

**Tughlaq as an Allegory of Nehruvian Era**

**– Deependra Chand (December, 2010)**

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY**

**Tughlaq as an Allegory of Nehruvian Era**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of Master of Arts in English**

**By  
Deependra Chand**

**Central Department of English  
Kirtipur, Kathmandu  
December 2010**

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY**

**Tughlaq as an Allegory of Nehruvian Era**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of Master of Arts in English**

**By**

**Deependra Chand**

**Central Department of English**

**Kirtipur, Kathmandu**

**December 2010**

**Tribhuvan University**  
**Central Department of English**

**Letter of Recommendation**

Mr. Deependra Chand has completed his thesis entitled "Tughlaq as an Allegory of Nehruvian Era" under my supervision. He carried out his research from August 2009 to January, 2010. I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted for viva voce.

---

Mr. Jivnath Lamsal

Supervisor

December , 2010

**Tribhuvan University**  
**Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**  
**Central Department of English**

**Letter of Approval**

This thesis entitled "Tughlaq as an Allegory of Nehruvian Era", submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University Kirtipur by Deependra Chand, has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Head

\_\_\_\_\_

Central Department of English

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Acknowledgements**

The present research would have been difficult to complete without the scholarly guidance and insightful suggestion of my honorable thesis supervisor Mr. Jivnath Lamsal, Central Department of English. So I am very indebted to his guidance.

I would like to express my sincere and profound gratitude to Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, Head of the Central Department of English for his kind co-operation and encouragement to complete this research. I equally give hearty thanks to my respected teachers Dr. Arun Gupto, Dr. Shiva Rijal and Mr. Bal Bahadur Thapa for their valuable suggestions and advice to keep my research going. I would like to give my thanks to all the teachers of Central Department of English for their help and suggestion.

I am most grateful and deeply indebted to my respected parents for their inspiration, encouragement and providing me an opportunity to achieve the degree. I am grateful to my uncle Bal Bahadur Chand for his kind support for this research work. Finally, special thanks go to Mr. Rajendra Pant who always encouraged and inspired me to complete my thesis.

December, 2010

**Deependra Chand**

## Abstract

Girish Karnad in his drama *Tughlaq* depicts the scenario of the post colonial India with the help of the historical character Sultan Tughlaq and his reign. In the drama the Sultan and his ruling system is allegorized to the Nehruvian era of post-independent India. In the drama Karnad tries to show the issues of colonialism and its onslaught and hangover in India that is quite prevalent even after independence. There was a great challenge to Indian leadership to maintain harmony in politics, religion, culture and economy to a newly independent India, which was under long colonial rule of the British. In the drama Girish Karnad allegorizes the 13<sup>th</sup> century reign of Delhi Sultanate Mummahad – Bin – Tughlaq to post colonized India under Jawaharlal Nahru's leadership. Girish Karnad presents the effects of colonization in post colonized India and how the nation with a long colonial history suffers to change norms and values established by colonizers. Karnad has allegorized the character of Sultan Tughlaq to Nehru; as both Tughlaq and Nehru despite having an extraordinary leadership quality, great intellectuals and idealist failed to lead their states.

## Content

Chapter I: Introduction	1
Chapter II: Post Colonialism: Concept and Definition	11
Post Colonial Literature in India	18
Chapter III: Tughlaq as an Allegory of Nehruvian Era	27
Chapter IV: Conclusion	42

## Chapter I

### Introduction

This research is an attempt to probe into the issue of postcolonial and allegorical significance of the independent India. The two decades of Indian independence under Nehru's idealistic but troubled leadership failed to meet the India drama of Nehruvian era. Despite an extraordinary intellect and idealistic leadership Nehruvian era was a mere failure. Girish Karinad's *Tughlaq* is a compelling allegory of Nehruvian era. The age of Muhammad-bin-Tughlaq was similar to the age of Nehru after independence in Indian history. Tughlaq, an emperor of medieval India, was a failure due to lack of political policies to other countries as well as internal economic policies which is similar to Nehru and his reign in India. After India became independent the political situation of the country became worse in terms of internal issues such as the issues of minority, dalits, Muslims and women. However the international political policy of Nehru is successful in many ways, he was failure in these internal agendas.

Before its independence India was never a single country but a bunch of different entities. Many predicted that India, because of diversities in its cultures, religion, languages, castes, manners, local histories, nationalities and identities, would not survive as a single democratic country, but would break up into smaller countries. Since independence, India had many political problems. During independence the most burning issues were the riots between the Hindus and Muslims while the Sikhs were with Hindus. Nehru as a prime minister was -failed to address such problems which are cultural rather than political. In this context D. D. Kosambi says:

Under Nehru's leadership, the government attempted to develop India quickly by embarking on agrarian reform and rapid industrialization. A successful land reform was introduced that abolished giant landholdings, but efforts to



redistribute land by placing limits on landownership failed. Attempts to introduce large-scale cooperative farming were frustrated by landowning rural elites. It is not only the case of land rather its connectivity to the large amount of population which has its own cultural and social significance, which means, obviously the entire politics became worthless. This is, merely the failure of Nehru's leadership. (249-250)

As D. D. Kosambi claims in the above extract Nehru became fail in internal politics for last decade of his time. He was unable to solve the problem of farmers and related groups in the society such as the ethnic groups and Muslims. The political situation in the country frustrated people all over the India. In the age of Tughlaq he had favored the Hindus in his state of Delhi. He tried his best to solve the problem of riots but failed due to the concept of the people psychologically established which opposed the Hindu in Muslim emperor. Most of the Muslims in this county denied following his order which support the Hindus in the nation. It was the issue of their orthodox Islamic religion. Moreover Tughlaq changed his capital city and purposed for new policies in economy and development sectors and the bureaucracy did not help him-, thus, he failed to his policy and due to chaos he had become insane at last. In this context R.C. Majumdar says:

Tughlaq ensures himself for siding with the Hindus and mixing privately with yogis. It has been contended that the Sultan had the audacity to employ and treat the *ulama* and saints like ordinary man and he was therefore a blasphemer. As a matter of fact the high classes of Muslims, including official classes, the itlania, the judges and other Muslims, a body of people who had hitherto enjoyed sanctity, were the ringleaders of the Muslim rebellions against the Sultan ... thus, although it may be not pronounced Muhammad Tughlaq as lacking in orthodox religious spirit, his general attitude toward the

Muslim divines, and particularly the severe punishment he inflicted upon them, must be regarded as a serious blemish in his character. (86)

The above paragraph shows the similarities between Nehru's India and the emperor of Sultan Tughlaq. Both of them failed to their policy in a same way as both of them were progressive in their thinking but the way they choose to change the society and the nation seems problematic by which they failed.

Nehru presided over the introduction of a modified, Indian version of state planning and control over the economy. Creating the Planning commission of India , Nehru drew up the first Five-Year Plan in 1951, which charted the government's investments in industries and agriculture. Increasing business and income taxes, Nehru envisaged a mixed economy in which the government would manage strategic industries such as mining, electricity and heavy industries, serving public interest and a check to private enterprise. Nehru pursued land redistribution and launched programs to build irrigation canals, dams and spread the use of fertilizers to increase agricultural production. He also pioneered a series of community development programs aimed at spreading diverse cottage industries and increasing efficiency into rural India . For such development large amount of budget was necessary for which the government established the tax system. Nehru was the head of the integrated India but as long as Tughlaq's history concern he was an Emperor of Delhi areas. Tughlaq pursued the industries and other trade unions at that time which was for instance, the progressive step for democratic rule. He changed the gold currency into paper currency which valued the gold and silver coins. In the market this system was failure with several obstacles along with it. In terms of economy Nehru and Tughlaq failed in their policies. In a way the age of Nehru is allegory to the age of Tughlaq. Amiya Kumar Bagchi illustrates the failure in terms of economy of Tughlaq and Nehru as follows:

[...] The then, had the novel idea of introducing for the first time in India the concept of token currency, using brass and copper coin rather than silver. Very few people exchanged their gold/silver coins for the new copper ones. The new currency was also easy to forge so there were heavy losses due to this. After the plan failed there were heaps of copper coins lying around the Royal offices for years which is the main cause of his failure but while talking about Nehru's failure he failed by his own policy such as planning commission for national plans, railways, international trade policy and the concept to nationalize the oil industries, tea plantation and land reforms. Though these policies are expected to make great economy but in reality he failed for the first time in independent India. (100-101)

