

I. Introduction

This research focuses on Khushwant Singh's second novel *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale* (1959). It tries to analyze Singh's interest in politics aroused by contemporary socio-political situation. It was the period of "Quit India movement" which has formed the backdrop of this novel. It gave him an opportunity to depict nationalistic feelings of the Indian people and the activities of would-be politicians and gave objectives of exposing different characters and their views. This section gives a brief outline of the novel *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale* and short introduction of Khushwant Singh and his literary creations.

Indian nationalism as represented by Khushwant Singh in the present novel takes the double shape in its resistance against the British Imperial power. The first shape is the politics of non-violence which has come out under the influence of Mahatma Gandhi and second is the armed protest of the nationalists group propounded by Bhagat Singh and other revolutionaries. Khushwant Singh has depicted both the motives very clearly but has given priority to the armed revolution as a true nationalist ethos.

Khushwant Singh has set his novel *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale* in the contemporary political and historical milieu of the 1940s, weaving significant political events taking place in India. The story revolves round a Sikh Senior Magistrate, Buta Singh, in the Punjab in the pre-partition days, and his family, and their relationships with the white Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Taylor and his wife, Joyce Taylor, another Hindu magistrate, Wazir Chand, his cricketer, rakish son, Madan, and shy, but academically bright daughter, Sita. Buta Singh's family comprises his intensely religious, illiterate wife Sabharai, his sexually inadequate, but

politically ambitious son, Sher Singh, Sher Singh's buxom, beautiful, sex-hungry and sexually loose wife Champak, Buta Singh's daughter Beena, maid-servant, Shunno, and boy servant, Mundoo.

It begins with the indications of developing into a political novel, with a focus on the pre-partition activities of the revolutionaries and the terrorists in India. It starts with a description of the killing of the Sarus Crane by Sher Singh and his groups which is supposed a part of training of his terrorist group. It seems to be a preparatory act of their initiation into the revolutionary creed aimed at driving the British out of India through terrorist means. The boys, a bunch of immature college students, desired to perform a "baptism in blood" in conformity with the ancient Hindu custom of dipping swords in goat's blood and laying them before the Goddess *Durga* or *Kali*.

Buta Singh's devoted wife, Sabhrai, is the moving spirit of the family. She is deeply religious and the sacred *Granth Saheb* is the source of all knowledge and enlightenment for her. Although she is an uneducated woman, she has an extra-ordinarily profound and instinctive understanding of life. She very deeply loves Sher Singh, her son, who is an odd combination of youthful bravado and calculated self-interest. Though she does not know anything about politics all the time she indirectly supports him. After the arrest of Sher Singh, it is her strength that sees the family through the crisis and holds it together. In a lopsided manner, it is her faith in God that brings about the release of Sher.

Sher Singh's young wife Champak is not bothered about public life and nationalistic activities. She is very keen on the enjoyment of regular matrimonial sex and even commits adultery with Madan secretly. She is portrayed as an excessively exhibitionist woman -this quality is the prime characteristic of her being. While

Sabhrai concentrates all her mind on religious prayers, Champak indulges in highly sensuous and sensual activities.

Wazir Chand's household unlike that of Buta Singh, was not involved with religious ritual. They had only "a large color print of Krishna", which was occasionally "garlanded by Wazir Chand's wife". Their son, Madan, was the hero of the family and was almost worshipped by his parents. He was tall and handsome affable and attractive, adventurous and unscrupulous in his early twenties. He had captained the University cricket team for three years and had scored 100 points against a foreign team. He was good at sports, though poor in studies but gives full support in nationalist-cum-terrorist activity to his friend, Sher Singh. He is considered the backbone for Sher Singh.

Mr. Taylor's part in this sordid affair is marked by decency, tact, and caution. He obviously felt unhappy over Sher Singh's reported involvement in terrorist action with the hot headed revolutionaries since he was genuinely interested in the welfare of Buta Singh and his family. He sent for Sher Singh on purpose, and while they talked he suggestively played with the empty cartridge cases on his table. He even arranged to send a license for a gun for the young man lest he should indulge in unlawful activities which would result in great trouble for him and his father. But the irony is that Sher Singh was involved in the tragic drama of his own making.

The Taylors sent for Buta Singh, offered him tea, and then gave the shocking news that his house was being searched in his absence and that Sher Singh was being held in custody on a suspected charge of the murder of Jhimma Singh. The presumption that the Lambardar was murdered was a belated discovery, and none really knew the truth. There was no tangible evidence of Sher Singh's involvement in this sad event; yet Mr. Taylor suggested that Sher Singh might be made a witness for

the state if he confessed. Buta Singh was almost stunned by this unexpected turn of events, and tears rolled down his cheeks. His world of ambition and power was destroyed overnight, and his hopes of getting knighted in the forthcoming New Year's Honors list were turned to dust.

Sher Singh, who had looked forward to a glorious political career now found himself lodged in jail on a suspected criminal charge. His experience with the Anglo-Indian sub-inspectors who hit him on the ankles, made him extremely miserable. He dreaded a visit from his father in Jail as much as father did visiting his son in Jail. In Jail, Sher Singh did not know whether to succumb to the pressure of the police and reveal the names of the young boys who were involved in that fatal attack on Jhimma Singh to keep them a complete secret.

The way out of this awful impasse was found by Sabhrai, who expressed her wish to meet with her son in Jail, a decision which comes as a relief to Buta Singh. Sabhrai put her heart in the nonstop reading of the *Granth*, the sacred book of the Sikhs, but it was of no avail in as much as the solution to elude her.

After seeing the condition of Sabhrai, Mrs Taylor told her husband to release Sher Singh to give a real Christmas gift to Buta Singh's family on the Christmas day itself. Sher Singh was ecstatic about his release when he was taken out of the prison into the city in a procession by his friends and nationalist zealots. He became a hero in the eyes of his fellow rebels and nationalists. He was garlanded, photographed and cheered by the enthusiastic audience.

But alas, this happiness did not continue for long because Sabhrai, after four days' cheerfulness, began to sink suddenly. She knew that she was going to die and said "My time has come" (231). She sent for all the members of her family and made

them read the holy *Granth*s. Then she died while uttering the prayer. Her funeral was conducted with due honor and dignity.

Buta Singh's loyalty to the British crown had earned him the right kind of reward. He, therefore, wanted to thank Mr. John Taylor for the new title and for his releasing his son so quickly and unexpectedly and Mrs. Joyce Taylor for her kindness shown to his family. He also wanted to seek the help of John Taylor in fixing a Job for his son. He wanted to build a memorial for his late wife Sabhrai in consultation with the Taylors. He bought a new tie and wore it before meeting them and thanked them profusely and consulted them about his son and a memorial for his late wife.

Khushwant Singh has presented a very real picture of politics when the colonial encounter between the Indians and the British was moving towards a climax on account of the emergence of nationalistic consciousness among the Indians. The Indians wanted to dethrone the British Imperial thoughts which were lying in their mind. After the suspension of the Non-cooperation movement many revolutionaries became disillusioned with the creed of non-violence espoused by Gandhi. Then, they started to involve in another activity and that was nothing less than armed protest.

By revolution they mean that the present order of things, which is based on manifest injustice, must change. Producers or laborers in spite of being the most necessary element of society are robbed by their exploiters of their labor and deprived of their elementary rights. For them, when patriots take up arms for the sake of their country and its society, when they eliminate exploitation and oppression or when they avert the injustice done to the oppressed, they use violence. They use it as a protest against the Imperialist. Thus, Singh has used this fragile narrative to convey his deepest and most mature political insights by elaborating the political situation of

contemporary India. The growth of political consciousness enforces him to write present novel.

Fictional Career of Khushwant Singh

Born on 15th August, 1915, in Hadali in Khushab district Sargodha, Punjab- now in Pakistan, Khushwant Singh has secured a prestigious position in the spectrum of the Indian literature enriching the literary world with his meticulous observation. Singh is a great son of mother India and his greatness has received national and international recognition. As a historian, novelist, short-story writer, translator, journalist, political commentator and naturalist, he is familiar to wide circle of admirers as all things to all men. He has world-wide readership. This is why he is today India's best known personality, across the length and breadth of the country. It is his journalistic writings and his two weekly columns, "With Malice towards one and All" and "Gossip Sweet and Sour" that have contributed towards his immense popularity. For his first novel *Train to Pakistan*, he won Grove Press Award in 1954 and *Padma Bhushan* was awarded to him in 1974 by the president of India. He also received Sulabh Award for 'upholding moral values and being a person of impeccable character and exceptional integrity in July 2000. World attention was at once focused on him and he was praised to have the tremendous skill to observe, to realize and to interpret social, political and religious India.

Most of the books that Khushwant Singh has written are on Punjab, and related to politics. He has also written books on nature, some travelogues, several essays and pen-portraits. In the field of fiction he has written thirty-four short stories and four novels. His writings merit serious thought and analysis, as he is among the first Indian writers who put Indo-Anglican literature on the international literary map. His short stories are outstanding due to their taut, deceptively simple style, and their

all pervasive humour. Singh is one of few Indian writers who have used humor with great dexterity. His short stories are the finest examples of humorous writings in Indian English literature.

Singh believes that the "truth" is the essential hallmark of all good fiction. He has mostly written about what he is personally acquainted with: his personal experience, close association, and intimate knowledge about the subject taken up, always comes through in all his fiction. He is by temperament an extremely witty man. He prefers to see the lighter side of life to the dark and dreary aspect of it. His major concerns are on nature, religion, political, history, culture and polity of India. Commenting on the nature of Singh, Dr Bideshwar Pathak, founder of Sulabh International for social service, says, "Khushwant's biggest attribute is that he speaks what he feels. He is honest to the extent that he offends even his friends and icons revered by people. It doesn't matter to him that it jeopardized his chances in life. I think it is this quality that made Gandhi to Mahatma" (qtd. in S.K. Jain 128).

