrument of perpetuating popular history, in this case, that of the 1857 Uprising.

Simplified for the understanding of the young readers, the volumes of Amar Chitra Katha on Rani Lakshmibai and Mangal Pande respectively, provide an abridged glimpse of their life during the Uprising and maximum space is given to illustrate their heroic deeds at their respective sites of action. It would be worthwhile to note that in the volume on Rani Lakshmibai, the protagonist is not given a single dialogue until the death of Raja Gangadhar Rao – in accordance with the customary understanding of gender roles in the Indian society. She is shown to be vocal for the first time in assuming the responsibilities of the state and even sending an envoy to London appealing for the recognition of her adopted son – the latter event imaginable only to the young readers of post-independence India.

In her book entitled The Classic Popular Amar Chitra Katha 1967-2007, Nandini Chandra observes that “women warriors have to be strictly seen with mythopoeic lenses”
and adds further — "what motivates these women to don male armour is not so much the idea of territorial liberation but the need to preserve the kingdom till the regent prince reaches an age where he can claim and defend his own...therefore, it is their role as mother that is emphasised" (Chandra 177). It is thus the figure of Lakshmibai riding a horse with her sword in a hand and little Damodar Rao tied to her back, which becomes the icon of reverence and celebration, rendered culturally acceptable by the visual implication of her role as a mother.

Similarly, the same volume provides a picture of the rebellion at Meerut and says that these "nationalist soldiers" received a "warm welcome" at Delhi, as the picture shows the local people of Delhi crowding gleefully to welcome the rebels. The transformation of the sepoys from 'rebels' to 'nationalist soldiers' conveys the message of social acceptability of the Uprising from the nationalist point of view. Further, Lakshmibai is shown to refuse shelter to the Englishmen when the rebels arrive at Jhansi. Interestingly, the inhumanity and violence of the massacre at Jhansi is completely concealed from the emerging youth by eradicating the existence of English women and children. History is thus seen to become a stage where light is shed only upon the required area as per the nationalist agenda of celebrating "the life of India's greatest heroine in the struggle for freedom".

*Mangal Pande* on the other hand, a volume of 31 pages, provides a detailed pictorial description of the rising social dissatisfaction about the Company among the sepoys and allows Mangal Pande to emerge as a distinct person speaking aloud for the first time,
A bust of Mangal Pandey at a park named ‘Shahid Mangal Pandey Udyan’ at Barrackpore
only once all the doubts among the sepoys regarding the cartridges have been authenticated after 18 pages. He is said to have been known among his regiment for his "mild temperament", thereby establishing a reasonable picture of the historical personage, acceptable to the young minds as sensible and calm instead of infuriated and ill tempered. Diversion from historical facts is visible as the sepoys are shown to have had the truth about the cartridges from the ammunition manufacturing station at Dumdum. The controversial issue of Mangal Pande having been under the influence of bhang never figures in the narrative and thus he is established as the protagonist who dared to stand for his own faith and religion and finally accepted having acted of his own will at the trial.3

Interestingly, the volume ends with the rest of the 34th Native Infantry being disbanded, after which the sepoys return to their villages celebrating this newly earned freedom instead of grieving upon their lost jobs. It is said that at their homes "they were treated as heroes" while the picture depicts a woman performing the traditional aarti known to be performed after one's victorious return from the battlefield. The last visual shows the map of India where the places of the Uprising are marked distinctly with the respective dates and the statement which sums up the heroic saga of Mangal Pande observes - "the Great Mutiny had begun, and Mangal Pande had struck the first blow". The perplexing and disjointed historical incident of Mangal Pandey at Barrackpore thus comes to be incorporated within the well-knit tapestry of mainstream nationalist struggle.
In his book called 'Of Many Heroes', G.N. Devy writes – “the process of exclusion and inclusion of events in historical narratives is tacitly guided by the general principles of inclusion and exclusion sanctioned by the community for which, and within which, the narrative is being constructed” (Devy 07). From this point of view, the representation of Mangal Pande and Rani Lakshmibai in these abridged pictorial versions can be seen to be adhering to the popular images related to these names as constructed in the minds of the people through a process of nationalist acculturation. Devy further observes – “history is ideally speaking, an interrelationship between facts and narratives, between the course of history and the discourse of history” (Devy 168). While the ‘course’ of history is factual and fixed, it is the concept of the ‘discourse’ which lends to it a fluidity to enlarge and accommodate in accordance with the developing worldviews and understanding of facts as per the subject position of the individual.