This is similar story of failure of these two great leaders of their time. In the above paragraph the way of the failure seems to be the same. It is not only the economy and for the failure of Nehru there are other reasons, however, the religious issues and other post-colonial hangover is another cause of his failure. Nehru tried for religious consideration among Hindu, Muslims and Sikkhas but the entire political stand is not prepared for this action in India. Due to colonial hang over there are several issues and demand ahead of the government. The tug of war between different places, states, ethnic groups, various religion and democratic and communists Nehru and his, government failed to solve all the problems. At the time of Tughlaq he tried to make all the people facilitated from government but there was the main problem of religion of Muslims to implement this concept. In this concept M. Visveswaraya says about Nehru's failure as follows:

Nehru was great figure in World politics from India but there are some issues where he fails to make them proper for his future policy in India. As long as colonial hang over concern Nehru knew the entire environment and his

politically calculation of the situation is right but his policy of being close to Muslims and advocacy for their rights affects the entire Indian politics and there becomes a trend to use Muslims as vote bank at the time of elections. However it is Nehru's success theoretically in politics but due to the Indian psychology hanged in the late colonial phase does not accept it [...] where the system misleads and blames Nehru for his religious propaganda. (37)

It is religious issue which merely fails Nehru in Indian politics but Nehru seems one of the famous and successful politicians from India in terms of foreign policy. Due to the same religious policy Tughlaq was failed King of his time. This allegory fits to the Nehruvian era.

*Tughlaq* the drama by Karnad presents the history of Indian Sultan and his life at the time of reign. Girish Raghunath Karnad was born on 19 May 1938 in Matheran near Bombay into a Konkani speaking family. His initial schooling was in Marathi. Karnad is the first generation playwright after India became independent. He accomplished his B.A. from Karnataka University Dharwad, Karnataka in 1958 and he secured a Rhodes scholarship at Oxford for three years where he studied at Lincoln and Magdalene colleges. After the completion of M.A. in philosophy, political science and economics he became a visiting professor and Fulbright scholar in resident at the University of Chicago.

Girish Karnad is a playwright, actor, director and dramatist is a most famous. His works written in Kannad have been widely translated into English and all major Indian Languages. *Yayati* is his first play, extracted from *Mahabharata*, reinterprets the myth of king Yayati, an early ancestor of Kuru dynasty.

*Hayavadana*, the award winning play performed in 1972 carries the theme of alienation, identity crisis, quest for completeness and sense of modernity. Devdatta, Kapila and Padmini all major characters are alienated from each other though they are together. The

drama is based on 11<sup>th</sup> century Indian text *Kathasaritsagara* by Som Dev and Thomas Mann's *Transposed Heads* as well as Indian myth.

*Nagamandala* 1988 by Girish Karnad uses the folk element in the form of theatre. In this drama he presents the condition of women in the Third World since the Aryan civilization. The plot of the drama is based on two folk tales from Karnataka where the character Rani suffers due to patriarchy.

His other plays are *Telendana*, *The Dreams of Ppu Sultan*, *Two Monologues*, *Flowers*, *Broken Images* and *Wedding Album* are popular among the readers as Karnad presents the modern way of writing the drama in Indian literature.

*Tughlaq* is a historical play based on the advent of 14<sup>th</sup> century Indian history of Sultan Mohammed Tughlaq and his Kingdom in Delhi. The drama presents the political situation of his state with different policies. The theme of the drama is similar to the politics of India after independence. The drama is concerned with contemporary political issues. First idealistic and visionary politics played by national leaders like Mahatma Gandhi and Nehru, secondly the politics of power among the groups that are separated by religious or racial differences. Karnad himself comments about the drama as follows:

My subject was the life of Muhammad Tughlaq, a fourteenth Sultan of Delhi, certainly the most brilliant individual ever to ascend the throne of Delhi and also one of the biggest failures. After a reign distinguished for politics that today seems far-cited to the point of genius, but which in their day earned him the title 'Muhammad the Mad', the Sultan ended his career in bloodshed and political chaos. In a sense the play reflected the slow disillusionment my generation felt with the new politics of independent India: the gradual erosion of the ethnical norms that had guided the movement for independence, the coming to terms with cynicism and realpolitik. (7)

Here in the above lines Karnad tries to show the relationship of Tughlaq to the independent India when Nehru was head of the state. Karand's attempt to show such relationship is merely the allegory of 14<sup>th</sup> century India to the India of 60s. This comparison is suitable in a sense that both are failure in basic policies and ended their career in political chaos.

Grish Karnad's *Tughlaq* deals with troubled Nehruvian era through the protagonist of the play sultan Tughlaq and other characters and events of the play. The complex character of Tughlaq is the major medium to represent troubled Nehruvian era. This drama is full of violence, political anarchy, social disorder and destruction. This play is parallel to the socio-political condition of Nehruvian era. This drama is analyzed from different perspective, new-historicism, cross-cultural, cultural encounter and social realism. Reviewing on Grish Karnad's *Tughlaq*, U. R. Ananthamurthy an eminent Kannada novelist remarked:

Karnad is the poet of drama. The use of history and mythology to tackle contemporary themes gives him the psychological distance to comment on our times. *Tughlaq* worked so well because it was not a realistic play however it is the history of the nation which is similar to the age of Nehru and his political career. Both Nehru and Tughlaq have the brilliant individual character but in politics both are failure which is Karand's attempt to make the theme of the drama. (9)

Thus Karnad has an ingenuity to transcend the past and history into contemporary and present as we will see in *Tughlaq*.

Karnad's second play *Tughlaq* is a compelling allegory on the Nehruvian era, it was performed by the National School of Drama repertory under Ebrahim Alkazi's direction with the noted actor Monohar Singh as the grandiose and visionary, but despotic Tughlaq, Karnad had arrived. In the play history as a discourse is proper source of narrative in the text,

however, it also provides the scope for antithetical and dialectical approach to the 'History' of Sultanate period which was the account of terror and violence and also simultaneously the very source of Hindu Bhakti movement. Another critic Rajunder Paul opined about Karnad's *Tughlaq* in these words:

The most idealistic, the most intelligent king ever to come (to) the throne of Delhi including the Mughal who nevertheless, ended as one of the greatest failure because of contradictions in his personality and the self defining nature of his politics. The 20 years period of Tughlaq's decline as a ruler also offered striking parallels to the two decades of Indian independence under Nehru's idealistic but troubled leadership and Nehru appeared remarkably like Tughlaq in his propensity for failure despite an extraordinary intellect. (12)

As Tughlaq fails in his reign because of contradiction in his personality and political mutuality between different power holders in the Kingdom Nehru fails due to his over confidence and lack of visionary concept towards the entire politics. The critic also notices this contradiction in Nehru 's personality. In this way he draws parallelism between Nehru and Tughlaq. In this context Dharwadker observes:

Karnad revives the paradoxical Tughlaq of history and occasionally constructs his ideologue verbatim out of various historical documents especially Barani's contemporaneous account of Tughlaq's reign, the *Tarikh-i-Firoj Shahi*. He also follows the chronology of Tughlaq's reign closely, mixes historical characters (such as Baranai, Najib, Sheikh Imam and Aziz), and thus creates a complex ideological and inter textual connection between history, historiography and his fiction. The effect of such interlineations, moreover, is not to perpetuate but to problematize the received history of Tughlaq: the play urges contemporary Indian audiences to scrutinize the premodern and colonial

institutions that have created their understanding of the past, and to question institutionalized history a source of knowledge. (xx)

Chandra observes the play is the account of the or the documentary of the reign of Muhammad-bin Tughlaq the most visionary and the rationalist but the worst failure, which started under in auspicious circumstances and till his last breathe his experiments which were indeed remarkable but misconstrued by his subjects and time, could not befit his visionary foresightedness and 'has been dubbed an 'ill- started idealist.' So, it is an endeavor of objective study of sultanate era especially Tughlaq, who is in the centre by his virtue of cruelty and generosity. In this manner, many critics have interpreted this play from various perspectives. No extensive research has been undertaken on it from the postcolonial perspective so far. Therefore, this study aspires to prove that Tughlaq is an allegory of the Nehruvian era. *Tughlaq* is an allegory of Nehruvian decolonized India as Nehru, due to the colonial onslaught and its hangover, failed to lead decolonized India to success though he was an ideal statesman the way Muhammad-bin-Tughlaq, an ideal Sultan, in Karnad's *Tughlaq*, fails to protect his country.

