

**THE *VARIETY WITHIN*: COMPETING  
VISIONS AND VERSIONS OF THE  
REVOLUTIONARY WAR IN SELECTED  
AMERICAN FICTION**

BY

**SHEEZA ASHRAF**



**NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES**

**ISLAMABAD**

**JANUARY, 2022**

**THE *VARIETY WITHIN*: COMPETIG VISIONS AND  
VERSIONS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR IN  
SELECTED AMERICAN FICTION**

By

**SHEEZA ASHRAF**

BS. University of Gujrat, 2016

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY**

**In English**

To

FACULTY OF ARTS & HUMANITIES



NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES, ISLAMABAD

© Sheeza Ashraf, 2022



NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES  
FACULTY OF ARTS & HUMANITIES

## THESIS AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM

The undersigned certify that they have read the following thesis, examined the defense, are satisfied with the overall exam performance, and recommend the thesis to the Faculty of Arts & Humanities for acceptance.

**Thesis Title:** The Variety Within: Competing Visions and Versions of the Revolutionary War in Selected American Fiction

**Submitted By:** Sheeza Ashraf

**Registration #:** 1466 MPhil/EngLit/S18

Master of Philosophy  
Degree name in full

English Literature  
Name of Discipline

Ms. Khadija Mushtaq  
Name of Research Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Research Supervisor

Dr. Muhammad Uzair  
Name of Dean (FAH)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Dean (FAH)

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Safeer Awan  
Name of Pro-Rector Academics

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Pro-Rector Academics

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I Sheeza Ashraf

Daughter of Muhammad Ashraf

Registration # 1466-MPhil/Eng Lit/S18

Discipline English Literature

Candidate of **Master of Philosophy** at the National University of Modern Languages do hereby declare that the thesis **The Variety Within: Competing Visions and Versions of the Revolutionary War in Selected American Fiction** submitted by me in partial fulfilment of MPhil degree, is my original work, and has not been submitted or published earlier. I also solemnly declare that it shall not, in future, be submitted by me for obtaining any other degree from this or any other university or institution.

I also understand that if evidence of plagiarism is found in my thesis/dissertation at any stage, even after the award of a degree, the work may be cancelled and the degree revoked.

---

Signature of Candidate

---

Name of Candidate

---

Date

## ABSTRACT

**Title: *The Variety Within: Competing Visions and Versions of the Revolutionary War in Selected American Fiction***

This study intends to explore the divide and fissures present in the American Revolutionary war portrayed through the perspectives of two opposing groups: Loyalists and Patriots. For the portrayal of these differing perspectives on the American Revolution, two works of fiction have been selected, namely, *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) by Kenneth Roberts and *The Glorious Cause* (2002) by Jeff Shaara. The study attempts to understand the two perspectives via the concepts of modernity and alternative modernity in the context of the American Revolution. Bill Ashcroft's concept of "multiple modernities" outlined in his essay, *Postcolonial Modernities*, (2014) forms the backbone of the study while Eric Hobsbawm's ideas on the emergence of nations and inventions of tradition (*The Invention of Tradition* 2012) help frame the American Revolution in a new light. The study investigates the divided ideological scenario that the American nation faces during the revolutionary war and demonstrates how modernity facilitates and transforms American identity and consciousness.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
<b>THESIS AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>AUTHOR’S DECLARATION .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>DEDICATION .....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Thesis Statement .....	3
1.2. Research Questions .....	3
1.3. Significance of the Study .....	4
1.4. Delimitations .....	4
1.5. Chapter Breakdown.....	5
<b>2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ...</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1. Introduction .....	21
3.2. Theoretical Background .....	22
3.3. Western Discourse on Modernity.....	24
3.4. Ashcroft, Postcolonial Modernities.....	26
3.5. Hobsbawm, Invention of Tradition .....	28
3.6. Research Methodology.....	31
3.7. Conclusion.....	31
<b>4. DISMANTLING THE COLONIAL LEGACY: ANALYSIS OF <i>THE GLORIOUS CAUSE</i> .....</b>	<b>33</b>
4.1. Legitimacy of the Revolution (Questioning the Present Reality \Modernity):.....	35
4.2. Criticism of the British (The Colonial Enterprise):.....	39
4.3. Inefficiencies of the British Army:.....	45
<b>5. THE IMPERIAL NOSTALGIA, CHALLENGING THE REVOLUTIONARY RHETORIC: ANALYSIS OF <i>OLIVER WISWELL</i> .....</b>	<b>53</b>

5.1. A Divided Land:.....	55
5.2. The Refusal to Endorse the Cause: .....	61
<b>6. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>7. WORKS CITED.....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>8. APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>82</b>

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

First and foremost, I would like to Praise Allah Subhana wa Ta'ala, for His blessing given to me during my study and in completing this thesis.

This project would not have been possible without the support, love and care of my family, who stood by me in difficult times.

I cannot express enough thanks and gratitude to my supervisor, Ms. Khadeeja Mushtaq, for her continued support and encouragement. I am thankful for her kindness and patience.

My completion of this project would not have been possible without the support and love of my best friend, Arooj.



## **DEDICATION**

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my family, especially my parents, who have been a source of inspiration and strength for me throughout my life.

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

The journey of America from a colony to a nation cannot be put under a simple narrative of conquest and liberation. Unlike most colonies of the British Empire, America was a settler colony and shared a filial relationship with its imperial center. And for most of the settlers, America was an extension of their homeland. Therefore, the coming together of the thirteen colonies under the unified political designation, which later came to be known as the War of Independence, was not only incredulous but also incredible. This process of becoming American despite of irrefutable similarities with its Metropolitan center, like religion, language, and Anglo-Saxon heritage was not only unprecedented but also unique. The revolutionary war was impetus by the social, political, and economic restrictions imposed by Britain. And ideals like democracy, liberalism, and pragmatism become not only the driving force of this resistance but also the inherent component of America as an independent and separate nation.