The quest of the artist in Khushwant Singh is, in many ways, a quest for identity. His explorations as novelist, short story writer, historian, and essayist have been the gradual achievement of self expression related to an innate search for identity. His art is deeply rooted in the soil, and the vitality which reveals is the vigour of a genuine Punjabi, permeated by an inwardly-felt Punjabi consciousness. He, though a product of western education and culture, is at heart a Sikh and an Indian. There are three kinds of environment or places which influenced him as man and writer. He was born and raised for a time in his childhood in a Punjab village. Then he went to school in Lahore and Delhi and graduated. Later he went abroad for further education, assignments and experience. He is what his British education made him a cultured humanist. In a lecture at the Expo' 67, delivered at Montreal, he has

outlined his personal creed or 'credo', and although it may not be termed as his philosophy of life, it contains nevertheless a view of life and an awareness which are implicit in his writings.

Khushwant Singh's first and awarded novel *Train to Pakistan* (1956) is the finest novel in the post-second world war Indo Anglican fiction. In terms of themes, it lays stress on its trenchant portrayal of hard and harsh facts of life against the background of India's partition, its skilful dissection of the real and its penetration beneath the inhuman bestialities of life to the human layer. The novel also deals with movingly tragic affair between a Sikh peasant Juggat Singh and a Muslim girl, Nooran with a recent news dispatch from the author's native land. The frontispiece of the evergreen edition depicts Juggat Singh, the uncouth, amoral, strongman of rural Punjab against the setting of people fighting among themselves. Jugga's last deed of supreme self sacrifice in love is an act of redeeming humanity and the human within him.

Singh's next novel *Delhi* (1990) is his crowning historical achievement. It is a vast, erotic, irreverent *magnus opus* based on the city of Delhi. The story spans several centuries of history, and took him twenty-five years to complete. The narrator of the saga, which extends over six hundred years, is a bawdy, ageing reprobate who loves Delhi as much as he does the *hijda* whore Bhagmati—half man, half-woman with the sexual inventiveness and energy of both the sexes. Traveling through time, space and history to 'discover' his beloved city the narrator meets a myriad of people poets and princes, saints and sultans, temptresses and traitors, emperors and eunuchs who have participated in the major historical forces that have shaped and endowed Delhi with its very special mystique.

In *The Company of Women* (1999), Khushwant Singh has produced an uninhabited, erotic and endless celebration of love, sex and passion. Recently separated from his nagging ill tempered wife of thirteen years, millionaire businessman Mohan Kumar decides to reinvent his life. Convinced that 'lust is the true foundation of love', he embarks on an audacious plan: he will advertise for paid lady companions to share his bed and his life. There is Jessica Browne, a black American, with whom he lost his virginity and learnt how to have sex. With Yasmeen Wanchoo, a fanatic Muslim woman; Mary Joseph, a Roman Catholic from Tamilnadu; Dhanno, a sweeper; sarojini Bharadwa, the demure professor from small-town Haryana who surprises Mohan with her ardour and sexual energy; Molly Gomes, a free-spirited masseuse from Goa; and Susanthika Goonatileke, the diminutive seductress from Sri Lanka, he has sex. Infected by HIV +ve, he became very sick in his later phase of life and killed himself by consuming sleeping pills and thus ends the story of Mohan Kumar.

Khushwant Singh's greatness as a novelist no longer needs any assertion. He is recognized as the greatest writer of fiction writing in English in India. Even as a story writer he holds a unique place and has made outstanding contribution in this field also. Immense is the range and variety of his stories. He deals with different levels of social, political and religious aspect of life. *The Mark of Vishnu and other Stories* (1950), *The Voice of God and Other Stories* (1975), *A Bride for the Sahab and Other stories* (1967) and *A History of the Sikhs Vol 1 and Vol II* (1963,1966) are the collection of Khushwant Singh's short stories. Likewise, *Religion of the Sikhs, Guru Govind Singh-the Saviour, Need for a New Religion in India and other Essays, My bleeding Punjab, Tragedy of Punjab operation Bluestar and After* with Kuldeep Nayar,

Shri Ram; A Biography with Arun Joshi, *The Many faces of Communalism* with Bipin Chandra, *Indira Gandhi Returns* are widely appreciated books of Khushwant Singh.

Reviews on *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale*

Since the time *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale* appeared on the literacy horizon in 1959, it has drawn the attention of good many critics and literary men. Many critics have said that Singh is a comedian. Comedy in his world is connected with laughter, which is corrective and arises from fragments of action and utterance. There are a host of critics who have treated the theme of Nature in the Novel. They have talked in great detail about Khushwant Singh's love for animals, for monsoons and summer.

Commenting on *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale* Sir Denzyl Ibbetson writes that Nature plays the vital role in the novel. This reveals Khushwant Singh's vast knowledge of nature, establishes credibility and draws the reader into the story. The critic has highlighted the function or the power of Nature in this novel in the manner of a romantic artist. He has shown that Nature is interwoven into the main fabric of the story. Deeply getting through the novel, he says:

In *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale* Khushwant Singh has made a skilful use of Nature in its various forms. Nature has been used effectively to either provide a realistic background, or to show up the actual character of a person, or to portray the growth in the story or the character. The basic symbolism of the title is to do with the theme of nature and [...] nightingale's song denotes nature in its full relaxation.

(259)

Regarding this novel, critic Ruby Gupta asserts that the novel presents a slice of life from a typical Sikh family of Punjab. Religion is an integral part of their lives and so it has been depicted in minute detail. All the character is connected with religious ethos to some extent in the novel. The towering character, deeply religious woman Sabhrai, is the moving spirit and the savior of the other characters has a strong thread of religious sentiments bind the narrative structure of the novel. She (Gupta) writes:

This entire novel is built around the question of religion. Religion plays an extremely important role in this novel because the main character of the story, Sabhrai, is a deeply religious lady. Also since India is a religious country, a novel deeply rooted in the soil cannot remain untouched by the religious ethos, [...].The very first chapter of the novel signifies that no India whether young or old can remain untouched by religion. (137)

There are some other scholars of Khushwant Singh who have looked at this novel through the lens of human relationships. They regard as an avid people watcher and adept at noticing the intricacies of character, weaknesses and relationships of different people. For them, his novels are based on the mutual relationships of the characters and their particular idiosyncrasies, which he takes delight in exposing. He has a deep understanding of human nature and he is also able to skillfully portray different type of human relationship with complete authenticity. It reveals Singh's immense knowledge, observation and understanding of different relationships and behavioral patterns that exist in our society. The critics duo Vasant A Shahane and R.V. Kaushik write:

Khushwant Singh's *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale* revolves around the interpersonal relationships of the members of the Buta Singh's household. It concludes their relations with other people. The various aspects of human relationships depicted provide an insight into the myriad forms of human nature. Most of the relationships have been developed with great deal of maturity and restraint. This book also touches upon the break down of the mutual relationship between the Hindus and the Muslims. (82)

Talking about the text, Ragini Ramchandra in *The Fiction of Khushwant Singh* analyses that the novel is marvelously entertaining description and exposes the essential weakness in the characters of the novel. The most integral part of his fiction is its ubiquitous humor. Humor is the mainstay of his writings. Khushwant Singh is a keen observer of common human weaknesses and brings them to light in a jovial manner. He is in his element when exposing the real face behind the mask people put on. He has personal aversion for such people. In this context, he has written several creative works that reveal the hollowness of westernized oriental gentlemen. Ragini Ramchandra writes:

In I shall Not hear the Nightingale, Khushwant Singh used wit and humor to expose the actual disposition of the various characters of the novel. Through his apt application of irony and satire, he shows up most of the characters as being rather sordid. Singh has also added some amount of sheer fun, and so the exposure is less harsh.

Khushwant Singh is basically a humanist and a humorist, and so he makes allowance for human frailties and reveals them in a general manner in *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale*. He has given an unusual

and amusing twist to all the relationships among different characters.

(278)

Rationale of the study

In the motley gallery of criticism and research upon Khushwant Singh's work *I shall Not Hear the Nightingale* has earned a pride of place. It has attracted considerable body of scholarship. Khushwant Singh's adaptation of the English language to the Indian idiom of expression, his cultural translation of an Indian world-view for the benefit of an increasingly receptive western audience, his integration of eastern and western experiences, his poignant human studies, his treatment of nature and human relationship, have all come in for detailed analysis. But relatively little attention has been paid to the study of the novel from nationalistic view point. Therefore, the objective of this research is a close study of Singh's involvement with politics.

Singh's *I shall Not Hear the Nightingale* has been deliberately chosen for the study on political point of view with the hope that this research will be helpful to the general reader of Khushwant Singh for further studies.

II. Nation, Nationalism and Violence: A Theoretical Study

Nation and Nationalism

By undertaking an examination of nation and nationalism, this section seeks to shed light on the introductory concept of them. Throughout history, human beings have formed groups of various kinds around criteria that are used to distinguish 'us' from 'them'. One such group is the nation. Many thousands, indeed millions, have died in wars on behalf of their nation, as they did in world wars I and II during the 20th century, perhaps the cruelest of all centuries. This section examines the various facets of the concept of nation and nationalism.