This research work has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter mainly provides an introductory outline of the study. It incorporates the explanation of the hypothesis in terms of how the allegory of Tughlaq is suitable to the Nehruvian era. It also provides a detailed introduction of the playwright and his works

The second chapter is the development of theoretical modality that is to be applied in this research paper. It gives short introduction to the allegory and comparison of two ages in the history of India . This part of work deals with the idea of allegory which will be the critical approach to the study of text.

The- third chapter of research is an analysis of the text at a considerable length on the basis of second chapter. It will cite out some extract from the text to prove the hypothesis of



the study. The chapter will serve as the core of this work. The chapter also provides a detailed analysis of the history of Tughlaq and the comparison to the Nehruvian era in India .The fourth chapter is the conclusion of the whole study on the basis of the analysis of the text done in the chapter three; it will conclude the explanations and argument put ahead in preceding chapters.

## Chapter II

### Post Colonialism: Concept and Definition

This chapter is allocated to discussing the critical concepts which would be the methodological tool to study and analyze the drama in this research. The terminologies such as nation and narration, colonialism, and post colonialism, new historicism, allegory, discourse, identity, ethnography, and subaltern which inevitably appertain to such a study are dealt with briefly in this chapter. The whole Indian politics is based on the traditional form and by subversion of the steps in the course of time the India of present day is formed; whatever the reasons are, the time after independence has allegorical influence in it. Due to colonial onslaught some of the sectors seem to be failed but the tradition and past history of India is similar in that sense.

Post-colonialism is an interdisciplinary movement that attempts to reshape the past, the present and the future of those colonized countries. While its point of departure was analyzing the lost identities, labors, languages, etc. and making a counter attack from the academic angle, it moved beyond the point of departure and turned out to be a rich and multilateral interdisciplinary area under which one can probe into many concepts and issues with new approaches and views. For example, the concept of nationalism, race, identity, and language, marginality are all being delved into, each time deciphering new things through postcolonial academic studies. If we wish, to categorize Post-colonialism in terms of the issues it preoccupies, we shall discern 'that it has an affiliation with many disciplinary branches ranging from philosophy, sociology, psychology, international affairs, economy, history, etc. It is for this particular reason that it is called as a new `interdisciplinary' field in the academic surroundings. Some academicians even further the argument and say that Post-colonialism rather than being a separate discipline per se it, by giving reference to many disciplines and dealing with the inherent problems of the disciplines, disciplines the

disciplines' Given its desire and attempt to reveal the reality, question the unquestionable, we can profess that Post-colonialism is an inevitable movement in accord with Postmodern era.

Colonialism often implies finished project in contemporary world where the colonized has gained illusionary freedom in the discourses of post-colonialism. In fact, colonialism has never finished. It continues to exist as a cultural phenomenon. Ania Loomba says:

The shifting and often interrelated Forms of dominance and resistance; about the constitution of the colonial archive; about the interdependent play of race and class; about the significance of gender and sexuality; about the complex forms in which subjectivities are experienced and collectivities mobilized; about representation itself, and about the ethnographic translation of cultures. (4)

From the above extract of Loomba post colonialism is the process of dominance and resistance even in the post colonial era on different independent race, gender, class, sex, etc. through the complex form created by the colonizer. The dominance is practiced through different subjective and collective form through which colonizers were represented and colonizers own way of defining the culture of colonized people. It is often similar that the situation in cultural dominance can define the people and their standard within the society.

The expansion, together with the eventual ascent, of postcolonial studies to a paradigmatic status on contemporary intellectual scene in recent decades doesn't seem to help clarify many of the fundamental questions about the field. There have been theoretical debates over the parameters, definition(s), methodologies or epistemological grounds, speaking positions, the locality, etc. of the postcolonial. This course will, then, situate postcolonial studies or, more specifically, postcolonial theory, in a series of critical debates, a

framework of theoretical engagements not limited to literary studies, but across the humanities. In this context Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin say:

Post colonialism, is the study of the ideological and cultural aftermath of western colonialism, and in order to escape the inevitable bias which is the profound experience of colonialism, one has to escape their own actual history and biography, much like how a former colonial nation must come to resent its given past and both paradoxically and ironically come up with a new national identity. They believe that image is everything, and that if you just put something in the media in front of people long enough, it will become believable . . . Post colonialism avoids a material focus on the economics of a capitalist world order in favor of a focus upon the psychological and sociological effects of colonization on cultures and societies. The shortest possible definition of the field called post-colonial studies is the study of the various cultural effects of Colonization. (47)

In the above lines it is clear that the system in colonialism is post-colonial tradition in the society; even sometimes the colonizer implies the old system such as in Indian history English rule followed most of Indian traditions with most familiar forms. It means it is a way of making allegorical sense in the history instead of the cultural significance; allegorical perspective is powerful which creates the human psychology. In this context Amit Shankar Saha claims:

The ultimate goal of post-colonialism is combating the residual effects of colonialism on cultures. It is not simply concerned with salvaging past worlds, but learning how the world can move beyond this period together, towards a place of mutual respect. This section surveys the thoughts of a number of post-colonialism's most prominent thinkers as to how to go about this. (57)

Post-colonialist thinkers recognize that many of the assumptions which underlay the "logic" of colonialism are still active forces today. Exposing and deconstructing the racist, imperialist nature of these assumptions will remove their power of persuasion and coercion. Recognizing that they are not simply airy substances but have widespread material consequences for the nature and scale of global inequality makes this project all the more urgent. A key goal of post-colonial theorists is clearing space for multiple voices. This is especially true of those voices that have been previously silenced by dominant ideologies - subalterns. It is widely recognized within the discourse that this space must first be cleared within academia. In this context Edward Said says:

"Orientalism" provides a clear picture of the ways social scientists, specifically Orientalists, can disregard the views of those they actually study - preferring instead to rely on the intellectual superiority of themselves and their peers. To the extent that Western scholars were aware of contemporary Oriental movements of thought and culture, these were perceived either as silent shadows to be animated by the Orientalist, brought into reality by them or as a kind of cultural and international proletariat useful for the Orientalist's grander interpretive activity. (208)

Much debate has since taken place regarding how to effectively and fairly incorporate the subaltern voice into social studies. With such a huge mass of criticism against the idea of studying others, many social scientists felt paralyzed, fatalistically accepting it as impossibility. Spivak, an Indian post-colonialist thinker, rejects this outright, "To refuse to represent a cultural "Other" is salving your conscience, and allowing you not to do any homework" (Spivak 24).

Spivak recognizes the project is problematic, as recovery and presentation of a

Subaltern voice would likely essentialize its message, negating the subaltern masses' heterogeneity. Spivak suggests "strategic essentialism" - speaking on behalf of a group while using a clear image of identity to fight opposition - is the only solution to this problem. In this context Spivak says

This is an intervention. A message from that space in the margin that is a site of creativity and power, that inclusive space where we recover ourselves, where we meet in solidarity to erase the category colonized/colonizer.

Marginality is the space [site] of resistance. Enter that space . . . This space of hybridity, he argues, offers the most profound challenge to colonialism. (89)

Spivak in this way tries to make clear that the societal status is controlled by using the people's psychology in particular society. In India the English ruling system is impressed by the former Emperor of Muhammedian Age. In a sense, the whole entire Indian political scenario is an allegory of the previous ages.