This critical enquiry is aimed at investigating the potential divide and fissures that exist regarding the American Revolutionary war. My main argument rests on the divided ideological scenario that the American nation faced during the revolutionary war and how modernity facilitates and transforms American identity and consciousness. In order to portray these two-differing perspective on the American Revolution, I have selected two works of fiction: *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) by Kenneth Roberts and *The Glorious Cause* (2002) by Jeff Shaara.

Through my analysis of the selected works, I have attempted to interrogate the divide and fissures present in the American Revolutionary war. I have also attempted to explain the viability of the concepts of modernity and alternative modernity in understanding the perspective of two opposing groups: Loyalists and Patriots, specifically in the context of the American revolution. Bill Ashcroft and his theory on multiple modernities outlined in his essay, *Postcolonial Modernities* (2014) have been employed, as well as a supporting theorist Eric Hobsbawm and his conceptual framework on the emergence of nations and inventions of tradition in his book, *The Invention of Tradition* (2012) have been used for the critical analysis of the selected texts.

Western Enlightenment Project resulted in a white supremacist civilizing mission. Modernity further fueled systemic othering which culminated in colonization. Through my analysis, I argue that modernity did not only initiate the colonial project, it also facilitated an anti-colonial response.

The revolutionary war remains one of the most significant tropes for the American literary consciousness. The fictional yield aiming at the depiction of the revolution is marked with multiplicity and contains representations of the issues ranging from personal aspirations to political associations. The fiction about the revolution also plays a defining role in the manifestation of the dilemmas of the American problematic postcolonial position.

Shocks of the American Revolution almost two centuries ago became the paramount foundation of today's America. The American Revolution was integral in underpinning the destruction of the old regime and simultaneously setting the path to the creation of the new regime. The ideals and the merits of the American Revolution reconceptualized the status and the image of the United States as a settler colony to an emerging superpower. The revolution consolidated the visions of a separate, independent, and democratic American nation. According to John Adams, the revolution was in the minds of the people, war and bloodshed was only an effect and consequence of it.

The ethos of the American dream has got inherent roots in the American resistance to the imperial rule. Historian James Truslow Adams coined the term 'American Dream' in his book *The Epic of America* in 1931. But the actual concept of the 'American Dream' existed long before the 1931. John Winthrop during the settlements of the Puritan colonies and Thomas Jefferson during the Declaration of Independence asserted a similar idea. The American dream of a better, richer, and happier life for all its citizens of every rank consolidated American exceptionalism. It became one of the most important components of the American identity, a birthright far more meaningful and compelling than terms like 'democracy', 'constitution' or even the 'United States'.

Kenneth Roberts was an American journalist and author known for his historical fiction and especially novels reconstructing the American Revolution. Roberts's historical fiction is marked with a desire to reconstruct and rehabilitate unpopular

narratives. Similarly, his novel *Oliver Wiswell* (1980) unfolds from the point of view of a Loyalist officer during the Revolutionary war.

Jeff Shaara is an American historical fiction author. He is known for his historical accuracy and extensive research in his fiction. His fiction covers a range of different civil wars. His novel *Glorious Cause* (2000) explores the American Revolution through third- person narratives of notable figures during the Revolution.

The present research aims to explore how these two novels, *Oliver Wiswell* (1980) and *The Glorious Cause* (2000), foregrounds competing narratives of the American Revolution and how these competing visions have proclivity towards multiplicity of modernities and how it transforms American identity and consciousness.

## **1.1. THESIS STATEMENT**

The subject of the American Revolutionary War has been shrouded in confusion as is evident from a split in the literary consciousness. The American fiction regarding the revolutionary war is marked by this divide. The present research aims to consolidate this divide by placing modernity at the center of the debate and investigates the impact of modernity in the transformation of the American consciousness through the fictional works *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) and *The Glorious Cause* (2000).

## **1.2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The study will aim to answer the following research questions:

1. In what ways does Jeff Shaara's *The Glorious Cause* incorporate the revolutionary rhetoric to legitimize the cause of liberation?
2. How does Kenneth Roberts' *Oliver Wiswell* conform to the Loyalist version of the American Revolution?
3. How does modernity facilitate transformation in the American consciousness in the selected texts?

### 1.3. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The following research will be significant as it will contribute to the existing realm of knowledge and understanding. This study will develop an understanding of the various versions of the American Revolutionary war. It will look at how postcolonial ideas have remained largely absent from American Studies. Many authors like Elleke Boehmer, Ania Loomba, Bart Moore-Gilbert, exclude the United States from their study of postcolonial literature, referring, as Boehmer does, to the fact that America ‘won independence long before other colonial places, and its literature has therefore followed a very different trajectory’. The research aims to study the competing versions of the Revolutionary war and how this conflictual representation is further enabled by modernity. Also, how alternative modernities lead to a variety of visions and versions of the revolutionary war.

It will also be significant as the selected novels *Oliver Wiswell* (1980) and *The Glorious Cause* (2000) have hardly been made a subject of scholarly enquiry through the critical stance that I have taken. *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) by Kenneth Roberts remains one of the most representative works produced by the Loyalists. Robert Allen, an authority on the Loyalist literature has declared it ‘the classic Loyalist novel’ (25). Jeff Shaara is an award-winning writer of historical fiction, especially focusing on the theme of war. The American Literary Association has confirmed upon him an award in 1997 for his novels on the theme of historical events and war.

### 1.4. DELIMITATIONS

The present research will only focus on two novels for the purpose of clarity and precision. The time constraints and the scale of the study makes it difficult to work upon large number of data. And by delimiting the number of texts to two novels, it will allow the researcher to explore the novels intensively. The following two novels have been selected for the research:

1. *The Glorious Cause* by Jeff Shaara
2. *Oliver Wiswell* by Kenneth Roberts

The present study aims to examine how Shaara incorporates the revolutionary rhetoric to legitimize the cause of liberation (*The Glorious Cause*) and how Roberts conforms to the Loyalist version of the American Revolution (*Oliver Wiswell*). As a novel is an extensive narrative and comprises of various themes and aspects, the present research will be delimited to examining some aspects of the selected novels that include diction, characterization, and representation of landscape.