In Imagined Communities: Reflections on The Origin and Spread of Nationalism (1992), Benedict Anderson defines nationalism as “a particular form of ideological system which, like kinship and religion, often represents itself as a natural, spontaneously generated and fully developed world view uninfluenced by history, economics and politics”(143). Anderson notes that a sense of nationality has often been expressed through the idioms of ‘Kinship’ or ‘home’ and that both idioms denote something to which one is nationally tied. The fact that one cannot choose to be born in a particular country makes nationality appear as ineluctable as do race, gender or parentage. The "naturalness" of this creates an illusion of disinterestedness which fashions the nation as an entity unaffected by ideology. A nation is simply "there". Geographic borders that are united by ties of blood, language and culture all of which are believed to be spontaneous expressions of some national essence to limit it. Renan, like many thinkers, observes the nation as unnatural entity. Since it is a social construct, the nature of the nation is always unstable. Renan's nationalism sustains itself by a desire to perpetuate the values of common heritage and by striving

towards building a better nation. His idea of a nation is propounded in his famous essay "Qu'es-ce qu'une nation?" He writes:

A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle. Only two things, actually, constitute this soul, this spiritual principle. One is the past, other is the present. One is in the possession of a rich legacy of remembrances; the other is the actual consent, the desire to live together, the will to continue value the heritage which all hold in common. A heroic past is the social principle on which the national idea rests. To have common glories in the past, a common will in the present; to have accomplished great things together, to wish to do so again, that is the essential condition for being a nation. (qtd. in Hutchinson and Smith 25)

It is undeniable that one of the essential human needs is the need to belong to a permanent country. Belonging to a particular country allows one to eliminate or minimize the feelings of loneliness. Bohdan Dziemidok believes, "the virtue of this form of satisfying the need of belonging is [...] like belonging to a family, it imposes on us no requirements of fulfilling any condition, it requires from us no merits or achievements and is given to us unconditionally" (36). Hence, the feeling of belonging to a national community shapes the national identity and national culture. Earnest Gellner, one of the greatest theoreticians of nation and nationalism, gives two provisional definitions of nation—cultural and voluntaristic—that point out two constitutive elements of national identity. These are a common culture which is "a system of ideas, signs, associations, modes of behavior and communication", and "a feeling of belongingness to the same nation if, and only if, they believe that they belong to the same nation" (16). Supporting Gellner's voluntaristic view of nationalism, Mary Kaldor argues, "nationalism to be a [...] subjective affirmation and

reaffirmation; nationalism will persist to the extent that individuals, movements and groups choose to be nationalist" (162).

Elaborating the working definition of nationalism, Anthony D. Smith says:

"An ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity and identity for a population which some of its members deem to constitute an actual or potential "nation" (9). For him, a nation cannot survive without a sufficient degree of national autonomy, national unity and national identity. Likewise, Liah Greenfeld argues nationalism as:

It refers to the set of ideas and sentiments which form the conceptual framework of national identity. National identity is one among many possible, and often coexisting and overlapping identities-such as religious, estate, occupational, tribal, linguistic, territorial, class, gender, and more. National identity represents what may be called the "fundamental identity" The one that is believed to other identities may modify but slightly, and to which they are consequently considered secondary. (69)

However, in the post-Renaissance period, the ideology of a national formation based on the unifying culture turned out to be the imperialism. Similarly, later the newly emergent nation-states in post-Imperialism era were motivated by the European nationalism. So, it is inappropriate to say that single common culture can create exclusive and homogeneous conception of national tradition, "National culture", Asha Sen argues-"must today be represented as a hybridize of different voices-modern, colonial, all of which constantly define and redefine each other" (46). In the post-Imperial era, assimilation between different cultures is greatly abetted and intensified

by nationalism and the idea of nation states. As Fred Dallmayr quotes Rupert Emerson:

In the contemporary world, the nation is for greater portions of mankind the community with which men must intensely and most unconditionally identify them [...]. The nation is today the largest community which [...] effectively commands men's loyalty, overriding the claims both of the lesser communities within it and those, which cut across it. In this sense the nation can be called a "terminal community". (Dallmayr 15)

On the other hand, a critic like A.R. Desai sees nationalism through historical perspective. For him, "like all social phenomena, nationalism is a historical category. It emerged in the social world at a certain stage of the evolution of the life of the community when certain socio-historical conditions, both objectives and subjective, matured" (4). It means that before national communities, national societies, national states, and national cultures came into existence, communities in various parts of the world generally lived through tribal, slave, and feudal phases of social existence. At a certain stage of social, economic, and cultural development, nations come into being.

Since the early 1980s, the resurgence of scholarly interest in the figure of the nation has been characterized by a sustained critical interrogation of it. It is now generally accepted that the nation is not a primordial category, fixed and unchanging. Rather it is the product of a specific historical moment, born as the European world slowly emerged into modernity, from the cradle of what Eric Hobsbawm calls 'the dual revolution' at the end of the eighteenth century, one which transformed its the political contours of Europe, the other which transformed its economic field of

production, each of them trailing in its wake the great social upheavals that lay the basis for the kind of world.

Many thinkers give their own views about the most debatable term 'nation'. The field of study of nation can be divided in two main camps: those who believe that the nation is primarily a cultural category, are called 'culturalist' and those who consider it to be primarily a political category are called 'statists'. For the culturalists the nation can be defined as a cultural community which exists above and beyond any political organization of it into a state; it is, therefore, 'pre-political'. These cultural communities, which Anthony D. Smith terms '*ethnies*' provide the basis for modern nations. They are more or less culturally homogeneous on the basis of what he terms a 'myth-symbol' complex, which forms a fund of shared historical meanings to which every possessor of that cultural has access, which bonds 'a people' together, and which ties that people to a 'historic territory or homeland'. The nation is, therefore, a collectivity of meaning, a bond embedded in history through common myths, symbols narratives and other cultural forms, all of which enable 'a people' to know itself as a commonality as opposed to others who do not have access to this fund of historical memories. This *ethnie* therefore places upon the transformations that create modern nations. Thus, the nation could be seen as the product of modernity only in so far as the era of nationalism succeeded in uniting the community on a new, political basis. For these scholars, if politics is important, it is only because it is the expression of a pre-existing nation; the nation exists 'objectively' regardless of whether it is organized politically or not.

For statists, on the other hand, the nation is primarily a political category. Earnest Gellner points out in the opening sentence of his book *Nations and Nationalism*, "Nationalism is primarily a political principle which holds that the

political and national unit should be congruent (1). The statist believe that the figure of the nation emerges as a solution to the socio-political problems faced at the end of the eighteenth century as a result of increasing modernization, the Industrial and French Revolutions and the massive socio-political upheavals they engendered, and of transformations in the relationship between the state and 'society'. Gellner points out that nationalism emerges only in milieus in which the existence of the state is already very much taken for granted', and in so far as statist believe nations to be the result of nationalist politics, the existence of 'politically centralized units' has a definitive rather than merely expressive impact upon the formation of nations (4).

Growth of Indian Nationalism

The significance of the study of the rise and growth of Indian nationalism, from the standpoint of a general study of nationalism, is great. Dr. A.R Desai rightly points out that "Indian nationalism is a modern phenomenon. It came into being during the British period as a result of the action and inter-action of numerous subjective and objective forces and factors which developed within the Indian society under the conditions of British rule and impact of world forces"(5). Another view is that nationalism was always a phenomenon of Indian life. Kohn Hans maintains that "a truer basis of unity than modern national sentiments was to be found in a common intellectual heritage persisting through an unbroken tradition and molding and permeating India's whole social life to the minutest detail, and in the peculiar contemplative piety which lies at the root of all the various forms of Hinduism" (349). However, Percival Griffiths points out that "the advent of the Muslims introduced in India the divergences of race, religion, language and social traditions and these in turn, greatly marred the growth of Indian nationality"(67).

Basically, nationalism in India arose to meet the challenge of foreign domination. The very existence of a foreign rule helped the growth of a national sentiment among the people. And then there was a clash between the British interests in India and the interests of the Indian people. The British had conquered India to promote their own interests and they ruled over her primarily with that object in view. With the passage of time, there was a realization in India and that realization brought bitterness against foreign rule and that was responsible for the growth of the nationalist movement to drive out the foreigners from the country. All classes of people in India joined at one stage or the other the nationalist movement in the country. The intelligentsia in India, the peasants, the artisans and the workers all played their part in the holy struggle.

Causes

The nationalist movement in India was the outcome of a large number of factors and the most important among them was British Imperialism. It was during the British rule that the whole of India was conquered and brought under one sovereign authority. The domination by one country over the whole of India enabled the people of India to think and act as one nation. Before the coming of the British to India, the people of the South were usually separated from the rest of India except for short intervals. British Imperialism helped the process of the unification of the country. Prof. Moon rightly says: "British imperialism in India gave her a political unity under a third party in spite of the many discordant elements in Indian society"(25).

The second cause of the growth of nationalist movement was the effects of British rule. British rule brought the entire geographical area of the country under a single administration. It unified the country by introducing a uniform system of law

and government. The introduction of the modern methods of communication and transport produced the same unifying effect. The modern industries were all India in their scope for the sources of their raw-materials and their market embraced the entire country. The economic life and a lot of the Indian people were getting inter-linked and India's economic life was becoming a single whole. The two new classes born in this country, the capitalist class and the working class were all India in character and stood above the traditional division of caste, region and religion.

The third was the improvements in means of transport and communication which quickened the pace of the nationalist movement in the country. The leaders found themselves in a position to carry on their national propaganda in every nook and corner of the country. Without the modern means of transport, books, magazines and newspapers could not have quickly been distributed throughout the country. To quote A.R Desai, "Modern means of transport were a formidable force in unifying the Indian people socially. The locomotive, triumphantly traversing a big physical distance, also helped to annihilate the social distance dividing the people living in different parts"(64).

Fourth, the English language played an important part in the growth of nationalism in the country. It acted as the *lingua franca* of the intelligentsia of India. Without the common medium of the English language, it would have been well-nigh impossible for the Madrasis, Bengalees and the Punjabis to sit at one table and discuss the common problems facing the country. The English language also made the Indians inheritors of a great literature which was full of great ideas and ideals. Tagore says:

We had come to know England through her glorious literature, which had brought new inspiration into our young lives. The English authors

whose books and poems we studied were full of love, humanity, justice and freedom. This great literary tradition had come down to us from the revolutionary period. We felt its power in Wordsworth's sonnets about human liberty. We glorified in it even in the immature production of Shelley written in the enthusiasm of his youth when he declared against the tyranny of priest craft and preached the overthrow of all despotisms through the powered of suffering bravely endured. All this tired our youthful imaginations. We believed with all our simple faith that even if we rebelled against foreign rule, we should have the pathy of the west. We feel that England was on our side in wishing to gain our freedom. (qtd. in Desai 438)

Next, the Indian press, and literature both English and vernacular, also aroused national consciousness. Great was the influence of the papers like *The Indian Mirror*, *The Bombay Samachar*, *The Kesari*, *The Bengalee* etc., on the political life of the country. The growth of the Indian press was phenomenal. It is rightly pointed out that the Indian press helped in mobilizing public opinion, conveying provincial and national conferences, organizing political movements, building up public institutions and fighting out public controversies. The writings of Din Bandhu Mitra, Hem Chandra Banrjee, Navin Chandra Sen, Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, etc., affected the minds of the people of India. These patriots' brought about a revolution in the minds of the Indians. It is the revolutionary minds that were responsible for the growth of Indian nationalism.