Allegory is a figurative mode of representation conveying meaning other than the literal. Allegory communicates its message by means of symbolic figures, actions or symbolic representation. Allegory is generally treated as a figure of rhetoric, but an allegory does not have to be expressed in language: it may be addressed to the eye, and is often found in realistic painting, sculpture or some other form of mimetic, or representative art. M. H. Abrams says:

An allegory is a narrative, whether in prose or verse, in which the and actions, and sometimes the setting as well as are contrived by the author to make coherent sense on the "literal", or primary, level of signification, and at the same time to communicate a second, correlated order of signification. We can distinguish two main types: 1) Historical and political allegory, in which the character and the actions that are signified literally in their turn represent, or

"allegorize", historical personages and event [ . . . ] and 2) the allegory of Idea in which the literal characters represents concepts and plots. (5-6)

Simply put, an allegory is a device that can be presented in literary form, such as a poem or novel, or in visual form, such as in painting or sculpture. As a literary device, an allegory in its most general sense is an extended metaphor. As an artistic device, an allegory is a visual symbolic representation. An example of a simple visual allegory is the image of the grim reaper. Viewers understand that the image of the grim reaper is a symbolic representation of death. Nevertheless, images and fictions with several possible interpretations are not allegories in the true sense. Furthermore, not every fiction with general application is an allegory. Bienert in this sense suggested the following, "Allegory is the vertical manner of interpretation, since it establishes unhistoricaltimeless relationships between images (allegories) and their spiritual archetypes present and future. (21)" In classical literature two of the best-known allegories are the cave in Plato's Republic (Book VII) and the story of the stomach and its members in the speech of Menenius Agrippa (Livy ii. 32). In Late Antiquity Martianus Capella organized all the <sup>1</sup> information a fifth-century upper-class male needed to know into an allegory of the wedding of Mercury and Philologia, with the seven liberal arts as guests; Capella's allegory was widely read through the Middle Ages. Medieval thinking accepted allegory as having a reality underlying any rhetorical or fictional uses. The allegory was as true as the facts of surface appearances. Thus, the bull *Unam Sanctam* (1302) presents themes of the unity of Christendom with the pope as its head in which the allegorical details of the metaphors are adduced as actual facts on which is based a demonstration with the vocabulary of logic: "Therefore of this one and only Church there is one body and one head-not two heads as if it were a monster. . . If then the Greeks or others say that they were not committed to the care of Peter and his successors they necessarily confess that they are not of the sheep of Christ." In the late fifteenth century, the enigmatic *Hypnerotomachia*, with its

elaborate woodcut illustrations, shows the influence of themed pageants and masques on contemporary allegorical representation, as humanist dialectic conveyed them.

However, the denial of medieval allegory as found in the eleventh-century works of Hugh of St Victor and Edward Topsell's *Historie of Foure footed Beastes* (London, 1607, 1653) and its replacement in the study of nature with methods of categorization and mathematics by such figures as naturalist John Ray and the astronomer Galileo is thought to mark the beginnings of early modern science. Since meaningful stories are nearly always applicable to larger issues, allegories may be read into many stories, sometimes distorting their author's overt meaning. For instance, many people have suggested that *The Lord of the Rings* is an allegory for the World Wars, in spite of J. R. R. Tolkien's emphatic statement in the introduction to the second edition, "It is neither allegorical nor topical [ . . . ] cordially dislike allegory in all its manifestations, and always have done so since I grew old and wary enough to detect its presence." Where some requirements of "realism", in its flexible meanings, are set aside, allegory can come more strongly to the surface, as in the work of Bertold Brecht or Franz Kafka on one hand, or on the other in science fiction and fantasy, where an element of universal application and allegorical overtones are common, as with *Dune*.

### **Post Colonial Literature in India**

Indian Literature after Independence of the country witnessed some major changes in terms of literary writings. Indian independence may be a historic event for its socio-political significance. But according to some writers, this event has had an outstanding impact on the creative writing done in various regional languages of the writers. India's nationalism at the point before independence was a nationalism of grief and mourning. Thus, most of the new age writers through their writings portrayed the terrible fake world that was based on the western modernism. However, in a country like India, the vast culture of the past does not go



off completely. With the independence of the country the cultural rhythm of the past certainly broke down as a result of modernistic experimentations. Rabindranath Tagore, Sarat Chandra Chatterjee, Vallathol Narayana Menon, Munshi Premchand, Mardhekar and Iqbal, to mention a few towering peaks in the Indian literary scene in the first half of this century, had given their best before independence. Here about the Indian literature and its form Homi K. Bhabha writes:

Post Colonial Literature in India did see greater awareness on the part of the reading public as well as the government of the existence of many more and richer languages and literatures, beyond the limited periphery of one's own mother-tongue or province . . . In spite of the new vistas opened to the writers in the form of writing for the new mass media like the film, the Radio and TV, the character of Indian literature continues to remain feudal, romantic, pastoral, idyllic and medievalist. Interestingly, the post independence literature of the country showed sign that permanent literature springs out of great tragedy. (137)

The partition of India did sear a poignant scar in the souls of many writers, particularly in Punjabi literature, Urdu literature, Hindi literature, and Bengali literature. The martyrdom of Mahatma Gandhi was another such event, about which soul-stirring poems were written by Vallathol Narayana Menon, Wamiq Jaunpuri, Bhai Vir Singh, Shivmangal Singh Suman and others. Hardly there was any mentionable little classic produced during this period. Some progressive critics oversimplify the situation by saying that the Indian writer comes from the lower middleclass, which is facing several physical and financial hurdles

The beginning of Indian literature in English, with relation to colonialism can very much be traced to the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th, by which time English education was more or less steadfastly grounded in the three major centre of British

power in India - Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. However, the changes came in the pattern of Indian English literature during the post colonial era.

Post-colonial literature is a body of literary writings that thoroughly 'opposes' to the preaching of colonization. Ideally therefore, the Post-colonial English literature in India, often involves writings, which deal with consequences of de-colonization or the political and cultural independence of people once quashed to colonial rule. It is also a literary analysis to texts that carry racist or colonial undercurrents. Post-colonial Indian English literature, eventually in its most recent form, also assays to assess the contemporary post-colonial discussion that has been let shape over considerable period of time. It endeavors to re-read this very emergence of post-colonialism and its literary formulation itself.

Post-colonialism in Indian English literature can be termed as the continual shaking off of the old skin of Western thought and the emergence of new consciousness and cognizance, critique and celebration. And with this new awareness, comes the concept of self-expression. In a country like India, prior to 1947, most people branded and recognized themselves as 'Indians', against the identity of their British tyrants and tormentors. There could be perceived a potential feeling of communal, national identity, nurtured by a shared antipathy and bitterness of the British colonial prowess. However, post 1947, after being granted autonomy, the Republic of India's populace slowly fell to bits and crumbled into more and more divided factions, as the "national" identity shrunk. People, on the other hand, discovered other, closer groups to identify with. The indefinite and confusing and variable nature of 'national identity' is thus vital and central to a discussion of post-colonial Indian English literary theories, as identification with one group without doubt leads to discrimination and segregation with others.

Post-colonial English literature in India works through the process of "writing back", "re-writing" and "re-reading". This delineates the rendering of well-known literature from

the point of view of the formerly colonized. Indian English Literature (IEL), as was seen before, pertains to that body of work by writers in India, who pen in the English language and whose native or co-native language could be one of the several regional languages of India. It is also associated with the works of members of the Indian diaspora, especially people like Salman Rushdie, who was born in India but raised outside. This body of Indian English literature is commonly referred to as Indo-Anglican literature. (Indo-Anglican is a specific term in the exclusive context of writing, which however is not confused with the expression Anglo-Indian). As a category, this production comes under the broader realm of post-colonial English literature in India - the brilliant production from previously colonized countries such as India.

Novelists like Kamala Markandaya (*Nectar in a Sieve*, *Some Inner Fury*, *A Silence of Desire*, *Two Virgins*), Manohar Malgaonkar (*Distant Drum*, *Combat of Shadows*, *The Princes*, *A Bend in the Ganges* and *The Devil's Wind*), Anita Desai (*Clear Light of Day*, *The Accompanist*, *Fire on the Mountain*, *Games at Twilight*) and Nayantara Sehgal could subtly capture the spirit of an independent India, struggling to break away from the British and traditional Indian cultures and establish a distinct identity, thus beginning to usher in the tremendous era of post-colonial Indian English literature.