## **1.5. CHAPTER BREAKDOWN**

The chapter breakdown plan for the thesis is as follows:

Chapter One: Introduction

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Chapter Three: Theoretical Framework and Methodology

Chapter Four: Dismantling the Colonial Legacy: Analysis of *The Glorious Cause*

Chapter Five: The Imperial Nostalgia, Challenging the Revolutionary Rhetoric:  
Analysis of *Oliver Wiswell*

Chapter Six: Conclusion

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this literature review is firstly to contextualize the research in the present scholarship available and secondly to find gaps in the currently present critical responses. In the following literature review those works and scholarships have been reviewed which are similar and relevant to the researcher's research and topic.

The American revolutionary war was one of the most poignant turns in American history, which solidified its identity and status as a sovereign nation on the world map. The venture of disassociating with the British Empire was not only a highly politicized event but also initiated massive changes in the social, economic, and political fabric of America as a nation.

Ilan Rechum, in his essay "*From "American Independence" to the "American Revolution"*" invokes the debate about America's journey from colony to a sovereign nation and contests the indiscriminate usage of the terms 'American Revolution' and 'American Independence'. According to Rechum the term 'American Revolution' encompasses larger philosophical, intellectual, and political sensibilities championed by the Enlightenment period. According to Bernard Bailyn in *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, it contributed to the most important and characteristic writings of the American Revolution: pamphlets and booklets, they became the most fashionable and efficient asset and mode of communication during these tumultuous times. Whereas the term 'American Independence' denotes the actual struggle, gruesome war, and bloodshed that the thirteen colonies underwent against the imperial power. Rechum, in his work, explores and outlines the trajectory of American political consciousness and how the terms revolution and independence became indistinguishable in the context of American.

Rechum's work is different from the present research as it does not explore the contradictions and dissension present in American society during the Revolutionary war and the role of modernity in shaping American experience and identity.

Gregg Crane in *The Cambridge Introduction to the Nineteenth-century American Novel* (2007), studies American novels produced in nineteenth century. His study discusses in detail the novels in which the revolution works as the background or

foreground. He scrutinizes the works to identify the various attitudes towards the events. There are “seduction tales” (6), those skeptical of autonomy, in the initial time after the event, showing perplexity. Later, the consciousness developed and the writers of romances found idealizing the revolution. In their hands, the “weary” troops turn the symbols of “glory” (33). This shows the imbibing of the political ideals by the novelists to strengthen the nationalist fervour. The idea of the gradual realization of the autonomy and separation from the English imperialism has also been endorsed in these romances. Crane has covered an array of the fictional representations of the events and ideals revolving around the revolution. Thus, he has envisaged the verisimilitude and development of the American novels about the revolutionary struggle and its aftermaths in the context of the nineteenth century.

Lester H.Cohen in his essay *Explaining the Revolution: Ideology and Ethics in Mercy Otis Warren's Historical Theory*, examines various historical writings of the American Revolutionary War. These historical writings range from memoirs, autobiographies, patriots' and loyalists' histories. According to Cohen the historical writings of the Revolutionary era not only challenged the traditional and conventional narratives of historical writings but also exhibited a great preoccupation with the future and present of America than for its past. Cohen postulates that these historical writings are filled with authors' anxieties and indispensable urge to shed all the vices and influence of the colonial masters.

Lester H.Cohen explores different genres of historical writings of the American Revolutionary period. But most of these writings center around the depiction and the portrayal of the Patriots (the winning side in the Revolutionary war) and lack the representation of the Loyalists.

In McLoughlin's book *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing* (2009), Edward Larkin's essay 'American Revolutionary War Writing' proposes the argument that the Revolutionary war is commemorated predominantly through political sites and documents such as Mount Vernon, Independence Hall, Monticello, Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. Whereas the memorialization and the emblems of the American Civil War of 1861 are portrayed in an entirely different way, 'the symbols and images of the Civil War are for the most part specifically related to the bloodshed of war' (McLoughlin 129). Sites and documents such as Mount Vernon, the United States Constitution, and the Bill of Rights



not only capture the national imagination but also presents us with a panoptic view of the revolutionary war, which focuses our attention solely on the political and ideological motivations of the war and pushes the actual war and bloodshed out of the margins.

Larkin is of the view that one of the main reasons for this is that in both the historical and literary worlds, the idea of the revolutionary war was deeply embedded in the unique and distinct identity of America as a separate nation. The entire commemoration of the American Revolution revolves around the axis of solidifying and evoking ideals such as freedom, democracy, equality, independence, and glory. Therefore, the American Revolutionary War is mythologized in a way that brings out larger cultural, political, and social transformations rather than it being an actual site of war or bloodshed.

Larkin explores the literary and historical paradoxes and the inconsistencies present in the depiction of the American Revolutionary war and the Civil War. His study examines the trajectory of these two important wars and how sanitized and more palatable versions of these events are exhibited in both history and literature. However, Larkin's study touches upon the contradictions of the American Revolutionary war but does not explore it in depth.

Henry M. Ward in his book, *'Going Down Hill': Legacies of the American Revolutionary War* (2009), explores the legacies and the subsequent implications of the American Revolution. Ward rejects the fundamentally glorious and positive ideals and outcomes of the American Revolution and investigates rather the uncommon aspects and recuperation of the revolution, the 'cast aside guilty unpleasantries such as carnage, injustices, brutality and persecutions' (Ward 229). Ward in his book explores the trajectory of the American experience from the revolution to the modern times. And examines the evolution of a set of practices and principles in relation to the Revolutionary ideals and how some of them have nourished whereas some have completely diverged, taking an entirely violent and destructive course. Hence, Ward traces the progression of American historiography and the role of legacies of the American Revolution and their implications in the present day.