The religious and social reformers like Raja Ram Mohan Ray, Devendra Nath Tagore, Kishor Chandra Sen, P.C Sarkar, Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar, Swami Dayanand Saraswati, Ram Krishna Paramhans, Vivekanand, etc., presented a glorious

picture of India's past and appealed to the people of India to bring back those good days once again. Regarding the influence of Raja Ram Mohan Ray, Vidya Dhar Mahajan says that "it is contended that political awakening in India began with Raja Ram Mohan Roy. It is study of English literature, history and parliamentary institutions acquainted him with the western political ideas and he introduced the method of presenting public grievances by petitions, pamphlets, memorials, public meetings and the press" (41). Like him, the preaching speeches of many reformers made them of the glory and greatness of their country's past and exhorted them to leave no stone unturned to make India great.

Next cause was the discontent among the people. The masses suffered from economic troubles. The revenue charged by the Government was more than what the people could afford to pay. The economic system was adjusted to the needs of the people of England. The interests of the Indians were completely ignored. There were a lot of wasteful expenditure which adversely affected the Indian economy. Thousands of Indian troops were sent outside India and they were all paid out of Indian revenues. This affected the financial condition of Indian. The economic policy of the British proved disastrous for the Indian People. They made the India people to suffer from starvation.

Besides these, administration of justice, arrogance of foreigners in India immorality in army, role of Christian missionaries was also the causes of national movement. Due to these suppression and inhumanity activity of the foreigners made the motives to think about their prestige and status. Thus, the national movement was based on the phenomenon of the nation in the making while it was itself a powerful factor contributing to this phenomenon. Its growing strength depended in part on the

extent to which the people became conscious of their being part of a nation whose essential interests required a struggle for the overthrow of Imperialism.

National Movement

Apart from the reactionary concepts out of which the consciousness and sentiment of the national was born, the organized articulation of the same was also significant. This organized articulation became a fact with the establishment of the Indian National Congress in 1885. By articulating their own demands, as national and claiming for themselves the status of the representatives of the whole nation, the early nationalists had become the first nationalist group who put forward their problem in front of the British Imperial power. They tried to capture the voice of all the people.

The first thirty years of the Indian nationalist movement is usually divided into two phases. The first two decades known as the moderate phase and the third, as the extremist or the nationalist phase-with the whole of this stage coming to end in 1916-17 when the two groups came together to begin what is known as the Gandhian Phase. The differences between the Moderates and the Extremists were real and significant. For the former the British rule was providential; it brought immense good to the country. It opened up the country to modernity and its benefits. It was thus necessary not to antagonize the rulers prematurely. They accepted the framework of the polity erected by the British with all its potentialities of democracy and power-equalization, rule of law and citizenship. For the extremists on the other hand, colonial rule was satanic; it destroyed Indian culture and tradition, and brought humiliation and servitude to the Indian people. The sooner the country got rid of this evil, the better. To achieve this aim, one had to give up the policy of mendicancy and take to militant ways based on one's own religion and tradition.

Politics of Violence

The image of Mahatma Gandhi and the overall success of his methods have led many to believe that India achieved freedom without resort to violence. In fact violent resistance was preached and practised from the beginning of the national movement till its end and had a significant effect on its course and outcome.

The timidity of the Moderates exasperated the youth of India and they decided to take to violence to turn out the foreigners from the country. Many youths were convinced that the British rule in India could not be ended by constitutional methods and force had to be employed for that purpose. These revolutionaries believed in the philosophy of bomb or pistol. They considered it as a sacred duty to subvert the British rule in India by violent means. The revolutionaries did not believe in methods of appeal, persuasion and peaceful struggle. They were convinced that without violence, it was impossible to uproot an imperialism imposed and maintained by brute force. It was the reactionary and repressive policy of the British Government that exasperated them. They believed in violent action with a view to demoralising the administration and its Indian collaborators.

Their commitment to revolution was moreover total. To them, revolution was not a mere historical accident or curiosity. It was not merely the demand of a particular historical situation in India. It was "inalienable right of mankind". More, it was the eternal principle of human progress. A perpetual process of revolution was needed if human society was not to stagnate and if it was to be overpowered by the dark forces of decay. According to manifesto of the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association (1929):

Upheavals have always been a terror to holders of power and privilege. (But) Revolution is a phenomenon which nature loves and without which there can be no progress either in nature or in human affairs. Revolution is not a philosophy of despair or a creed of desperadoes. Revolution may be anti-God but is certainly not antimem. It is a vital, living force which is indicative of eternal conflict between the old and the new, between life and living Death, between the light and Darkness. There is no concord, no symphony, no rhythm without Revolution. The music of the spheres' of which poets have sung, would remain an unreality if a ceaseless Revolution were to be eliminated from the space. Revolution is law, Revolution is order and Revolution is the Truth. (qtd. in Bipan Chandra 234-35)

Such glorification of revolution and willingness to make great sacrifices at its altar were, of course, not peculiar to the period under discussion. These were, in fact, inherited from their predecessors. Where first the leaders of the Hindustan Republican Association and then Bhagat Singh and his comrades took a giant step forward was in broadening the scope. Bhagat Singh and others repeatedly disclaimed that revolution was to be identified with violence or with "the cult of the pistol and the bomb". Revolution was no longer to be seen as a mere political act. It had a deeper, wider social content. Its aim was to regenerate society, to change the social order based on "manifest injustice." A fuller statement of their position was made in Bhagat Singh's and Battukeswar Dutt's statement of 6 June 1929:

By revolution we mean the ultimate establishment of an order of society which may not be threatened by such (social) breakdowns and in which the sovereignty of the proletariat shall be recognized and as a

result of which a world federation should redeem humanity from the bondage of capitalism and misery of imperial wars. (qtd. in Bipan Chandra 236)

Starting with this view of the revolutionary process, the revolutionary terrorists were no longer satisfied with the mere prospects of the achievement of complete national independence. Even national freedom had to be seen as a means to a new social order. So, socialism became the official goal of the revolutionary terrorists, and Bhagat Singh was made forerunner of this movement. He was given powerful backing by Sukhdev, Bejoy Kumar Sinha, and Shiv Varma. Regarding the vision of life of Bhagat Singh, Niraja Rao remarks:

Bhagat Singh was an outstanding revolutionary and martyr of the Indian anti-colonial movement. He represented the youth who were dissatisfied with Gandhian politics and grouped for revolutionary alternatives. Bhagat Singh studied the European revolutionary movement and was attracted to anarchism and communism. He became a confirmed atheist, socialist and communist. He realised that the overthrow of British rule should be accompanied by the socialist reconstruction of Indian society and for this political power must be seized by the workers. (1)

Bhagat Singh argued that a 'radical change' was necessary and it is the duty of those who realise it to reorganise society on the socialistic basis. The growing socialist consciousness enabled them to constantly link capitalism and imperialism. They began to see the close link between capitalism and modern imperialism, between capitalist economic exploitation and the enslavement of nations. For them,

socialism alone could lead to the establishment of complete independence and the removal of all social distinctions and privileges.

In this later phase of life, Bhagat Singh had abandoned his belief in terrorism and individual heroic action. He had turned to Marxism and had come to believe that popular broad-based mass movements alone could lead to a successful revolution; in other words revolution could only be achieved by the masses for the masses'. That is why Bhagat Singh helped establish the Punjab Naujawan Bharat Sabha in 1926, as the open wing of the revolutionaries. As Naraja Rao quotes:

Bhagat Singh was critical of the individual terrorism which was prevalent among the revolutionary youth of his time and realised the need for mass mobilization by the communist party. In his final writings he argued that the party had to organize the workers and the peasantry. The fight around the small economic demands through the labour unions were the best means to educate the masses for a final struggle to conquer political power. Apart from this work it was necessary for the communist party to organise a military department. The military department of the party should always keep ready all the war-material it can command for any emergency. (qtd. in Niraja Rao 1-2)

At last Birindra Pal Singh believes, "It is true that the revolutionaries failed to bring about the independence of India. However, they had made their own contribution to the national cause" (22). It is they who set an example before the Indians by sacrificing their own lives. They taught the people not by precept but by personal example. They taught the people to face death and do everything for the sake of their country. By their sacrifices, they created a new spirit which helped the

Indians ultimately to win their freedom. The impression which the revolutionaries left on the minds of the people was very effective and great. They extorted the people to live dedicated lives—self-sacrifice for national emancipation, a feeling of service for the needy and the oppressed and dislike for self-publicity and political exhibitionism. The revolutionaries were the heroes who left their footprints on the sands of time.

Terrorism and Non-Violence

The Extremists were expelled from the Indian National Congress in 1907. After the First World War they were allowed to re-enter the organization. From that point on the national movement can be described as a blend of the Extremists' activism and demand for independence and the Moderates' constitutional methods and willingness to compromise. From 1920 onwards the principal Congress leader was M.K. Gandhi. His main method, passive resistance, had been advanced by Bengali Extremists the same time he began experimenting with it in South Africa. But the Extremists, unlike Gandhi, considered passive resistance an expedient and not an article of faith.

Peter Heehs describes “during the quarter-century between 1922 and the attainment of independence, the principal methods of the national movement were constitutional negotiation and non-violence passive resistance. But there were also numerous outbreaks of terrorism, and these kept British security forces in a state of constant alert” (7). Terrorism also influenced the political agenda. In 1931, for instance, Congress passed a resolution commending the bravery of Bhagat Singh and two other terrorists who had just been executed. Its wording became a bone of contention between Gandhi's group, which insisted on the inclusion of a phrase 'dissociating from and disapproving of political violence in any shape or form', and a strong anti-Gandhi faction to overshadow the discussion of the Gandhi-Irwin

Agreement. The widespread support for Bhagat Singh and other terrorists, both within congress and among the general public, was such that the official congress historian had to admit at this moment 'Bhagat Singh's name was as widely known all over India and was as popular as Gandhiji' (12).