During late nineteen seventies that a new breed of Convent, boarding-school educated and elite class of novelists and writers, that started to emerge, who forever had chalked out a plan to alter the map of post-colonial Indian English literature. The likes of Salman Rushdie, Vikram Seth, Amitav Ghosh, Shashi Tharoor set the literature world on fire. Salman Rushdie's *'Midnight Children'* had won Booker in 1981 and Arundhati Roy and Kiran Desai repeated the feat, when they won Man Booker in the year 1997 and 2006 respectively.

Hybridity and National Identity is one of the most important features of Postcolonial Literature in India. Every human being, in addition to having their own personal identity, has

a sense of who they are in relation to the larger community; the nation. A postcolonial study is the attempt to strip away conventional perspective and examine what that national identity might be for a postcolonial subject. To read literature from the perspective of postcolonial studies is to seek out--to listen for, that indigenous, representative voice which can inform the world of the essence of existence as a colonial subject, or as a postcolonial citizen.

Postcolonial authors use their literature and poetry to solidify, through criticism and celebration, an emerging national identity, which they have taken on the responsibility of representing. Surely, the reevaluation of national identity is an eventual and essential result of a country gaining independence from a colonial power, or a country emerging from a fledgling settler colony. However, to claim to be representative of that entire identity is a huge undertaking for an author trying to convey a postcolonial message. Each nation, province, island, state, neighborhood and individual is its own unique amalgamation of history, culture, language and tradition. Only by understanding and embracing the idea of cultural hybridity when attempting to explore the concept of national identity can any one individual, or nation, truly hope to understand or communicate the lasting effects of the colonial process.

Post-colonialism is the continual shedding of the old skin of Western thought and discourse and the emergence of new self-awareness, critique, and celebration. With this self-awareness comes self-expression. But how should the inhabitants of a colonial territory, or formerly colonized country or province see themselves, once they have achieved their independence? With whom will they identify? In a country like India, prior to 1947, most people identified themselves as Indians, against the identity of their British oppressors. There was a strong feeling of communal, national identity, fostered by a shared resentment of the British colonial powers. However, after 1947, after being granted autonomy, India's populace slowly disintegrated into more and more divided factions, as the "national" identity shrunk,

and people found other, closer groups to identify with. The ambiguous and shifting nature of national identity is thus integral to a discussion of postcolonial theory, as identification with one group inevitably leads to differentiation with others.

In his definitive book about the concept of "nation" and "nationalism," *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson says, "In an anthropological spirit, then, I propose the following definition of the nation: it is an imagined political community--and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" (5). His work refers to anthropological data, as he maintains that the concept of "nation" is truly a cultural construct, a man-made artifice. Thus, for Anderson, it is "imagined." Nation, and identity, begins with one's family and closest friends, and slowly moves out from this center. In our contemporary example, two residents of the same country may live in completely different geographical climates, having very little in common with each other. In such a case, one may have a personal identity, and identify with a more local "nation," yet be part of a political nation as defined by demarcated boundary lines, drawn on a map." All communities are larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined" (6).

Children are raised to associate with a nation as representing unity and government. The long-running Western colonialist perspective of nation seems to be: that simply by drawing lines on a piece of paper and forming a government within those lines, a cohesive political entity can be created. A perfect example of this lies in the formation of modern India. Prior to British colonization of India, there existed, in relative harmony, one of the most diverse and heterogeneous populations on the planet. Communities and culture gave people their identity. By the time India achieved its independence, however, the British had created a bureaucracy, boundaries and centralized government, in the likeness of the prototypical Western nation-state. For the inhabitants of India during the colonial years and the time leading to their independence, embracing a national identity was not a difficult

task, for several reasons. The first is that it is easiest for someone to identify themselves in terms of contrast with another, outside identity. People living in India prior to 1947 were striving for independence from shared oppression by the British. Thus, no matter what their cultural background may have been, or their geographical location within the emerging nation of India, anyone who was not a member of the colonial institution could view themselves as being victimized by that institution, and could identify with every other "Indian" in that victimization. Another example could be a participant in the Negritude movement in Africa, who could celebrate being black only by contrasting black with white. And yet another example lies with any country, any nation, which is at war with another. Nationalist sentiment reaches a crescendo during war by differentiating one's own country from that of the enemy.

The second reason that it is relatively easy for colonized subjects to adopt and live a national identity lies in the fact that the very identity adopted by the oppressed has been most likely encouraged by the oppressor. This touches on the idea of "hegemony," as postulated by Antonio Gramsci. Gramsci was interested in the subject of subordination as it existed within a colony or nation. He maintained that colonial powers would not have been able to maintain their rule over colonized people without the implicit, if unconscious permission of the colonized subjects. He believed that subordination over long periods entailed the participation of those subordinated. As Ania Loomba points out in *Colonialism/Post-colonialism*, "Gramsci argued that the ruling classes achieve domination not by force or coercion alone, but also by creating subjects who 'willingly' submit to being ruled" (Loomba, 29). Colonial authority wanted a subject to feel a sense of national spirit. The British wanted the inhabitants of their newly-constructed India to embrace the idea of their being "Indian," albeit in a form laid out by the British. Before the British consolidated their influence into a territory they called India, it was an immensely varied, heterogeneous

mass of different religions, political and cultural beliefs. Having drawn lines in the sand which defined India, and having instituted a central government, the British expected Parsi, Kashmiri, Muslim, Hindu, and Buddhist, upper and lower class/caste to think of themselves as Indian and to respect the British-established government. The British gave the Indian people a model of "Indian," of being a British subject, and expected the population to embrace it, which, in most cases, they did. This is what Anderson refers to as "mental miscegenation."

Anderson has defined "nation" as an "imagined political community." We have discussed why it is "imagined," but why does he consider the nation a "community?" He says, "Finally, it [the nation] is imagined as a community because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship" (Anderson 7). But, as an American, does one feel "a deep, horizontal comradeship" for a fellow citizen living in Alaska? Or is there more fraternity to be found with someone of similar religious belief or ethnic background? This is where the ambiguity surrounding the concept of "national identity" emerges. As Loomba states, "Perhaps the connection between postcolonial writing and the nation can be better comprehended by understanding that the 'nation' itself is a ground of dispute and debate, a site for the competing imaginings of different ideological and political interests (207). I believe that this "dispute and debate" can be successfully joined and undertaken only with a knowledge of the work of Homi K. Bhabha as it relates to<sup>6</sup> the concept of "cultural hybridity." Bhabha put forth his idea of hybridity to explain the very unique sense of identity shared and experienced individually by members of a former colonized people. He maintains that members of a postcolonial society have an identity which has been shaped jointly by their own unique cultural and community history, intertwined with that of the colonial power. Thus, for example, a Parsi in Bombay will have incorporated into his or her personal and national

identity the traditions inherent in being Parsi, being Muslim, and being an "Indian"--a member of a formerly oppressed society. Bhabha writes, "These hyphenated, hybridized cultural conditions are also forms of a vernacular cosmopolitanism that emerges in multicultural societies and explicitly exceeds a particular national location" (23). Thus, having illustrated the difficulties inherent in the postcolonial subject's attempt to formulate a new personal and national identity, we return to the initial, basic point of this discussion: How does a postcolonial author, playwright or poet provide a reader with a true representation of a particular postcolonial condition? Who does the author claim to represent? If an author is Indian in origin, does his writing represent the state of affairs for all Indians living in postcolonial India? The answer to this last question is transparently "no."

The quality of life and historical circumstances vary too widely from town to town, neighborhood to neighborhood, family to family, and, ultimately, from individual to individual. The question remains then: is there a way for postcolonial authors to convey their respective messages about the colonial condition without assuming a definitive "voice," without presuming that they speak for all members of their respective "nation?" I maintain that there are at least three authors who have incorporated Bhabha's theory of cultural hybridity into their works, and thus are able to communicate the postcolonial condition to the rest of the world.