Ward's study takes an opposite approach towards American Revolution as compared to Larkin's study. His study explores the gruesome and macabre aspects of

the war. He also explores the hypocrisy of the American ideals and principles during the time of the revolution and how they have shaped present-day America. However, Ward's study does not address the fissures present in American Revolutionary war fiction.

T.H. Breen in his book *The Marketplace of Revolution: How consumer politics shape American Independence* (2004), investigates the historiography of consumerism, politics, and colonial America. Breen in his work challenges the narrative of political mobilization of the colonial Americans, during the Revolutionary war, as the random occurrence of providence and result of relentless efforts of its people fighting under the banner of human rights and freedom. She denounces John Ferling and Stacy Schiff, notable historians, who are of the view that the American Revolution was accidental and coincidental, 'a leap in the dark' and 'a great improvisation', only possible because of the guidance of their accomplished and talented leaders.

Breen challenges this narrative and theorizes that instead; it was American consumerism that laid the foundation for the colonial rebellion. The marketplace in colonial America mostly comprised of British imported goods and it held the potential to bring together a dispersed population of America. Hence, providing a platform where people from different walks of life could share their common experiences and concerns regarding the empire. Therefore, the marketplace became politicalized, 'the colonialists' shared experience as consumers provided them with the cultural resources needed to develop a bold new form of political protest' (Breen 15), laying the groundwork for the anti-colonial rebellion. This cultural and economic solidarity resulted in a phenomenon which according to Breen is the 'original American invention' (16) the *consumer boycott*, granted the power to the consumer goods, empowering the common man, usually overlooked in the conventional accounts of revolutions. Therefore, Breen in her book demonstrates that how people in the colonial America came together through the venture of marketplace and consumerism, which later evolved into a political struggle against the imperial power.

Breen provides critical insight into the commercial aspect of the revolution and theorizes that commerce played a decisive role in the uprising of the Americans against the British Empire. But the study fails to address the hyphenated state of the Americans and the role of modernity in regards to the American Revolution.

Judith L. Van Buskirk in her book *Generous Enemies: Patriots and Loyalists in Revolutionary New York* (2002), constructs an intriguing social history of colonial America during the Revolutionary war. She subverts the conventional narrative of war, its boundaries, and loyalties. Buskirk challenges the clear distinctions created during warfare because of the hostilities among the oppositional forces, usually a line that cannot be crossed. The traditional accounts of wartime writings tend to perceive the involved parties in an unambiguous manner, 'two distinct and antagonistic groups who fought for their respective movements' (Buskirk 3). Buskirk in her work demonstrates how these distinctions or lines are not only crossed but also blurred, through the interaction between the Patriots and the Loyalists during the colonial rebellion. One of the primary agendas of the political and military leaders during the Revolutionary war was to establish explicit borders or boundaries with respect to peoples' loyalties and identities, in order to differentiate between the Patriots and the Loyalists; commonly known as the Whigs and the Tories in those days. Buskirk demonstrates that the common man, to sustain and survive the war blurred these boundaries, 'people chose family, profit, or the best offer of freedom, reconciling those choices, if possible, with political ideology and civic virtue' (4). Therefore, Buskirk in her book outlines the complex continuities and connections found among people of opposing sides, even during the perilous times, and the possibilities of permeability of boundaries and loyalties among people.

Buskirk in her work critically explores the political and social divide present during the time of the revolution. But she exhibits how these lines were often blurred thus depicting the ambivalent nature and aspect of the revolution and the people involved. Although Buskirk's study conforms to the present research to some extent but it does not take into account the role of modernity in the American Revolution.

Harry M. Ward in his work *The War for Independence and the Transformation of American Society* (2009) examines and traces the experiences of wartime society during the American revolution. The ideals of the revolution such as freedom, equality, individuality, liberty, civil and political rights, became the guiding principles in the rebuilding process after the war. Ward discusses the implications of the war and the challenges of rebuilding a nation upon the ideals it won its independence. According to Ward, the war of independence revolutionized the social, economic, and political fabric of the American society: social and political mobility, expansion and autarky were the

newly gained aspirations. But subsequently, it brought many negative aspects as well, ‘the oppression of the dissenting and ethnic minorities, ingraining violence to the collective consciousness of people, hardening class lines between the poor and the more affluent, bolting down more securely the institution of slavery’ (Ward 4). Hence Ward in his work examines the American society and revolution within the context of the war, its efforts for rehabilitation and accentuates those aspects and policies of American society, often overlooked, into the immediate postwar decade. Although Ward’s work explores the unpopular narrative of the American revolution similar to the present research, however, it does not take into account the role of modernity in shaping American identity and consciousness.

Eric Foner in *The Story of American Freedom* (1998) investigates the history of the notion of ‘freedom’ and its unfolding in the history of America, moreover, Foner’s study focuses on ‘freedom’ as an ideal and the multifaceted role it played in: consumerist, social, political and social spheres. The book embarks on the narrative of freedom, taking its roots in the origin of the American Revolution to Reagan Revolution. Along the journey one of the main aims of Foner is to reflect on the paradoxes of the notion of ‘American Freedom’, demonstrating the fundamental beliefs of freedom, democracy, and equality, which are intimately intertwined with the birth of America as a sovereign nation, yet the nation engaged in the slavery project. Foner theorizes that the notion of freedom is not only contestable but also malleable. It demonstrates how the concept of freedom conciliates between all the major historical events, bringing out both the positive and negative facets of freedom. Foner’s work gives a useful insight into the notion of ‘freedom’ and how the narrative of ‘freedom’ has changed over the course of American history. The ideal of ‘freedom’ was one of the salient principles around which the foundation of the American Revolution was laid down. But Foner’s work does not address the divide and role of modernity in the American Revolution.