In recognition of terrorism's popular appeal, Gandhi claimed to 'admire and adore' the patriotism of the 'party of violence'. It was, he said in 1930, 'as patriotic as the best among us', commendable especially because it had 'much sacrifice to its credit'. But while admiring the objective of these 'young men and even women who want to see their country free at any cost', he had 'no faith what so ever in their method'. Knowing that they wanted action and not talk, he invited them to channel their energy into the civil disobedience movement, which alone could bring 'complete independence' and at the same time 'save the country from impending lawlessness and secret time. At no time did Gandhi compromise his ideals by co-operating with party of violence; but he knew that much of his strength came from being perceived by the British as a lesser evil than men like Bhagat Singh.

During the first two decades of India's independent existence there was little organized terrorism in the country; but since then it has been a constant presence. During the late 1960s left-wing insurgents began using terrorist methods to achieve their aims. The eighties saw the rise of separatist terrorism in Punjab, Kashmir and Assam and among ethnic Tamils in Sri Lanka. Targeting of rulers or officials of oppressive regimes has given place to kidnappings, mass murders and aims apparently more criminal than political. Most terrorists operating in India today seem to have more in common with the new generation in Europe than with their predecessors in the national movement. While there was an element of gratuitous violence and crime in pre-1947 terrorism, most of its practitioners were activated by a sincere desire for

freedom. Despite their failings they made a substantial contribution India's national movement.

Quit India Movement

Quit India Movement was a revolutionary movement in which millions of Indian people raised their hands against British Imperialist. The activities like suppression and exploitation the Indians made fed up. As a result, Indians wanted their own India and intended to be ruled by the native people. They told the British people many times to leave the country for them but they continued their behavior and never tried to realize the energy of Indians. As a result, people started to reach a stage where they could demonstrate that they could lay down their lives for national independence and it would become impossible for a foreign power to continue to impose its will on them for any length of time.

K.K. Chaudhary says, "Quit India was a Revolution not because there was a violent explosion of pent up energy, but there was a violent explosion because it was a Revolution" (17). In this revolution, the violence method was unintended. Though, the leaders did not want to accept violation. But anarchy was hidden and it was purposeful. The Revolution indeed conformed to Mahatma Gandhi's idea of Anarchy. It did not begin accidentally instead it took long days. Veritably, its amplitude and spontaneity have no parallel in world history. It was indeed mass revolution having the concept to punish the British for their sins of exploitation and enslavement of Indians.

Of all the ideological interventions into nationalist politics during the struggle for Indian independence, M.K. Gandhi was unquestionably the most decisive in terms of the movement's development from the spectacular ineffectiveness of an

elitist constitutional politics into a broadly based mass movement capable of mobilizing, during periods of maximal resistance, diverse and often contradictory constituencies. The Gandhian era of the movement is understandably seen as the period in which the nationalist movement became multi-class and multi-based, gained politico legitimacy, achieved enormous power due to its indigenous tone and style.

Many reasons have been given for starting the “Quit India Movement”. The first was the growing of Japanese invasion of India. Mahatma Gandhi wanted to save India from that attack and his view was that if the British Government withdrew from India, the Japanese might not attack India. Another was the defenselessness of the British positions in India. The views of Mahatma Gandhi was that India would meet the same fate as Malaya and Burma met if the British did not withdrew from India.

Next, the mind of Mahatma Gandhi was revolting against the racial discrimination shown in the process of evacuation from Burma. The British provided separate routes for the evacuation of Europeans and Indians. The White Road was meant for Europeans and the Black Road for Indians. The result was that the Indian evacuees had to undergo too many hardships on the way. Another was the sufferings of the people on account of the “scorched earth” policy followed by the British Government in India. The lands belonging to the people of India were destroyed for military purposes and they were not given adequate compensation. They were deprived of their means of livelihood. Likewise, many other factors which watered the cause of “Quit India Movement”.

In the summer of the 1942 history was moving very fast and Mahatma Gandhi was ordaining the end of a mighty Empire. He was aware that anarchy might lead to an internecine warfare for a time or to an unrestricted sabotage. Yet it was a

case for *swaraj* or death. This would arise India as a welfare state. British ordered, disciplined anarchy should go and if there was complete lawlessness in India as a result, he was prepared to risk it. Because he believed that those 22 years of continuous effort at educating India along the lines of non-violence would not have gone in vain, and the people would evolve a real popular order out of chaos. Gandhiji did intend to keep his biggest movement an “open rebellion of a non-violent character”, Even if there be violence here and there, he would not on this occasion withdraw the movement, because according to him it would be greater violence for him to try to withhold his hand and to risk more violence that might take place, if he does not act. By non-violence if possible but by violence if necessary, was his watchword.

Gandhi, at that time, would prefer anarchy to the present impotency. Anarchy would itself stimulate the country to bring about order of a different type than the one now imposed by the dominating power. He was prepared to accept anarchy as an alternative to the existing order, and made it known that contemplated struggle was to be “a conflagration” and that he would “not hesitate to run any risk however great”. The parables and phrases used by him would have the ring of war slogans to the western eye, although they must appear in quite another light to any one who lived in the atmosphere of his mind.

As regards the gain of the result of 1942, Arun Chandra Bhuyan says, “[...] it had shown to the latter the strength of Indian nationalism in a way in which nothing else had been done in the past. [...] it represented the most serious challenge to British rule in India since the rebellion of 1857 this was acknowledged by no less a person than the Viceray himself". (qtd. in Vidya Dhar Mahajan 497). Quit India movement marked the culmination of the Indian freedom movement. It gave

utterance to India's anger against imperialism and her determination to be free. It was a living testimony to the white not intensity which the nationalist feelings had reached and the limits to which the people were prepared to suffer.

In a nutshell, Quit India indeed was not a mere slogan but caught on as a revolutionary cry, potent call of the soul of India struggling for self-realization. It was a passion of India a mighty urge made upon British to do the right thing to the 'wronged' nation. It was an essential condition for the emancipation of India and to encourage the people to give their best to the winning of the war for democracy. The result made to British nation realize, supreme realists as they have been, that their rule was no longer wanted by India. There was a deep and widespread anti-British feeling existing after this movement.

Though, the movement was heavily mobilized by the Indian people, but there were India based British supporters also who named to this revolution 'irresponsible and insane'. They did not want change. They thought if Britishers went in this critical situation, Japan would capture the nation and it would be no optimistic sign for the Indians. Many thought that it was the Britishers who developed country as well as the people. Leader like Mr. Jinnah appealed to the Muslims to keep aloof from the Quit India movement. His view was that the success of the movement would harmful to the Muslims. The Muslim League maintained an attitude of "benevolent neutrality" towards the Government. They view of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru was that the quit India resolution was "ill-considered" and "ill-opportune". He stood for a compromise between the government and the congress. Like them, many other criticized the movement.

III. Politics of Nationalism and Violence in Khushwant Singh's *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale*

As I have said in my methodological chapter, nationalist movement in India was the outcome of the national feelings among the people. The people became fed up by seeing the behaviour of foreign rulers. As a result, they tried to organize all the nationalists under a single umbrella. The people gathered from different states and spoke the same slogan. As time passed, the youths exasperated to see the timidity of constitutional methods. Many youths were convinced that the British rule in India could not be ended by constitutional methods and force had to be employed for that purpose. They decided to take to violence to turn out the foreigners from the country.

For the Nationalists, revolution was not only a political act. It had a deeper, wider social content. Its purpose was to regenerate society, to change the social order based on manifest injustice. Along with majority of the people, the movement was led by youths, labours and farmers. These youngsters had no faith in compromise and confession. They believed in action, not on talk. Because they knew the nature of British Government—divide and rule—policy. Due to this policy, many Indians were confused and knowingly or unknowingly fell in the grasp of foreign administration. But, at the very same time, the people with aggressive blood gave up their confusion and got ready to give their lives for their country. Such motives are related to the issues of conflict between imperialism and nationalism, treatment of violence and symbols and their political dimensions in this chapter

Conflict between Imperialism and Nationalism

Khushwant Singh has presented the conflict between Indians and the British Government against the background of the Punjab, and its military history and Sikh religion. He has tried to give a very microscopic picture of Punjabi in the novel when he concentrates his attention on the political theme. He describes the time when the colonial encounter between the Indians and the British was going on.

The characters in *I shall Not Hear the Nightingale* can be classified in two groups: one, Sardar Buta Singh, Wazir Chand, John Taylor and Lambardar are pro-British in their attitude; two: Sher Singh, Madan and other student leaders are anti-British in their attitude, and both the pro-British and the anti-British ideologies are cherished by different members of a Sikh. Buta Singh, for example, happens to be a District Magistrate who has a great admiration for the British rule in India. He thinks, "...Loyalty to the Raj had been as much faith with him as it had been with his father and grandfather who had served in the army. He, like them, had mentioned the English king or queen in his prayer, o, Guru, bless our sovereign and bless us their subjects so that we remain contented and happy" (23). Buta Singh tells his son

The Indians should help the British in their war against the Germans and other European powers. I do believe that in this war our interests and that of the English are identical. If they lose, we lose. If we help them to win, they will certainly give us something more than we have now. We should know who our friends are and who our enemies are. The English have ruled us for over a hundred years, and I don't care what you say. I believe they have treated us better than our own kings did in the past; or the Germans, Italians or Japanese will do if they win take our India. We must by the English in their hour of trouble. (23)

Buta Singh knows that his sympathy for the British rule in India may earn him the scorn of his own countrymen. But he does not mind being unpopular with his countrymen as long as he has the patronage of the British rulers like, the District Commissioner, Mr. John Taylor. Buta Singh's attitude to life is opportunistic in that he wants to accept the contingencies of political life and turn them to his own best possible advantage so that he can lead a life of security and ensure happiness for his family.