It is, therefore, not surprising that based upon this strong sense of inclusion and belongingness, the nation should have celebrated 150 years of the Uprising with such enthusiasm. The publication of numerous academic volumes about the Uprising on this occasion only stands to testify the ways in which this historical event came to be re-visited and re-evaluated within the ever-growing intellectual traditions of the nation in order to incorporate multiple discourses. Similarly, the recent fictional representations enable a renewed understanding of latent possibilities within a world now remote, from a desirable objective distance to facilitate a more tolerant and accommodative vision of the past, in the completely altered present global scenario. It would be worthwhile to remember here that unlike the perspective adopted for comprehending the Uprising in
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1957, this time the viewpoint is not that of 20th century nationalism, but 21st century nationalism/s where the target reader is global, holds a pluralist identity and recognizes existence of differences as a natural possibility.

Acceptance of plurality through the course of the last 50 years, thus, gradually comes to replace the elitist understanding and portrayal of the Uprising being a nationalist movement under the leadership of certain rulers. Heterogeneity of the nature of the rebellion is stressed upon in looking at it as an accumulation of several movements of resistance scattered through a large geographical area of the country – each with its own cause but primarily directed against foreign oppression. In this process the subalternized sections come to attain identities of their own, for while 1957 saw the issuance of a commemorative stamp in the memory of Rani Lakshmibai, the turn of the century comes to recognize the contribution of Jhalkaribai – the little known daughter of a Bundelkhandi farmer who posed as the queen of Jhansi in front of Hugh Rose when Jhansi was taken over so that Lakshmibai could get the time enough to escape safely from the fort with her son Damodar, in the form of a commemorative stamp issued in her honour in 2001.

In *The Empire Writes Back*, the authors note that “a major feature of post colonial literatures is the concern with place and displacement” (Ashcroft 08). It would be worthwhile to remember here that literature in all societies across ages has been a linguistic expression of existence. This concern with ‘place and displacement’ can thus be seen to derive from life itself. Since generation of ‘discourse’ is directly proportional
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to power hierarchy, the perception of the 1857 rebellion as the Sepoy Mutiny came to form the centre of discourse during the colonial rule, while the voices silenced by the fear of 'retribution' came to form the margins. However, as Amartya Sen observes in *The Argumentative Indian* - “a defeated argument that refuses to be obliterated can remain very alive”, with the end of the colonial rule and the post colonial quest for suppressed identity/ies, a continuous tussle between the discourses till now forming the defined 'centre' and the 'margin' came to be initiated (Sen 06).

Interestingly, with the change in the subject-position of the individual as the 'centre' and the 'margin' are defined and re-defined, this continuous clash also comes to signify a continuous interaction between two 'centres' – independent in themselves, and yet interdependent to comprise a complete picture. Taken together thus, as the 'margin' claims the point of 'centricity' with its rapidly widening range of discourse/s, the entire picture which forms the story of two nations, two races and civilizations comes to be understood as being linked to each other in a rather complex and inseparable manner of existence. It is this confluence of the two nations through equations of power, love and perhaps even hatred, which makes the Uprising of 1857, in a way, a site of cultural pilgrimage for both the nations – providing them with a better insight into mutual tolerance and co-existence across a history of strife.

It is not surprising, therefore, that in the present context of independent political existence and interdependent economic ties, the 150th anniversary of the Uprising should involve
packages of 'Mutiny Tour' arranged by the travel agents of both India as well as England and encouraged by Uttar Pradesh Tourism – the state which felt the tremors of the rebellion most intensely in the past. Most of these tours, arranged for the citizens of England, covered the sites of violence and the cemeteries across Delhi, Meerut, Lucknow, Kanpur, Gwalior and Jhansi, and though they mention that “the rebellion was marked by atrocities on both sides", almost all these tours claim their importance from the distant colonial perspective by declaring – “more Victoria Crosses were awarded in this short period than the Second World War”. Stating the sites to be covered in detail along with their historical significance in the detailed itinerary, in one of the websites called dicoverindia.net, the Orientalist image of the East is re-invoked as their unique sales proposition announces – “nowhere in the World would it be so easy to turn back the pages of History as in India”.