Robert Middlekauff in *The glorious cause: The American Revolution 1763-1789* (1982) glorifies the American Revolution, its causes, and the participants in an enthusiastic manner. He renders the reasons, events, and results in a structural simplified linear narrative. Studying from the seed of the surge in “The Act Crisis” (60) to its consummation in the form of “Independence” (251), he recounts the events with emotional fervour, and often falling prey to melodramatic sensationalism. The gist of

his argument is present in extolling the struggle as “the beginnings of an organizational revolution to America” that would turn the miserable colony into “a thriving nation” (246). Middlekauff has unambiguously argued, representing the American ideals, that the nation is the fruition of revolution. Thus, for him, revolution is not a disruptive metaphor for the English nationalism instead a metonymic manifestation of an autonomous American identity.

Bill Ashcroft, Griffiths Gareth, and Tiffin Helen, the three leading authors of *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures* (2003), have not only transformed but also laid down the conceptual groundwork for the postcolonial literature and cultures. Their work investigates the literary practices of postcolonial cultures and how their recuperations can still be observed in the present age. The authors examine and undertake various debates regarding the interrelationships between postcolonial literatures with culture, language, and the empire.

According to the authors any nation colonized by Britain or other European powers such as Spain, France, and Portugal are characterized as a postcolonial nation, the term ‘post-colonial’, is used ‘to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day’ (2). The postcolonial literature holds a unique place and characteristics as it emerges and evolves from its experiences of colonial control and oppression. Hence it aims to break the imperial associations through a constant assertion of it being different and distinct. Although the nature of America as a postcolonial nation has been contested by many theorists because of its neocolonial status in the present age but Ashcroft, Griffith, and Tiffin, consider America as a postcolonial nation. And therefore, deems it necessary to include its literature in the category of postcolonial literature because ‘its relationship with the metropolitan center as it evolved over the last two centuries has been paradigmatic for postcolonial literatures everywhere’ (2). While discussing critical models for postcolonial literature, the authors regard America as the first postcolonial nation to come up with its ‘national literature’. The model of national literature became one of the most effective and essential tools for the postcolonial nation to declare and proclaim its distinctiveness and independence from the center. This literary category established and demonstrated the social, political, and economic history of the postcolonial nations, thus playing a vital role in forging the national identity and history separate from the imperial center. Ashcroft, Griffith, and Tiffin are of the view that the tradition of

American national literature paved the way for the rest of the postcolonial societies, ‘in many ways American experience and its attempts to produce a new kind of literature can be seen to be the model for all later post-colonial writing (15). Therefore, the writers of *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures* (2003) acknowledge the neo-colonial status of America in the present day, but its experiences and efforts of shedding away its colonial past cannot be ignored therefore making it a postcolonial nation.

Mark Morrisson in his essay ‘Nationalism and the Modern American’, in Walter Kalaidjian’s book *The Cambridge Companion to American Modernism* (2005), reflects on American writers' efforts to establish their ‘American-ness’ and national identity through the literary and artistic phenomenon of modernism in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century. Although Britain and more specifically London were considered the hub of modern literary activity but Morrisson is of the view that the major modern literary canons were produced by American writers such as: T.S.Eliot, William Carlos Williams Ezra Pound, Hart Crane, William Butler Yeats, Marianne Moore, Wyndham Lewis, William Faulkner, James Joyce, Samuel Beckett, John Dos Passos. Canadian literary critic, Hugh Kenner terms the movement of modernism as ‘supranational movement’ and believes that ‘the English language and English literature itself had become decentered’ during the literary modernist movement and all the major modern literary canons were produced by American writers. Morrison traces the historiography of modern American literature and writers and their allegiance to the notion of American literary nationalism. And how this relationship between national literature and national identity emerged explicitly during the literary movement of modernism. In order to shed away the label of being ‘a provincial footnote to English literature’ (Kalaidjian 12), the notions of ‘American-ness’ and identity became the national narrative of American literature.

The characteristics, features, and modes of modernism facilitated and provided a canvas to American writers which permitted them to explore the notion of identity multifariously: cultural, linguistic, racial, and national identity. And it is this tendency of American literature to engage into distinctively modern voice and elements in order to imagine its national identity, made it ‘a nation that embodied in the most pronounced way the tensions and the strain of modernity’ (Kalaidjian 33). Therefore, nationalism

and the concept of national identity became not only a major theme but also a significant area of exploration in American literature.

Lotte Jensen in his book *The Roots of Nationalism: National Identity Formation in Early Modern Europe, 1660-1815* (2016) chronicles the historical, and social accounts of national cultures prevalent in seventeenth and eighteenth-century Europe. Jensen in his book explores the notions of national identity and nationalism, situating them in cultural, historical and literary frameworks of the premodern European era. It also traces the development of national identity in various premodern societies of Europe. Thus, generating a debate on the origins of nationalism and addressing the divided schism that exists: the modernist who believe that the nation is a 'quintessentially modern political phenomenon' (Jensen 11) and the traditionalist who are of the view that the concept of nation is primordial. The entire volume dives into various debates regarding the dichotomy, either rejecting or facilitating the modernist paradigm. The theoretical essays presented in the volume readdresses the entire modernist paradigm in light of the traditionalist approach to the notions of nation and nationalism. Although the volume tends to advocate the proposition that various revolutionary movements led to the popularity of the political ideology of nation and nationalism during the eighteenth century but it also acknowledges and establishes that different 'cultural continuities' (Jensen 10) and expressions of the premodern societies paved the way to the ideology of nation and nationalism, which fully evolved in the modern times.

*Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (1992), by Liah Greenfeld, investigates the inception of nationalism precipitated by the notions of collectiveness, identity, and national consciousness in the context of five major nations: England, Germany, France, Russia, and America. According to Greenfeld different national identities and consciousness tend to manifest themselves in different cultural patterns and practices and thus transforming social and political institutions. The book traces the trajectory of these five nations from the old order into the new modern world and the social and political transformations it entailed.

Greenfeld outlines different types of nationalism and explores their emergence in the respective nations. Greenfeld has interpreted nationalism as 'individualistic libertarian' and 'collectivistic-authoritarian' (11), he further suggests their subdivision into *civic* or *ethnic* (11). Sixteenth-century England was the first nation to embrace the

idea of national identity and nationalism by embracing the individualistic civic nationalism. According to Greenfeld the inception of nationalism in England was one of the turning points in the history of Europe 'the birth of English nation was not the birth of a nation; it was the birth of the nations, the birth of nationalism' (23). The sentiment of national consciousness eventually engulfed all the major European nations in the eighteenth century and France, Russia and Germany adopted Collectivistic nationalism.