Buta Singh's son Sher Singh believes in a diametrically opposite philosophy of life. A young and energetic student in the local college, he heads the Student Union as its President. He is not very serious about his studies, but he is tired by the patriotic zeal and nationalistic philosophy. He questions the very rationale of the British rule in India and pleads for self-government for the motherland. He is not influenced by his father's loyalty to the British. He, therefore, reacts very strongly to his father, "We are far too concerned with other people. Our communist friends are only worried about what will happen to Russia: others think only of what will happen to Britain. Very few of us are bothered with our own future" (23). Sher Singh is, thus, deeply concerned with the Indian life. He becomes an embodiment of the nationalistic ideal. He enjoys the support of a large mass of students and consequently conducts several secret meetings of students there by planning to carry out terrorist activities in the city of Amritsar. He gets the co-operation of other leaders like Madan, son of Wazir Chand. Thus the conflict between the pro-British attitude and the anti-British comes into operation in one and the same family which may be said to be a microscopic symbol of the macroscopic phenomenon of the Indian political life.

Buta Singh's sympathy for the British rule is supported by his knowledge of the internal contradictions and conflicts of Indian life. He knows that there is no homogeneous society in India and that it is a mosaic of many castes and cultures, like the Sikhs, the Hindu and the Muslim among others. He knows that the ethnic conflicts are sparked off in the violence and chaos. He, therefore, believes that the British rule can keep these violent and conflicting forces under check and offer a political unity to India.

The conflict between the pro-British and the anti- British continues all through the novel. Sher Singh patriotic speech whips up the nationalistic zeal in the audience and elicits great applauses from them. He expresses his nationalistic ideology in the fiery speech he delivers at the gathering of patriotic students,

Comrades, we meet at a crucial time. The enemy is at our gatest [...]
 Comrades, We not only have the enemy at our door step, we have
 enemies within our own house [...]. Those who sacrifice the interests
 of the motherland for foreign countries are our enemy No. 1. They
 have been rightly named as the *Kaum nashts* -destroyers of the race
 [...]. There are also people who want to cut off the limbs of Mother
 India and make another state Pakistan. They too are our enemies [...]
 But we are Sikhs who do not fear any enemies. We shall destroy all
 those who stand in our way. (39)

Buta Singh does not encourage his son to indulge in anti-British activities. Though he knows the general trend of his son's thinking, he does not know any details of his secret activities. He enjoys the confidence of the D.C. John Taylor and offers him when, for example, John Taylor issues an order banning the Hindu procession in the city, the Hindus feel insulted and irritated because the Muslim and Sikh

processions were not banned earlier. Wazir Chand, who is a Hindu, wants to meet the D.C. Taylor and gets permission for the Hindu procession by explaining the situation. But he is not permitted. He, therefore, seeks the help of Buta Singh and requests him to explain the sensitiveness of the communal issue to John Taylor and gets at least a relaxation of the ban order. Buta Singh who enjoys the confidence of John Taylor meets the latter at his residence, explains the possibility of communal explosion in the city and finally but gently persuades him to relax the ban order against the Hindu procession.

The ideological conflict between father and son continues all through the novel. When Buta Singh habitually admires the British people and their impartiality etc., and suggests that "we Indians have a lot to learn from them"(76). Sher Singh boldly crosses his father and argues that the British "too have something to learn from us [...] like hospitality [...] tolerance [...] etc." (77). Buta Singh pinpoints the mutual intolerance among Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims and highlights the so-called impartiality and tolerance of the British people. Sher Singh does not hesitate to show the racial discrimination practiced by the British elsewhere, "you can find examples like that everywhere. Most white people are anti-Semitic. It's not only Hitler [...], the Russians have killed many. Everywhere in Europe and America there is prejudice against them and only because they have better brains and talent than others. We do not have any racial discrimination" (77). Sher Singh's mother Sabhrai does not like his being cross with his father and asks him "Tell me, son, what will you get if the English leave this country?" (78). Then Sher Singh replies that the country will be free. He waxes lyrical and hopes that "Spring will come to our barren land once more [...] once more the nightingales will sing" (79). The song of nightingales thus becomes a symbol of freedom and joy for Sher Singh.

As the time passes, Sher Singh associates himself with the terrorist group of Amritsar and begins to indulge in the terrorist activities in the city. He is so much preoccupied with the nationalistic-cum-terroristic activities that he remains blissfully ignorant about the loss of his wife's chastity. In spite of his knowledge about Madan's being a notorious womanizer, he fails to know that he has been cuckolded by the latter. Though Sher Singh hates the British rule and the British officers, he is persuaded by his father to meet the District Commissioner Mr. John Taylor to develop some familiarity with him and consequently to change his attitude towards him.

Buta Singh expresses his pure admiration for the British people, "As I was saying, these Englishmen take a lot of interest in other people, and it is not just curiosity, it is a genuine concern with their problems. Now Taylor knows all of you by name, what you are doing, how you have failed in your examinations everything. He has an excellent memory (94). Far from being impressed by his father's Anglophilia, Sher Singh offers his severe comment on the Englishmen,

They have learnt from Americans [. . .]. They have reduced human relationships to a set of rules. They say you must know the name of the person you are talking to and use it as often as possible. You must know his or her interest and talk about them and never of your own. They write down whatever they have discussed with anyone in their diaries and refresh their memories before the next meeting. It does not mean much because their real desire is to create a good impression about themselves. They are not one bit concerned with the affairs of the person they happen to be talking to (94).

But when he meets John Taylor much against his willingness, he feels angry with himself. Although Taylor treats him with courtesy and advises him to relax in

the summer holidays and even offers him permission to own a rifle, Sher Singh feels confused between the contradictory feelings in him like respecting the authority of the District Commissioner on the one hand and his hatred for the British rule on the other. Similarly he feels confused between his fear of the empty cartridges fingered by John Taylor and his eagerness to drive out to British from India. He feels a sense of humiliation at having agreed to meet John Taylor and a sense of anger at his parents and wife for having pressurized him, to meet the officer. He, therefore, returns home with a decision never to repeat such a compromising act.

Sher Singh dreams of harmonizing the contradictory philosophies of his family somehow or the other, without realizing the impossibility of such a happening in real life. He thinks at once “Britain had to get out of India herself or be kicked out, and Sher Singh would say that to Taylor’s face, could he? What about his father’s views? His cousin in service and his hope of finding his name in the next Honors list? [. . .] (118).

On the other side, “he visualized scenes when his Nationalist and terrorist colleagues honored him as their beloved leader, [. . .] such were the dreams with which Sher Singh tried to dope himself” (118). Thus Sher Singh dreams of achieving his ideal and hope to concretize his plans by resolving the confusion in his mind.

As his will power grows stronger with the passing of time, he decides to resort to terrorist action. He, therefore, calls a secret meeting of his student friends near the canal bridge outside the city. He hides the arms in his garage to escape the notice of the Government police. He also knows that some of his fellow conspirators might be informers against him and therefore remains quite alert.

By this time, the nationalist activities begin rigorously. The Gandhi-cap covered patriots begin to attack the shops and public offices. The British soldiers try to beat the patriots violently. Thus, the nationalistic struggle gathers force and occupies the mind of Indians who tend to forget or neglect their personal problems shops are looted, roads are blocked and trains are stopped by the nationalist agitators. After learning about the spread of nationalistic movement all over the country, Sher Singh's rebellious impulse grows more and more intense. Finally he overcomes his confusion and oscillation and decides to indulge in terrorist action. He, therefore, calls a secret meeting of his fellow rebels and takes the oath of liberating the country from the foreign rule. They take the oath of secrecy before indulging in terroristic action. They define their terroristic targets clearly. As Sher Singh makes it clear, "The call is to destroy means of communication. A few bridges blown up, a few roads barricaded and the British army will be stuck where it is" (153). Accordingly, they take six hand grenades and initially blow the central bridge and think that nobody knows about themselves.

Since the nationalistic activities spread all over the country, the British officers, especially John Taylor becomes very alert and tries to control the situation as far as they can. John Taylor, therefore, sends for Buta Singh to track down the agitators unofficially. He also suggests to Buta Singh that he knows about Sher Singh's nationalistic activities. He explains to him clearly that they would leave India as soon as the war is over. He tells, "Your son could do a good service to his friends and his country. You know we are anxious to get out of India [. . .] will not leave the country to the Japanese or the Germans. And these acts are calculated to do just that-hand over India on a silver platter to the fascist powers" (59). An ardent admirer of British rule, Buta Singh decides to advise his son at his leisure.

But, on the other side, John Taylor sends a warrant to search the house of Sardar Buta Singh and to arrest Sher Singh for the charge of the murder of Lambardar, the police-informer. Buta Singh does not know what is happening in his house because he is at John Taylor house and narrating the history of the loyalty of his family to the British crown right from the days of Sikh rule. He narrates, “My great grandfather, who was a *Subedar* [. . .], joined the British army. My grandfather was also in the British army.[. . .] My father [. . .] recruited many soldiers in the 1914-18 war [. . .]. I have kept up the tradition of loyalty to the British Crown and will do so till the day I dies” (180).

Then John Taylor gently asks Buta Singh about his son’s nationalistic and terroristic activities and his connection with the murder of the village headman, Jhimma Singh. Buta Singh is simply shocked out of his wits and begins to cry for shame. He covers his face with his palms and blurts out, “my nose has been cut. I can no longer show my face to the world”(182). John Taylor tells him further that his son Sher Singh has been put into jail and gives him fifteen days leave and allows him to see and advise his son as often as he can.

Buta Singh with his pro-British attitude is so much angered and insulted by his son’s arrest that he refuses to go to the prison to talk to Sher Singh. Likewise, Sher Singh also knows that his father does not spare him in case he visits him in the prison. Buta Singh fears that his son’s anti-British activities may cost him his own job, pension and other amenities of life which he owes to the British sympathy.

But, after some days, Sher Singh is going to be released. This makes him so ecstatic. He informs Madan and all his colleagues. His friends and nationalist Zealots make a procession to welcome Sher Singh. Thus, he becomes a hero in the eyes of his fellow rebels and nationalists. He is garlanded, photographed and cheered

by the enthusiastic audience. He thumps his chest and declares, "Comrades, I will cherish the honor you have done me today for the rest of my life. I am proved that I was called upon to do a small duty to my country and I did it" (225).

In this way, the conflict between Pro-British notion and anti-British notion has been portrayed. The son along with his friend rebel against the British rule where as the father along with co-workers submits to it. Depiction of the growth of the nationalistic feelings is fully supported by the youngsters who have courage to tackle with British administration and went to liberate their country and make it totally free.