### Chapter III

#### Tughlaq as an Allegory of Nehruvian Era

In *Tughlaq* Girish Karnad presents issues of colonialism and its onslaught and hangover in India even after independence. There was a great challenge to Indian leadership to maintain harmony in politics, religion, culture and economy to a newly independent India, which was under long colonial rule of the British. In the drama Girish Karnad allegorize the 13th century reign of Delhi Sultanate Mummahad -Bin-Tughlaq to post colonized India under Jawaharlal Nahru's leadership. Girish Karnad presents the effects of colonization in post colonized India and how the nation with a long colonial history suffers to change norms and values established by colonizers. Karnad has allegorized the character of Sultan Tughlaq to Nehru; as both Tughlaq and Nehru despite having an extraordinary leadership quality, great intellectuals and idealist failed to lead their states.

The drama *Tughlaq* is Karnad's best play. In this play there are several characters. As it is historical drama these characters have significant meaning. In the order of their appearance there are more than twelve characters. They are; Announcer, Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq, Aazam, Aziz, Step Mother, Vizier Muhammad Najib, Jai – Din – Barani, Sheikh Imam – Ud – Din, Shihav – Ud – Din, Sardar Ratan Singh, Sheikh Shams – Ud – Din and Ghiyas – Ud – Din Abbasid. The characters are well organized. The protagonist Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq has the changeable nature in his life. In the drama there are thirteen scenes. Girish Karnad not only presents the foreign colonization rather he presents colonization within the Nehru rule. The British colonialism in India largely effects Indian way to progress and development even after India was independent. The colonial rule and its onslaught and hangover still exists in Indian society. The internal colonization in India from different ways as leadership, religion, gender, culture and so on. Post colonial Indian leadership became fat after India became independent and they were doing whatever they like

without any consultation with people. Aftermath of partition Muslims were minorities in India, they were biased from governing bodies of the government in terms of equal opportunity and right. In this way religious problems were deeply rooted in post colonial India. Another reason behind chaos in India was indirect rule of elite and higher class over mass population. Indian society was under controlled by land lords, higher caste people and male dominated groups in spite of controlled by the government. One of the major hindrances of Nehru rule was British colonial rule and colonialism within India itself.

The drama generally carries the theme of political mood of disillusionment and chaos beside this major theme he tried to show other phenomenon behind the political disillusionment and chaos. Through the protagonist of the play Karnad tried to show lack of practicability and wrong time decisions of Sultan Tughlaq which was major reason of failure of Tughlaq's reign .The postcolonial head of the state Nehru was also the victim of practicability and wrong time decisions. Beside this Karnad attempts to show leadership only can not change things for the development of the nation; it was the organized efforts of the people and their pervious education, thinking, knowledge and the quality to live in peaceful societies. The following dialogue between Imam – Ud – Din and Muhammad shows the condition as follows:

Muhammad: I need your help, Sheikhsahib.

Imam – Ud – Din: Don't play any more games with me –

Muhammad: There's no time for games. I am desperate. Ain – Ul – Mulk of Avadh is marching on Delhi at this very moment.

Imam – Ud – Din: What? Your intimate friend and confidant? Why? No, I don't wish to know why. That's politics and you know your way there. But why tell me this?

Muhammad: Because I want peace. I am willing to make peace but how can I do it? I don't even know why he has turned against me. He won't even see my official envoys. But he will see you . . . for all the Muslims who will die at the hands of Muslims if there is a war. (166)

The above dialogue between Imam – Ud – Din and Muhammad shows their desire for the peace but due to several movements in the state he was failed to maintain the peace in the state. Muhammad tried his best to maintain peace and he thus changed his capital city and such as Nehru, in his time tried to make peace treaty among India and Pakistan in the debate of Jammu and Kashmir.

The drama by Karand is quite allegorical to the Nehru's era in India. After the Independence Nehru's all attempts in the political level failed in a sense that the problem is never ending on the issue of boarder and security. Tughlaq was afraid of his friends as he thought of his own state insecure all the time. In the drama Tughlaq was addressing his people in scene one seems quite allegorical to Nehru's speech in Punjab after independence. The following dialogue from drama seems allegorical to Nehru.

MUHAMMAD: My beloved people you have heard to judgment of the Kazi and seen for yourselves how justice works in my kingdom without any consideration peace but a more purposeful life . . . of might or weakness, religion and creed. May this movement burn bright and light up our path towards greater justice, equality, progress and peace-not just Your surprise is natural, but i beg you to realize that this no mad whim of tyrant. My ministers and i took this decision after careful thought and discussion. My empire is large now and embraces the south and i need a capital which is at it's heart. Delhi is too near the border and as you well know it's peace in never free from invaders. But for one the most important future is that Daulatabad a city of

Hindu and as the capital it will symbolized the bound between Hindu and Muslims which i wish to develop and strengthen in my kingdom. I invite you all to accompany me Daulatabad . This is only an invitation and not an order. Only those who have faith in may came with me. With their help I shall bulid an empire which will be the envy of the world. (149)

The above dialogue is quite significant and allegorical to Nehruvian era. Nehru was democratic man largely loved by the Indians the way Tughlaq seems quite democratic and Tughlaq's way of addressing to his people was quite artistic. Nehru was one of the masters of addressing the people; he can move and motive the people through his speech. In congress party campaigning in Punjab town of Ludhina on September 30, he was addressing the Punjabi people including Muslims and Hindus. Nehru always advocates for democracy and religious tolerance and condemned the communal bodies which in the name of religion and culture were spreading the virus of communal riots violence. Nehru further appeals to the people of India to live in a friendly and harmony without any considerations of might's, weakness religion and creed. He further appeals to Indian people to bound themselves and find unity in diversity between different religion, culture, language etc. If such unity is possible the post colonial government will provide justice, equality, opportunity and such bound between different culture, religion and language may light up India towards progress, prosperity, peace and towards more purposeful life. Nehru further states that Indians should respect multiple religions, culture and language .Such mutual respect is the only element which can lead India towards prosperity and success. At least Nehru reminds Indian people the purpose of his speech in Punjab is to bind the Muslims and Hindus at the time the Hindu Muslim clashes were going on violently. Nehru wants to symbolizes Punjab as a city of religious and cultural tolerance where various groups of people representing different religion

and culture were living .At last Nehru appeals to all community and religious groups to help him in the mission of making successful India .

The play Tughlaq is itself allegorical. It is not only historical rather it relevant to the modern times. The play was written in 1964, one year after the death of Nehru. 16 year's after independence India was still in a state of turmoil and was no better than when it had started off as an independent country. Thus Tughlaq becomes allegorical of the dreams of Nehru. The Indian government policies are echoed by those of Tughlaq policies. The disillusionment echoed was not only of India but of the Third world countries as well. The following dialogue between Shihab – Ud – Din and Muhammad Tughlaq shows the policy of the Muhammad at his time:

Shihab – Ud – Din: I implore your Majesty not to move the capital to Daulatabad. I am not from Delhi myself and have no stake in it. But I know the people of Delhi are very unhappy about the move.

Muhammad: What am I do, Shihab – Ud – Din? I have explained every reason to them, shown how my empire cannot flourish with Delhi as its capital. But how can I explain tomorrow to those who haven't even opened their eyes to the light of today? Let's not waste more time over that. They will see the point soon. Its getting late and I must tell you the more important news. From next year, we shall have copper currency in our empire along with the silver dinars.

(182)

The above vision of Muhammad is the policy of his state for the next year. Though his policy was failed in terms of the copper currency, he had his own vision in his state. It is also allegorical to the modern India at the time of Nehru as he was also failed in the same level.

Tughlaq's reign failed because of proper policy implementation. Tughlaq proposed different policies in his state to develop socioeconomic, religious and other aspects of his

state. Those policies proposed by Tughlaq were suitable and far sighted but the Amirs, ministers and scholars of his state always define Tughlaq's policies negatively in spite of their help and suggestions they were always the major hindrance in terms of policy implementation. Every plan and policy of Tughlaq rule was of a great importance but higher post official, ministers and religious head always creates a discourse that those policies and plans were not suitable for the state. What Ania Loomba claims is suitable in the following dialogue between Imam – Ud – Din and Muhammad is suitable:

Muhammad: No one can go on his knees. I have a long way to go. I can't afford to crawl – and I have to gallop.

Imam – Ud – Din: And you will do it without the Koran to guide you?

Beware, Sultan, you are trying to become another god. It is a sin worse than parricide.

Muhammad: Only an atheist can try to be a god. I am god's most humble slave.