The origins of American national consciousness and identity demonstrate a unique case study. For America, being a settler colony of England meant that the English national identity and the sentiment of nationalism was imposed upon them, Greenfeld describes it as 'American inheritance' (402). Greenfeld traces the journey of American nationalism from its initial days of living under the shadow of British nationalism, the settler colony's desire to demonstrate loyalty and sameness to the mother country by naming their cities after English rulers; to the eventual formation and realization of a unique, separate, and a distinct national identity, embracing the principles of individualistic, civic nationalism. Thus, Greenfeld in his work demonstrates the national evolution of these five nations and how they all are interconnected and transformed the socio-political landscape of the region, and paved the way to modernity.

Lawrence Buell in his theoretical work *American Literary Emergence as a Postcolonial Phenomenon* (1992) outlines the parochial and reductive approach of American literary canon, especially during the American Renaissance period. According to Buell what motivated the centripetalism of American literature, is the prototype status assigned to America, due to it being the first nation to achieve independence, for the rest of the nations of the world. Therefore, there is a lack of tendency of American literary canon to analogize with the rest of the literary traditions of the world, contrary to its continuous efforts to set forth its distinctiveness and uniqueness. Buell believes that it is essential to examine American national literature which emerged after its independence, in the light of recent postcolonial literature. Buell establishes that the national literature of America should be situated along with the literature of newly independent nations. And in order to achieve this Buell suggests that it is essential to embark on a journey of demystifying the 'proto-imperial' image of America. Although the literary canon produced during the American Renaissance



managed to establish the 'native' literary tradition of America but according to Buell, it is imperative that these literary traditions are understood in their original context, 'a culture in which the ruled were constantly tempted to fight their rulers within the psychological limits set by the later' (415). He emphasizes that America's ancestral link to the mother country and the conditions which led to the rise of their national literature should not be forgotten.

In *America's Troubled Postcoloniality: Some Reflections from Abroad* (2000), Gesa Mackenthun assesses America's status as a postcolonial nation. For a very long period, American studies have refused to endorse postcolonial principles and ideas. But according to Mackenthun, this tradition needs to change and it is vital to situate and study American culture and history through the critical lens of postcolonial theory. But the entire notion of America being a postcolonial nation is contested. Many theorists like Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, Lawrence Buell, and Edward Watts are of the view that America should be perceived as a postcolonial nation and believes its literary canon to be a model for the rest of the postcolonial nation. Other the hand theorists like Elleke Boehmer, Ania Loomba, Bart Moore Gilbert opposes the inclusion of America in postcolonial studies as it, 'won independence long before other colonial places, and its literature has therefore followed a very different trajectory' (Boehmer 4).

Mackenthun counters this proposition by suggesting that we should establish 'transhistorical analogies between the literary texts of recently decolonized countries and the early national literature of the United States' (35). Eric Cheyfiyz problematizes this approach of transhistorical analogies because by utilizing the canvas of contemporary Africa as a source of literary comparison with American struggle for independence, it undermines the role of Africa and its people and history 'in the constitution of early American society, culture, and literature' (Mackenthun 35). Amy Kaplan subscribes to Cheyfiyz's line of argument and states that by juxtaposing the antebellum national literature with that of Africa's not only violates but also diminishes the African struggle. Kaplan further expresses that American exceptionalism should not be viewed as a separate phenomenon from European imperialism/ colonialism. As being a settler colony of England, America shared and reciprocated some of the British imperial policies in the case of the American indigenous population and the Africans.

Theorists like Peter Hulme, Jorge Klor De Alva, Bernd Peyer, Anne McClintock believe that America stopped being a postcolonial nation since 1898 as it entered the

world stage with its imperial policies and the practice of internal colonialism. Richard King situates and views postcolonial America from the vantage point of multiculturalism and immigration. King perceives it 'in terms of change, decentering, and displacement...the intersections of local, national and translational formations, as specific articulation of histories, processes, and relations' (Mackenthun 8-9).

Laura Donaldson is of the view that postcolonial theory and framework should not be refuted altogether, rather she believes in its feasibility, as it comprises of a set of valuable terms and tools which can be used to study and interpret 'colonial and neocolonial constellations between the Early Republic and today' (42). According to Donaldson postcolonial concepts such as enunciation, mimicry, imagined community, colonial hysteria, hybridization can contribute significantly while studying nineteenth-century American literature. But Donaldson discourages reading texts by establishing a total dependency on postcolonial theory or contriving it 'as a critical monolith' rather advises it to be utilized as 'an important, but necessarily partial, explanatory frame' (43).

Therefore, Gesa Mackenthun in her essay has tried to examine different theoretical takes of various theorists regarding the inclusion of America in postcolonial studies and the contested American postcolonial identity.

Malini Johar Schueller in his essay *Postcolonial American Studies* (2004) investigates and tries to situate American studies and its culture and literature in postcolonial studies. Schueller is of the view that in the present-day and age of prevalent hatred and nationalism it is imperative to investigate America through the critical lens of postcolonialism. Though in the world of academics the inclusion of America as a postcolonial nation has always been debatable but America itself has taken a parochial stance when it comes to endorsing its placement in the literary category of postcolonialism. America has always been dedicated to establishing and forging identity and national image as distinct and suspended from the rest of the world. But in *Facing the West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire Building* (1980), Richard Drinnon proclaims that America's goals and policies have been those of an empire from the beginning, 'imperialism was central to national identity from the beginning' (162). Academics like Ruth Frankenberg, Lata Mani, Donald Pease, and John Carlos Rowe, they all theorize that imperialism has always been an essential

component of American identity and that the period after colonialism preferably should be termed as 'post-civil rights' according to Frankenberg and Mani.