Treatment of Violence

Dealing with the India of 1940s, when the colonial encounter between the Indians and the British was moving towards a climax on account of the emergence of nationalistic consciousness among the Indians, the events in *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale* assume that rebellion activities were the only way by which India would get Independence. During that period, people took double steps of two great revolutionaries. First of Mahatma Gandhi and second of Bhagat Singh. They were inspired by Mahatma Gandhi in general and by Bhagat Singh in particular. They defined their targets clearly. Gandhi named his method "an open rebellion of a non-violent character" while Bhagat Singh followed violence technique.

The novel begins with a description of the killing of the Sarus Crane by Sher Singh and his colleagues. They are shown engaging in target practice and rifle shooting in a secluded rural area. It seems to be a preparatory act of their initiation into the revolutionary creed aimed at driving the British out of India through terrorist means. The boys, a bunch of immature college students, desired to perform a "baptism in blood" in conformity with the ancient Hindu custom of dipping swords in

goat's blood and laying them before the Goddess *Durga* or *Kali*. By doing this ritualistic deed they thought that they would never miss their mark and they could kill as many English men as they liked. Being a leader, Sher Singh started to kill crane. Though it was difficult for him to take the life of an innocent bird in his first phase of killing activity but as time passes, he is attaining his courage. He thought that he has to kill many birds so as to kill many British people.

Madan is the strongest man of the same University. He has won his colors in many games and has played cricket for his province. His performance against a visiting English side has made him a local hero. He has brought the other boys with him and would have been the leader of the band. He makes them to help Sher Singh in the election of president of the students' Union and elects him as a president. The real cause of his success is the name of Madan. He is considered "Although Sher Singh has assumed the leadership of the group, Madan was its backbone" (5).

After getting the information of Sher Singh's releasing from the jail, he spends the whole of Christmas Eve going round to all the college hostels and telling the boys to turn up at the police station at the crack of dawn. He informs the Nationalist party office and persuades them to him a brass band and gets an open car to take Sher Singh in procession. He gets hold of press photographers and newspaper correspondents, all of whom has been obliged to him for exclusive interviews and picture of sporting events.

The Sarus crane symbolizes the motif of love, mating and sacrifice. The brutal, almost inhuman, separation of the male and the female cranes caused by Sher Singh's and Madan's actions clearly shows that neither Sher Singh nor Madan has any genuine awareness of love. They don't care about the lives of birds. They are so much guided by nationalistic feelings that they don't mind about the conditions of the

living being. Because at the time of revolution such types of lives are not to be cared. Many have to give their life for the sake of revolution. They have to live and die for their own nation. They don't want to take advantages by being an opportunist. Their thoughts may lead them to generate the conflict even in one's family.

Sher Singh does not care who his father is and how to behave with him. He is so much saturated for his nation that he often forgets his family and gets involve in armed revolution. Sher Singh involves in this action fully and does not care who ever comes in front of him, when he meets Mr. John Taylor in his house, he does not feel quite well. The exaggeration of John Taylor makes him angry internally. He tells " I am glad. And how are your politics? You are a leader of the students, aren't you? Your father told me you had become President of the students Union. He is very proud of you" (98).

A kind word from anyone fears or hates has quicker and greater impact than it has from another and Sher Singh has worked up both fear and hatred for Taylor. The Deputy Commissioner's friendly tone and praise win him over completely. He could hardly believe his own ears. But after some time, he remembers the double nature of the British people and starts to abuse his father who sends him to visit John Taylor. Sher Singh gets the sentence while talking with John Taylor "Today in your European outfit you like the heir of Sardar Buta Singh" (99). The sentence puzzles him and at the same time angries him that by elaborating the dress of Sher Singh as the dress of an English man. He does not want to forget his nation and nationality. He abuses the people who don't want to liberate India and its existence.

After returning from Taylor's house he is angry, humiliated and frightened. He angries with his father who has sent him. He feels humiliation by the behavior of John Taylor and frightened by the activities which would come latter on. He wants

to cry but no tears would come into his eyes. He sits on a quiet spot for a long time till the anger and humiliation recede to the background and only fear remains fear of what Taylor might do to him, fear of what the whole family would have to say for the way he has disgraced his father in front of his colleagues.

On the point of principle, Sher Singh feels that his mind is quite clear: he is a nationalist and although he has worn a silk suit when he was called on the Deputy Commissioner's home that was to save Taylor's feelings. He has told Taylor that he does not believe in the hocus-pocus of traditional Sikh loyalty to the British. He wants the India to be called Independent country. For that he intends to do whatever the time demands. He is ready to give his life for his country. He knows the two extremes one of Deputy Commissioner's and other is of the terrorists'. One stood for the status quo with the power to maintain it; the others, for change and the insecurity that is the price of change. In the case of terrorism, the price could be one's life. But he does not hesitate to give the life and make Indian people free from foreign rule.

To get rid of arms suspicion, Sher Singh tries to arrange a meeting but none of boys agree to have it in his own home. Sher Singh asked them to meet on the canal bank outside the town. They grumble about the heat and the distance and only agree when Sher Singh loses his temper and gives them a Sermon on the greatest battles to come. He trains all his colleagues for wax and management of arms. He gives the sermon to all his volunteers of the future plan of the gang. It is his speeds that block the road and regular cause of on trains has caused a lot of cancellations. All nationalist volunteers in Gandhi caps come up the long flights of stairs to close shops. Many shout defiantly, "Victory to Mahatma Gandhi" (144) and wave his tricolor flag. All the time they talk nothing but politics. A national crisis has overtaken them and completely swamps their personal problems.

The rebellion impulses are growing more and more. Sher Singh reads a letter which is of “A Manifesto of the Hindustan Socialist Republican Army”, explains “Shoot English Officials and the Indian toadies who serve them. Destroy road and bridges; cut telegraph and telephone wires; create chaos and paralyze the administration” (151). Influenced by it, he gathers all the revolutionaries in a house and teaches them how to use grenades. All the boys who have taken part in the shooting practice are there. First, they take the oath of secrecy. They spread out the Indian tricolor flag on the table and put their hands on it. Some produce a picture of Mahatama Gandhi and set it in the corner.

Sher Singh does not like to follow all the path of Gandhi because he sees that passive resistance does not do as much as violence can do. He delivers a speech in front of his volunteers “No, not Gandhi what has he to do with bombs and pistols? We are not launching a campaign of passive resistance. He will take the oath in the name of our martyrs. Have you a picture of Bhagat Singh?” (153). The revolutionaries fetch a card with the photograph of Bhagat Singh and take the oath to liberate their country from foreign rule. They start to blow up bridges, destroy means of communication and roads are barricaded.

To make them trained, Sher Singh gives six hand grenades and a piece of paper on which he has written down the instructions. According to that instruction, they intend to test the quality of grenades. He elaborates his friend “let us blow up the little bridge near where we shot the crane. [. . .] it is in a deserted spot. We can test the power of these grenades without anyone bothering us” (153). The group reassemble a few hours later and make for the canal. But they don’t know how to use it. They ask Sher Singh “[. . .] But tell us how it is done” (154). Sher Singh takes

out his flashlight and produces one of the grenades. He wants to show his art in these explosive grenades.

After reading the leaflet of 'Hindustan Socialist republican Army' which is filled with the sentences to rise against the British, John Taylor commands Buta Singh to handle with these nationalists. He tells "Some sort organization in the city has violent aims and is planning to put them in effect. If that is so it must be tracked down and its plans nipped in the bud" (159). He further adds that he has heard about Sher Singh's involvement in this action. He tells to forbid his son's participation in this destructive work.

Lambardar, a police informer, wants to make close relation to know the daily routine of the youngsters. He regularly visits Sher Singh with polite expression. But his behaviour haunts in Sher Singh's mind and he starts to suspect upon him. One day, Lambardar goes to Sher Singh's house. Sher Singh treats him nicely by giving him buttered toast and asks him to see him at the canal bridge in the evening.

Lambardar starts to exploit the situation by asking Rs.300 for the medical treatment of his bullock which has broken its leg in the holes created by the grenades in the canal.

When Lambardar sees Sher Singh and his friends near the canal bridge, there is an exchange of hot words between them. Lambardar's behavior changes from the modest to the arrogant. Sher Singh and his friends grow certain about his being an informer to the government and therefore, Sher Singh Shoots him to death.

Lambardar sags to the earth cursing them, "I'll sleep with your mothers [. . .] I'll sleep with your sisters [. . .]" (168).

After the death of Lambardar, Jhimma Singh is appointed and is given the same task. To find out the killer of Lambardar, Taylor commands some sergeants to bring Sher on a suspected charge of the murder. He refuses to disclose his source of

information. All he said is: "Be gentle to the old man. Send him over to see me and then search the house [. . .] in any case, take his son to the police station and give him the works" (174). When Buta Singh meets John Taylor at home, he knows that his house is searched by the Police Commissioner. He is stunned by this unexpected turn of events, and tears roll down his cheeks. His world of ambition and power is destroyed overnight, and his hopes of getting knighted in the forthcoming New Year's honors list are turned to dust.

Being a loyal to British Raj, Buta Singh abuses his son in front of John Taylor. He replies the question what would he do if he discovers that he has been mixed up not only with the nationalists but also with terrorists of Taylor by saying that "I would disown him. I would throw him out of the house"(181). Playing the double role, Taylor persuades him" Children are meant to be understood, not thrown out where there is a difference of opinion" (181). Taylor informs all the hidden things in a satirical way. He mocks at Buta Singh's behavior by offering him cold drink and orange juice.

Sabhrai is the female spirit who becomes the savior of all these lost souls. She received a telegram from Buta Singh at Simla asking her to return home at once. The word of telegrams and violence thus involve her serene and religious world of moral values. On reaching home she found everything in disarrange: her son, Sher is in jail Champak is greatly shaken and forlorn Buta Singh a picture of utter despair, self-pity and sulkiness. She, too, is shocked. She suggests all the family members to read *Granth* in order to get God blessing in this critical time in her family. She firmly says" we will first do the non-stop reading of the *Granth*. The Guru will guide us. We will do what He commands" (192).