While the tour conductors uphold the exceptional position of India in the history of the British Empire along with a stress upon the traditionalist preservation of the past in this country, it is interesting to note how they encash the multiple discourses of history which gradually came to be associated with the Uprising by reviving simultaneously the sentiment of the erstwhile colonizer and the colonized through retaining an ambiguity in the usage of the word ‘heritage’. Contextually, an article entitled ‘Mutiny and the Bounty’ in India Today states – “the tourism directorate has been working on a comprehensive plan to attract ‘Mutiny tourists’ and help them understand the events and the people involved. The plan includes identifying the sites, cleaning them up, providing signboards with details of events”. This perhaps provides a wonderful example of
ascribing historicity to a particular place in retrospect, away from the specific historical dimensions of time and space.

The reason for dwelling upon this incident in detail is the fact that ten years from now, this kind of a cultural exchange and shared reverence of two nations towards a historical event from different and often contradictory angles, will also come to be seen as an extension of the history of the Uprising of 1857 in an era of post/post colonial existence. That this entire exercise was of immense importance is also asserted by Hugh Purcell in his book entitled *After the Raj* (2008). In his Postscript to the book called ‘The Indian Mutiny of 2007’, he writes of the stiff opposition and demonstrations the tourists from England faced during the tour after The Rifles Regiment expressed the desire to present a plaque at St. James Church in the memory “of the bravery and distinguished service of the first battalion of the 60th, The King’s Royal Rifle Corps, at Meerut and Delhi between 10th May and 20th September 1857” (Purcell 202).

Purcell notes that “like the Uprising of old, the protest spread and increased in ferocity...in Agra our hotel was invaded by a mob shouting *Angrez Hatao* (‘English Out!’) and *Mangal Pande ki jai* (‘Long live Mangal Pande’, the first Indian martyr in the War of Independence)” (ibid). Whatever might have been the motivation behind these demonstrations by local people, one cannot miss the popular perception of the Uprising as established in India and the sentiments related to the same being voiced in this protest as the proposal to present a plaque is seen to humiliate the first martyrs of the soil.
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It would be important to recognize here that this sense of nationalist consciousness springing from the Uprising could not have been possibly achieved by official historiography alone without the aid of the representations in literature – oral as well as written, fiction as well as non-fiction, and films, which popularized and concretized the concept of one’s identity as a citizen of India with reference to the Uprising of 1857. While dates confine events to a certain era, it is the various forms of representations which enable the ethos of the same to permeate through the boundaries of time and space into the realms of contemporary existence – as in this case, the Uprising of 1857 comes to signify a perplexing pattern of myriad viewpoints and analyses in portraying worlds apart and worlds united through a shared experience of history.

Just like the truth of the incident of resistance referred to by Purcell, the preparations for celebrating 150 years by the government of India and welcoming tourists from England is equally true. This multiplicity of truths lends to the Uprising the ability to transcend historicity by becoming a part of the existential conscience penetrating lives through repeated modes of representations – from then and there to here and now. As multiple discourses related to this historical event jostle for centricity, they communicate, contradict and coalesce to reveal the journey of humankind as a story of progress and development across races/nations/civilizations through the universal grounds of humanitarianism.
If history should signify a sense of the past events of a nation or civilization, then 'sense' is perhaps derived from those people's understanding of it, whose past it stands to record. While it is true that in the 19th century during the Uprising, India was yet to arrive at its sense of being an integrated nation and that in the Uprising, all the participating states and rulers had their own reasons and motives, one cannot deny the role of the common people who lived to incorporate these tales of heroism in the oral/ written literature/s of various regions, and thereby immortalized the spirit of this historic period of resistance against foreign rule beyond space and time. When the English and Indian non/ fictional accounts are read together, the Uprising of 1857 can be seen to be primarily a signifier of loss of human lives and resistance of violence. While there is anger, pride and an indomitable spirit of defiance, this period also holds within itself one of the finest examples of inter-human relationships and trans-cultural coexistence. Such an event cannot be kept confined in any particular academic discipline, for life as it stands to be comprehended, perhaps, is an amalgamation of history and literature.

* Translations of excerpts from Amritlal Nagar's book are mine.
Notes:

1. Discussed in Chapter 2 – ‘Conceptualizing the Nation’.

2. Ibid.

3. When questioned about whether he was under the influence of any drugs at his trial, Mangal Pandey had replied – “Yes, I have been taking bhang and opium of late, but formerly never touched any drugs. I was not aware at the time of what I was doing” (Sarup 109).

4. This impact might be said to have been achieved by the film entitled Rang De Basanti in the context of 20th century nationalism in India, as the girl from England lands up in the alien country and takes the initiative which enables the present youth of the nation to relocate its roots amidst the figures of the nationalist leaders of 20th century India – thereby introducing an altogether different discourse from the present perspective of post/postcolonialism.