Imam – Ud – Din: Yes. And slaves have often tried to replace their masters.

Muhammad: Don't I know it? I still remember the days when I read the Greeks – Sukrat who took poison so he could give the world the drink of gods . . . you are asking me to make myself complete by killing the Greek in me and you propose to unify my people by denying the visions which led Zarathustra or the Buddha. I am sorry. But it can't be done. (165)

The above lines of Muhammad seem as an example of his brilliant mind and good emperor of his time. His policy was apt but his workmen were not good. Even the concept of the Sultan Muhammad is somewhat democratic but his religious people and other officials were rude and as a result his policy became fail.

As colonizers motive of defining things by centering them and the discourse made by colonizer always was a major obstacle for the post colonized countries. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin says about post colonialism is that the post colonialism, is the study of the ideological and cultural aftermath of western colonialism, and in order to escape the inevitable bias which is the profound experience of colonialism, one has to escape their own actual history and biography, much like how a former colonial nation must come to resent its given past and both paradoxically and ironically come up with a new national identity. The following dialogue between Young Man and Old Man shows the colonial representation and the resistance:

Young Man: They say it's the widest road in the world. But it looks no bigger than a thin snake from here.

Old Man: And four years ago that snake bit a whole city to death.

Young Man: What a fort! What a magnificent thing! I met a foreign visitor the other day and he said he has been round the world and not seen any fort as strong as this anyway. (192)

From the above dialogue between Old Man and Young Man representation and resistance is very broad arena within which much of the drama of colonialist relations and postcolonial examinations and subversion of those relations have taken place. In both conquest and colonization, texts and textuality play a major part. Colonial texts – anthropologies, history, and fictions captured the colonized subjects within colonialist framework which read his or her alterity as terror or lack. Within the complex relations of colonialism these representation were re-projected to the colonized – through formal education or general colonialist cultural relation. This is why this resistance and the representation may be not suitable as such concept, at last, shows the harassment in the nation. In the above dialogue both men are talking about the snake which bites the country symbolizes the colonial representation.

Tughlaq denied the history and its events while making policy. The practice of colonialism before his reign in the different form was totally denied. Though Nehru tried a lot and proposed versatile plans and policies in post colonized India but his efforts brings no changes in socioeconomic, cultural and political aspects of India. Nehru was knowledgeable about the Indian history of colonialism. Muhammad Tughlaq also denied the cultural aspects of the society in his time. In the drama Karnad shows the views of Sultan regressed. In this context the following dialogue between Muhammad and his Step Mother is suitable:

Muhammad: But then how can I spread my branches in the star while the roots have yet to find their hold in the earth? I wish I could believe in recurring births life in the Hindus . . . And don't tell me to go and get married and breed a family because I won't sleep.

Step Mother: I don't know what to do with you. I can't ask a simple question without your giving a royal performance. Even Ain – Ul – Mulk does not seem to stop you –

Muhammad: Mother, supposed I die fighting Ain – Ul – Mulk –

Step Mother: Stop it!

Muhammad: No really. Suppose I die in the battle. What of it? Why should I waste my last few days worrying? I am not worried about my enemies. I am only worried about my people. (155)

In the above dialogue between Mother and son shows the intention of Muhammad and his Mother. He is not ready to quit the fighting but wants peace in his kingdom but his mother tried to make him clear by telling the truth for peace. Here Muhammad did not want to learn from the history of his kingdom. It is often allegorical to the Nehruvian era. Learning by doing mistake is suitable but both of the great man never follows such concept in the history of India. It is the postcolonial concept where the rulers seem confuse in the hand of politics



such as the condition of Nehru in India after the independence. In the above dialogue the mother unknowingly tries to convince her son, the Sultan for war but the colonial mentality of the Sultan seems weak in this context. It is the main feature of the postcolonial that the civilization of the colonizer remains as the hangover in the nation and the psychology formed due the onslaught. The people may not know this deep effect of the postcolonialism.

India after its long colonial rule is new and free from every kind of bondages now it is the time of Indian people to develop their nation according to their own way. But still there was colonial onslaught and hangover in politics religion, culture and economy. Indians were still ambivalent whether to follow the bureaucracy led by the British or to do something Indian type of beaucracy. Such ambivalent was inherent in different ways in India. Cultural ambivalent mostly rooted in Indian society neither they can accept whole English culture nor they can enjoy their own culture. This ambivalent creates lots of confusions and tension among Indian people which was one of the major causes of failure. Along with ambivalent inherent among Indians mass population was hybridized by the so called developed and perfect type of English culture language, religion, education etc. such hybridizing Indian people were the victims of British colonization, who can not found Indianess in their own religion, culture, language etc because of two hundred year's of British colonization.

As Edward Said's notion of Orientalism discusses how power functions to create discourse and how discourse create truth. British rule as the power of colonized India have interpreted religion, culture and politics of India according to their interest. The binary constructed by colonizers between Hindus and Muslims was to have their control even in post colonial era. Such binary constructed by colonizers was the major obstacle for Indian progress even in post colonial period. Such type of discourse applied in religion never bound Hindus and Muslims to work together for their better future. In the same way colonizer constructed different cultural discourses to have a control over Indian people even in post

colonial period. Edward Said's notion of discourse was regulated in language, democracy, knowledge etc in post colonial India. The colonizers created the chaos among Hindu and Muslim which based on the Muhammadian rules before their rule in India. In the drama *Tughlaq* the condition of Hindus is very poor. The following dialogue between Third Man, Hindu and Old Man shows the dominance over Hindus as follows:

Old Man: What's the use? One must act according to it [ . . . ]

Third Man: All this about the Hindus not paying the jaiziya tax. That's against the Koran, you know. A Mowlvi told me that –

Hindu: Now, now don't look at me when you say that. We didn't want exemption! Look, when a Sultan kicks me in the teeth and says, 'pay up, you Hindu dog', I am happy. I know I am safe. But the moment a man comes along and says, 'I know you are a Hindu, but you are also a human being' while, that makes me nervous.

Old Man: But this wretch is out best friend Jamal. Beware of Hindu who embraces you. (147-148)

The above lines show the real condition of the Hindus in the Kingdom of Muhammad Tughlaq. Hindus were suppressed by the rulers even sometimes killed in the name of the religion. Hindus were forced to pay the religious tax to the government. This domination was the main cause of the failure of the Tughlaq. British colonizers learned from the Muslims and Hindus to dominate each other. Other important factor of capturing the nation is the control over the language. The following dialogue between Muhammad and Imam – Ud – Din shows the importance of controlling the language:

Muhammad: No one can go far on his knees. I have a long way to go. I can't effort to crawl – I have to gallop.

Imam – Ud – Din: And you do it without the Koran to guide you? Beware, Sultan, you are trying to become another God. It's a sin worse than parricide.

Muhammad: You don't know, it well. The language is powerful and I know how to get control over these subjects by using their own language. (164)

The above dialogue is conversation about the language and its use. The Sultan, very cunningly tried his best to convince the people by making them emotional through the language. The way Sultan has control over language colonial process itself begins in language. The control over the language by the colonizers center – whether achieved by displacing native languages, by installing itself as a 'standard' against other variants which are constituted as impurities, or by planting the language of Empire in a new place remains the most potent instrument of cultural control. Language provides the terms by which reality may be constituted; it provides the names by which the world may be known.

Imam – Ud – Din: You mean, you are making them emotional by using their Hindu language [ . . . ]

Girish Karnad presents Tughlaq as an ace schemer who is able to manipulate his neighboring countries and people to act according to pre-arranged plan. Karnad presents Tughlaq as highly diplomatic and intellectual Sultan. He always proposed his plans to people and to the ministers of state very gently and philosophically though his plans were far from normal peoples thinking of that time. Tughlaq believes in making diplomatic relationship with his neighboring countries. It is said that he send for the first time his envoy to Egypt. Tughlaq was updated with world affairs, hence he proposed paper currency. Such paper currency was used in China in that time. Karnad presents Tughlaq as a political man rather than traditional type of king. The following dialogue between Muhammad and Imam – Ud – Din shows the nature of the King Muhammad as follows:

Muhammad: Believe me, Sheikhsahib, I am sorry, I am not disappointed. Yes, they will now decide you are a spy – they will greet you as a spy in the market place tomorrow. But now you do see what I mean, don't you? You are known as a saint and you have risked your life by speaking out against the Sultan. Yet a trick – and they suspect you.