Sher Singh, who has worked forward to a glorious political career, now finds himself locked in jail. His experience with the Anglo-Indian sub inspectors, who hits him on the ankles, makes him extremely miserable. He has touched the depths of hate and anger towards those people. He has been treated very and roughly in the jail. The British sergeants abuses by saying 'nigger', 'Rape your sister' to him while he has been asked to tell all the group members' name. But he hesitates to say. He does not know whether to succumb to the pressure of the police and reveals the name of the young boys who were involved in this fatal attack on Lambarder.

After visiting the son from the prison, Mrs. Sabharai sends a letter full of filial tenderness and touches the heart of the family. She wants to give a Christmas gift in which she persuades Joyce Taylor to convince Mr. Taylor to release Sher Singh. Suspicion of his release, Sher Singh asks disdainfully with an Indian sub-Inspector "Tell me, what happened about the case? Am I being released on bail" (221). He does not take the mercy of British administration. He gets the reply "No, no, Sardar Sahib. Discharged! Finished! Holiday! There was no evidence against you" (221).

Sher Singh is ecstatic about his release. He takes up a piece of buff colored paper from a large pad and writes a letter to his friend Madan to convey this message to all and greets from there to all comrades who are involved in freedom movement. Fluxed with excitement, Madan is going round to all the college hostels and telling the boys to turn up at the police station at the crack of dawn. He informs all the Nationalist party office and persuades them to hire a brass band get an open car to take Sher Singh in procession and to celebrate their victory.

Cheering with the slogans "Long Live the Revolution", "Long Live Sher Singh" (224), the crowd stand carrying garlands of marigolds and roses for their hero. As Sher Singh comes out, there are thunderous cries of their triumph over British

administration. He addresses to all his colleagues that this administration who are can not suppress the attitude of these nationalist agitators, who are struggling for freedom. He anchors "They could not break the spirit of the son of India and God willing they never will" (225). Hearing his speech, the crowd cry with cheer and roared again on their victory. Sher Singh is honored and cheered by the enthusiastic audience and he thumps his chest and declares his duty which is given to him.

Thus, all anti-British people in the novel directly or indirectly involve in this revolutionary movement. They all morally and physically support to get free from the tyrannical rule of the Britishers. All spread chaos across the country. All agitators get involve in strike and show their tricolor flag. When they do not follow the command of police, they loose their lives. Many leaders are locked in the jail: many are kept behind the screen. Students, labours and farmers lead the movement. After this revolution, it is considered that time of the British ruling has come to return. People now get courage to invade the foreign ruler and want to establish their own government.

Symbols and their Political Dimensions

Singh, while dealing with the theme of Indian Nationalism, has made an extensive use of symbols. The first and the most important symbol is the title itself. The title of the novel is very much symbolic. Perhaps Singh himself realized the significance of Sabhrai in the human and moral world he endeavored to portray in *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale* since his title symbolically expresses the primacy of her part in the novel's portrait gallery. In an explication of title, the question, who is the 'I' in *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale*, is certainly important and relevant to any assessment of political meaning and significance of the novel.

The scene of Sabhrai's death contains a clear reference to the title. She knew that her end was near and said that she did not need a doctor. "let me go to the Guru with your blessings (232)". All members of her family sat around her and her son, Sher Singh, too joined them. "Sabhrai woke up as soon as he came in -just as if she had been waiting for him all the time. She ssssmiled and backboned him to come close to her. She whispered in his ear: *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale*, my son. May the Guru give you long life".(233)

In the symbolic pattern of the novel and the meaning of the title; the nightingale symbolizes the coming of spring, which in turn symbolizes the event of India's independence (1947). The symbols do not represent specific historical facts, because India did not become free in spring but during the season of rains. Yet the implication is that the achievement of India's freedom, like the coming of spring, gave say to millions of Indians, and, therefore, the basic meaning of the title is valid and sacred. Sabhrai, we learn, will not see the happy day when nightingales will sing, but Sher Singh and others will. Thus, the nightingale's symbolistic framework is the melodious indicator or harbinger of spring, i.e. the dawn of freedom.

Another reference to the title too supports this view. Sabhrai in her majestic simplicity had asked her son, Sher Singh, to explain what would happen if and when the English left India:

"Tell me, son," she asked putting her hand [...] if the English leave this country?"

"I"? Nothing. But we will be free. (185)

Another important symbol is that of a Crane. The killing of the crane, symbolizes the recklessness and aggressiveness of youth. Many Indian revolutionaries in the course of the chequered history of India's struggle for freedom

followed the way of violence and bloodshed. The young men are involved in a world of violence, bloodshed, cheating and lying with the declared objective of serving the sound of the drums of the Indian people's anger against British rule. It is an indicative of the preparatory act of their initiation into revolutionary creed aimed at driving the British out of India through terrorist means. The boys perform a "baptism in blood" in conformity with ancient Hindu custom of dipping sword in a goat's blood and laying them before different Goddess.

The symbolic pattern in the novel is prominent in places. Religious festivals—Baisakhi and Christmas—symbolize the regeneration of man, which in return symbolize that emergence of free India. Birds too are symbols of the renewal and joy of life. The monsoon which is an atmospheric rhythm, also symbolizes renewal of life in a cyclical pattern.

IV. Conclusion

Good wine needs no bush and a good play needs no epilogues, but to good wine we do supply bushes and good plays often prove better with good epilogues. It is early in the day to claim any sort of epithet, creditable or discreditable, for this thesis on Khushwant Singh's thought, but after a comprehensive study of his novel it will be appropriate to sum up his idea of nationalism in as few words as possible.

In *I shall Not Hear the Nightingale*, Singh has drawn the theme of political milieu of the time when the call for the "Quit Indian Movement" was given by Mahatma Gandhi. The novel deals with the colonial on counter between the Indians and the British on account of the emergence of nationalistic consciousness among the formers. Singh has sketched the characters whose rebellious impulse grows more and more intense after learning about the spread of nationalist movement all over the country. Sher Singh is one such character, who having over come his confusion and oscillation, decides to indulge in terroristic action. He calls for a secret meeting of his fellow rebels and takes the oath of liberating his country from the foreign rule. They take the oath of secrecy before indulging in terroristic action. They are inspired by Mahatma Gandhi in general and by Bhagat Singh in particular.

The novel contains sufficient references to the incidents involving in Indians who offered resistance to the British. Some Nationalist Leaders are arrested, several demonstrators rounded up, and riots occur in several towns. In Shimla too, a young boy volunteer pickets an English store on the Mall. He is hit full by a European sergeant, His teeth are knocked out and he rolls down a dozen of steep steps. He along with the man who helps him is arrested. Subsequently many shops

close in protest. The next day, most of the bazaar is shut. The situation is tensed, and Madan's blood boils.

The novel evolves out of its basic structure of social and political narrative. It is essentially a social and political document. Taking into its account the “Quit India Movement” of 1942, the novel has been set against the decaying power of the British Raj. In this novel, the drums of the Indian people's anger against British rule are sounded. In its deepest sense, the novel has a deep involvement with and commitment to a political philosophy of nationalism. By means of violent-nationalism, as Singh assumes us, can freedom be achieved? Singh has here faced up the stimulating political challenges of his times and consequently submerges to the aggressive nationalism.

Finally, it can be said that the present novel is the expression of the most intimate national awareness of the country in which it was born and evolved. It has accompanied with the articulation of political concerns, its blossoming and coming of age is also seen to be the direct outcome of the growing up of the national political movement of freedom. Political consciousness flows in the very life-blood of Singh's fiction. In fact, in countries with a long history of subjugation by foreign powers, nationalism becomes a preoccupation of the Khushwant Singh.

Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Chandra, Bipan. *Nationalism and Colonialism in Modern India*. New Delhi: Orient Longman, 1979.
- Chaudhary, K.K. *Quit India Revolution: The Ethos of its Central Direction*. Mumbai: Popular Books, 1996.
- Dallmayr, Fred. *Beyond Orientalism: Essays on Cross-Culture Encounter*. New Delhi: Rawat Publications, 2001.
- Desai, A.R. *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*. Bombay: Popular Book Depot, 1954.
- Dziemidok, Bohdan. "Art, Culture, National Identity and Globalization." *Dialogue and Universalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.36.
- Gellner, Earnest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- Greenfeld, Liah. *Nationalism and The Mind*. Oxford: One World Publication, 2007.
- Griffith, Percival. *Modern India*. Bombay: The Publisher's World, 1977.
- Gupta, Dr. Ruby. *Khushwant Singh: Reality and Myth*. New Delhi: Classical Publishing Company, 2001.
- Hans, Kohn. *A History of Nationalism in the East*. London: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Heehs, Peter. "Terrorism and the National Movement". *Nationalism, Terrorism, Communalism: Essays in Modern Indian History*. New York: OUP, 1998.

- Hutchinson, John, and Anthony D. Smith, eds. *Nationalism*. Oxford: OUP, 1994.
- Ibbetson, Sir Denzyl. *Khushwant Singh*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969.
- Jain, Sushil Kumar. *Indian Literature in English*. London: 36 Whitehall Park, 1963.
- Mahajan, Vidya Dhar. *The Nationalist Movement in India*: New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1979.
- Moon, Penderal: *Divide and Quit*. Berkley, OUP, 1962.
- Ramchandra, Ragini. *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction*. New Delhi: Indian Book Export and Import Co., 1960.
- Rao, Niraja. "Bhagat Singh and the Revolutionary Movement." *India's Struggle for Freedom*. Bombay: Padma Publications, 1993.
- Sen, Asha. *Nationalist Thought*. Bombay: The Publisher's World, 1966.
- Shahani, Vasant A. and R.V. Kaushik. *An Introduction to Indian Fiction in English*. New Delhi: Primal Publication, 2001.
- Shahani, Vasant A. *Khushwant Singh*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1972.
- Singh, Khushwant. *I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale*. New Delhi: TBI, 1959.
- Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*: New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2005.
- Singh, Birindra Pal. "Revolutionary Violence." *Problem of Violence: Themes in Literature*. New Delhi: Replike Press, 1999.