According to Schueller, it is imperative to generate a debate around America's inclusion in postcolonial studies because it will open new routes not only in America and ethnic studies but it also will allow to explore various possibilities and assumptions in the field of postcolonialism. Peter Hulme acknowledges the postcolonial entanglements present in American culture but at the same time also urges to be aware of the imperial proclivities and states that 'country can be postcolonial and colonizing at the same time' (164), but Hulme's argument focuses exclusively on white Americans. Hence Schueller promulgates that the postcolonial assumptions radically alter with the inclusion of Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Mexican Americans.

Amrijit Singh and Peter Schmidt in an anthology called *Postcolonial Theory and the United States: Race, ethnicity and literature* (2000), explore the interconnections between US ethnic studies and postcolonial theory. The anthology has grouped US race and ethnic studies into Postethnicity school and the borders school. Postethnicity school acknowledges and permits the inclusion of 'cultural contradictions.... stresses progressivist narrative of assimilation and argues for the existence of a postethnic identity' whereas borders school highlights 'how shifting internal and external borders continue to create racial outsiders' (Buell et al.165). Schueller is of the view that borders school holds the most potential to generate new debates and dialogue. In the contemporary world of multiculturalism, immigration, and diaspora, the imbrications between postcolonial theory and ethnic studies are not only essential but also inevitable. Schueller in his essay has investigated different approaches and attitudes regarding postcolonial theory and the placement of American studies in the postcolonial paradigm. Although the debates surrounding America and its postcolonial status have become a contentious site but Schueller in his essay has explored various methodologies, opening up various trajectories for future dialogues.

Saleem Akhtar Khan in his study *Representational Politics and National Ideological Discourse: A Discursive Analysis of the British, American, and Indian Fictional Narratives of the Wars of Independence* (2018) explores the polemical fictional narratives of the wars of independence fought against the Empire, in India and America. The study aims to understand the literary dialogue between the colonial and

the postcolonial versions, discourse and counter discourse. In order to examine the fictional narratives of the wars of independence, four of the representative novels, two for each colonizer and colonized, have been analyzed. In order to represent the English colonial discourse *The Red Year* (1907) by Louis Tracy and *The Fort* (2010) by Bernard Cornwell have been selected. Whereas to study the perspectives of the postcolonial nations *The Sun Behind the Cloud* (2001) by Basavaraj Naikar and *The Glorious Cause* (2002) by Jeff Shaara have been selected by Khan. The study has been carried out through the lens of New Historicism and Postcolonialism. The study explores the breeches and fissures between the factional visions and fictional versions of the colonizer and the colonized. By juxtaposing the representative fictional narratives of the war, the study also explores the similarities and the difference between the American and Indian postcolonialisms.

Saleem Akhtar Khan's research extensively studies the colonial and postcolonial versions, discourse and counter discourses, grounded in the fictional narratives of the wars of independence waged against the Empire. The present research is different as it solely focuses on the fictional narratives of the American revolutionary war and aims to explore the different versions of the war through the eyes of the Loyalists and Patriots (colonial subjects) in America. And in order to study these competing versions of war of these two groups the critical lens of alternative modernities by Ashcroft and Hobsbawm's invention of tradition has been employed. The research aims to study the hyphenated state of the Americans during the revolutionary war and its proclivity towards alternative modernities, giving rise to a new kind of American consciousness.

This study takes Jeff Sahara's *The Glorious Cause* (2002) and Kenneth Roberts *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) as the primary texts to analyze and examine the divide in American consciousness during the Revolutionary war and how modernity plays a vital role in shaping American experience and consciousness.

Jeff Shaara's *The Glorious Cause* (2002) is suggested, in Barker's *The Readers' Advisory Guide to Historical Fiction* (2015), as "a good companion book to [Cornwell's] *The Fort*" and its thematic "contrast" (118). Moreover, Jouni Jussila in *Power and Politeness in historical novels set during the American Civil War* (2015) has produced a study on historical novels of the Shaaras, Jeff Shaara and his father Michael Shaara, depicting the American Civil War. He has acknowledged the archival

awareness of Jeff Shaara: “the younger Shaara conducted extensive research on the Civil War” (7). He also draws parallel between the narrative style of the father and son: “staying true to his father's style, Jeff too tells the story of the war through the eyes and mouths of the most influential commanders who served on both sides of the conflict” (8).

Robert Allen in *Loyalist Literature: An Annotated Bibliographic Guide to the Writings on the Loyalists of the American Revolution* (1982), his repository of the loyalist legacy, reviews the famous fictional works, from the loyalists’ perspectives, about the American Revolution. He suggests the literary readership to focus the Royalist fictional version of the war to have information, and additionally, entertainment: “for those who wish to pursue their interests in a more leisurely and fanciful bent, are adding of various historical novels on Loyalists provides both entertainment and information” (25). He proposes the authenticity of the various novels for their being rooted in the archival evidence researches. In his categorization of the narratives, Kenneth Roberts’ *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) is “the classic Loyalist novel” (25). The novel portrays the hardships and plight of the Loyalist refugees faced due to the persecution of the rebels and the mismanagement of the English.

In this chapter, the researcher has tried to review a series of secondary sources. These secondary resources are related to the trajectory of the American studies, literature in the wake of American Revolutionary war, and the contested postcolonial identity of America. Most of these secondary sources explore the trajectory of war writings during the Revolutionary period or the period in the wake of American independence. These studies are concerned with the historiography of the American writings after they gained their independence and examine various elements that precipitated the struggle for independence. Some of the studies also delve into and ponder on the contested postcolonial identity of America. But these secondary sources do not provide any critical insight into the contradictions and the dissension present in the American society during the time of the Revolutionary war, nor do they study the emergence of new American consciousness through the lens of modernity. Capitalizing on this research gap, the present study aims to explore the divided American consciousness through the selected texts by examining how the American Revolutionary war fiction is marked with a divide and how modernity facilitates in transforming American consciousness and ultimately its consciousness.