Imam – Ud – Din: My turn to congratulate you. Your experiment was a brilliant success. Yes I have learnt my lesson thank you – and good – bye.

Muhammad: Good – bye? You are not going?

Imam – Ud – Din: You have finished my work for me. You don't want me to with longer, do you? For an audience who want turn up? (166)

The above dialogue shows the problem of the rulers in the kingdom. Muhammad as a king had faced many problems inside the politics. The saint tried to convince Muhammad for his own benefits. There was not a question of center and margin but for the first time Imam – Ud – Din established the concept in the kingdom. While talking about Nehru he is quite allegorical to Tughlaq. As Tughlaq, Nehru felt that foreign policy was a means of making India's presence felt in the world. After independence he personally supervised the creation of the Indian Foreign Service (IFS) he was the man who opened forty embassies and forty missions abroad. Nehru was great intellectual with vast knowledge of international affairs. Because of his friendly relation with international community he was highly respected leader of his time. Even opposition politicians appreciated what Nehru had done for India's international standing. Nehru was successful to stabilize decent relationship with major world power of that time including USSR, USA, Europe, and China. Despite all these qualities and efforts, Nehru's rule was failed and criticized.

In the scene seven when Sultan Tughlaq decided to shift his capital from Delhi to Daulatabad many people suffered a lot. Due to mass migration and lack of proper

arrangement of food, housing, medicine and so on hundreds and thousands of people suffered in large number. Many people were getting sick because of long journey and other arrangements. Many have lost their lives. Sultan Tughlaq was failed to take care of a citizen while shifting his capital from Delhi to Daulatabad. His plan of traveling large number of people without sufficient arrangement was another mistake for misery. The following dialogue between Hindu Woman, Aziz and Aazam shows the effect of mass migration as follows:

Hindu Woman: Please let me go, sir . . . my child . . . please have mercy . . . only for a day, sir . . .

Aziz: I told you I can't. No one can be allowed out of sight until we reach Daulatabad. I am sorry, but I have my orders.

Hindu Woman: But I will return tomorrow . . . I swear by my child I will . . . its dying, your Excellency, I have to take it to a doctor . . .

Aziz: But what can I do? There is the Hakim's tent. Go to him. He will give you some medicine. I have told you what you can do. I could try and bribe my senior officials but you shall have to pay for it.

Hindu Woman: But I have not got a paisa on me, your Excellency. And what will I give the doctor. My husbands' also ill, sir, please, I hold your feet – please let me go.

Aazam: Poor thing! Why don't you let her go? The doctor may help her. (187)

The above dialogue of the Aziz and other characters shows the effects of mass migration in the society which is allegorical to the mass migration at the time of Nehru. Karnad, in this way allegorizes such pathetic condition of migrants through drama to 1949/50, when there was wave of communal riots in East Pakistan several hundreds thousands Hindus crossed over the border into India. They have also the same conditions as in the drama. They have no

houses, food, and medicines because of mass migration from Pakistan to India at once. It was really a difficult task to arrange houses, food and medicine for them. The Hindus moved from Pakistan to west Bengal were furious and angry towards the attitude of Indian and Pakistani government. Nehru government was failed to stop that wave of migration and unable to manage the migrant's basic needs. The migrants have to suffer extremely as they were living in the tents, feeding once a day hardly epidemics made their life worst and many has lost their lives. In this way Tughlaq's shifting of capital and mass migration at once is allegorical to Nehru period migration from East Pakistan to West Bengal.

Tughlaq himself allegorize post colonialism. In the colonial era there was dominance and exploitation of colonizer, every thing in the society is controlled by physical power. But as the consciousness of the people gradually grows up colonizers way of dominance and exploitation Shifts from physical to ideological and philosophical ways. In the drama Tughlaq also does the same thing to have control over his people as he uses power and force to implement his norms and values. But as the people of medieval India were consciousness grows he established his own discourse to control them he regulated different religious discourses, economic discourses and cultural discourses to control and to have influence over his people.

The way in the drama Tughlaq created different discourses colonizers in post colonial India have established different discourses through literature, movie and language to have control over them. In colonial period colonizer used physical power to control nation but after independence of the then colonial countries their way of controlling post colonial nations shift and they created and define according to their own interest as Tuglaq does in the drama.

## Chapter IV

### Conclusion

After the meticulous discussion and analysis of Girish Karnad's play *Tughlaq* the researcher reaches to the conclusion that the issues of colonialism and its onslaught and hangover in India is quite prevalent even after independence. There was a great challenge to Indian leadership to maintain harmony in politics, religion, culture and economy to a newly independent India, which was under long colonial rule of the British. In the drama Girish Karnad allegorize the 13<sup>th</sup> century reign of Delhi Sultanate Mummahad – Bin – Tughlaq to post colonized India under Jawaharlal Nahru's leadership. Girish Karnad presents the effects of colonization in post colonized India and how the nation with a long colonial history suffers to change norms and values established by colonizers. Karnad has allegorized the character of Sultan Tughlaq to Nehru; as both Tughlaq and Nehru despite having an extraordinary leadership quality, great intellectuals and idealist failed to lead their states.

In the drama Karand present the protagonist Muhammad as a diplomatic king but failure in the same directions. Tughlaq tries to make his nation developed economically but unable to do so. In his kingdom there are several people who are strict by the religion but the liberal king Tughlaq never supports such views. So he tries to implement his own economic policies. In politics without cooperation one can not be successful which is suitable for Tughlaq. Like Tughlaq Nehru in the modern India fails in the policy level. This drama is allegorical in this context which shows the colonial efforts to fail the nation in one sense but most important aspects of the colonial rule is the way by which the country can be developed.

In the cultural level the drama shows the secular state types but the under lie condition of the state is not a secular rather there is cultural domination over the Hindus in the state. The Hindus, less in the number faced the problems in the drama. In a way Tughlaq himself was the colonizer for the Hindus.

In nutshell, Karnad presents the political mood of disillusionment in postcolonial India by the help of the play *Tughlaq*. In this play he compares the age of Tughlaq Muhammad to the age of Nehru allegorically.



### Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 8<sup>th</sup> ed. Singapore: Thomson Learning, 2008.
- Ananthamurthy, U.R. *Critical Note on Indian Drama*. Delhi: Routledge, 1998.
- Ashcroft, B. Griffiths, and Tiffin. *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Bagchi, Amiya Kumar. *Ancient Economy of India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarashidash, 1983.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "From Development to Globalization." *Postcolonial Studies and Globalization Theory*. Ed. Neil Lazarus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- - -. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Dharwadker, Vinay. "Indian Writing Today." *Indian Literature in the fifth Decade of Independence, Comparative Study*. *World Literature Today*, 68.1 (Spring 1994). 234-239
- - -. *Diaspora, Nation, and the Failure of Home: Two Contemporary Indian Plays*, *Theatre Journal* 50.2 (Spring 1998). 71-94
- Karnad, Girish. *Three Plays: Nagamandala, Hayavadana and Tughlaq*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Kosambi, D.D. "Ideals, Images and Lives." *Postcolonial India: Emancipation and Equality*. Ed. Alice Thorner and Maithreye Krishna Raj. Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 2000.
- Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Majumdar, R.C. *Indian History: a Postcolonial Reading*. Mumbai: Orient Longman, 2003.
- Paul, Rajunder. "The Main Rulers of India." *Ancient Politics and India*. Ed. Ramgopal Tapendra Prasad. Gorakhpur: Vani Prakshan, 1988.
- Rushdie, Salman. *The Satanic Verses*. London: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Saha, Amit Shankar. *A study of Postcolonial Literature in India*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Bangalore: Saras Salil Publication, 1991.

Said, Edward. "Arabs, Islam and the Dogmas of the West." *New York Times Book Review* 67.1(31 October 1976): 79-81

-- -. *Orientalism*. London : Routledge, 1978.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *A critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1999.

Visveswaraya, M. *Nehru and His Politics in India: a Glimpse*. Delhi: Routledge, 1979.