## CHAPTER 3

### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher has discussed the theoretical perspectives and research methodology that the researcher has chosen to analyse the selected works of fiction. As the research falls under the qualitative paradigm therefore the research method that has been used is largely subjective in nature. And for that purpose, the researcher has employed Catherine Belsey's method of textual analysis from her essay 'Textual Analysis as a Research Method', from Gabriele Griffin's *Research Methods for English Studies* (2013), to carry out the analysis of the selected texts, *The Glorious Cause* (2000) by Jeff Shaara and *Oliver Wiswell* (1980) by Kenneth Roberts.

The following research is based on the theoretical concepts of Australian critic and writer, Bill Ashcroft and his theory on multiple modernities outlined in his essay, *Postcolonial Modernities* (2014). The supporting theorist that has been employed by the researcher is Eric Hobsbawm, a British critic, and historian, and his conceptual framework on the emergence of nations and inventions of tradition in his book, *The Invention of Tradition* (2012). The following research has been carried out through the amalgamations of conceptual frameworks of transformational modernities and the invention of tradition.

Hobsbawm theorizes that the construction of nation and nationalism was propelled by the advent of Modernity and the invention and performances of certain traditions play an essential role in the birth and the continuation of nations. Ashcroft in his essay demonstrates how certain notions of Western modernity are used by the colonial societies, not only to challenge but also to overthrow the colonial rule, how in this way non-western modernities emerges. And this questioning of the present result in various visions and versions of modernity, hence alternative modernities. Therefore, the researcher aims to explore how modernity facilitates and transforms American identity consciousness. And how it accentuates the fissures and the divide present in American Revolutionary war fiction.

### 3.2. Theoretical Background

Robbie Shilliam in *Modernity and Modernisation* (2010) defines modernity as a 'condition of social existence that is significantly different to all past forms of human experience, while modernization refers to the transitional process of moving from traditional or primitive communities to modern societies' (56). The word 'modern' originates from the Latin word 'modernus', which was used to mark a difference between 'an officially Christian present from a Roman, pagan past....it was used in the medieval period to distinguish between the contemporary from the ancient past' (Shilliam 130).

In his essay *On Alternative Modernities* (2001) Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar characterizes modernity 'as an attitude of questioning the present' (14). Therefore, modernity surfaces against the background of tradition and customs and tends to hold the potential to profoundly alter the underpinnings of any given society. A society experiencing modernity and paving its way to modernization is in constant pull and push between the antiquity and the new ways of living. According to Jürgen Habermas in his critical essay *Modernity: An Unfinished Project*, 'the entire modern movement was sustained through its engagement with the past' (38)

Peter Van Der Veer in *The Global History of Modernity* (1998) maps out the evolution of modernity, 'modernity is a project and an ideology that originates in the Enlightenment' (285). The emergence of modernity in Europe during the seventeenth century brought a revolution in various spheres of social and human life. The phenomena of Reformation, which originated in opposition to religious obscurantism prevalent at that time, set in motion the early signs of modernity. It introduced the principles of individualism, progress, and freedom, which later gained their full consciousness during the period of Renaissance and Enlightenment. Hence these three major movements served as a prelude to the breaking off from the old traditions and customs. They brought institutional and social changes, shifting the contours of authority, law, morality, economy, politics, knowledge, universe, and religion. According to Peter Childs in *Modernism* (2016) 'modernity is both the culmination of the past and the harbinger of the future, pinpointing a moment of a potential breakdown in socio-cultural relations and aesthetic representation' (16). Modernity aimed to release all the various institutions from their esoteric forms, by questioning their

legitimacy. Therefore, one of the main goals of modernity was to devote its focus to emancipatory efforts, in order to release the cognitive potentials of these institutions.

The unscrupulous and complacent attitude of various establishments during the sixteenth century became of the main reasons that challenged the legitimacy of institutions like monarchy, aristocracy, feudalism, and clergy in Europe, hence questioning the ontological, cosmological, and temporal truths of the time. Hence amidst this pandemonium, fundamental shifts occurred in all major conceptual frameworks of the society and brought changes in all facets of society. The entire Western thought was reformulated, rejecting the accepted notions about the world. Some of the major thinkers who contributed to the scientific breakthroughs were Galileo, Hobbes, Newton, Leibniz, Darwin, and Descartes; tried to fill the void left by religion, revolutionizing and altering the perception of reality and time (Childs 16). Notions of urban society, its disenchantment with rationality, and division of labour were conceptualized by thinkers like Émile Durkheim, Max Weber, and Ferdinand Tönnies (Childs 15). Whereas the likes of Freud and Marx cataclysmically reinterpreted the philosophical and economic canvas of the society.

The psychiatrist Sigmund Freud, the economist Karl Marx, the naturalist Charles Darwin and the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche are considered the visionaries of modern times, the tenets and principles proposed by these intellectuals not only challenged societies' certainties but also dismantled them.

Darwin's *Origins of Species* (1859) generated widespread attention and controversy from the masses and the religious authorities. Darwinian evolution and social Darwinism contested the validity of religion but also human's place in the universe, therefore, changing the narrative of human history (Childs 36). Marx's *Das Kapital* (1867) and the *Communist Manifesto* (1848) put forth a social and economic theory that subverted the notion of social class and advocated a classless, communist society. Sigmund Freud's *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920) and *Ego and I* (1923) caused an uproar in both the academic and religious circles. Freud worked on mapping the mind and its workings and his theories 'reduced human individuality to an instinctive sex drive' (Milne 495). He denounced the notion of a centred and unified self, demonstrating the division of mind through id, ego, and superego. Nietzsche one of the renowned philosophers and writers of his time expounded his theories about how all values and principles are constructions mounted by society. In his seminal work



*Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for Everyone and No One* (1883), he made his famous pronouncements about the death of God and Übermensch. These scholars and intellectuals predominately questioned and subverted the assumptions and certainties of their time. And therefore, diminished the authority and dominance of religious ideology and theological dogmatism.

Modernity altered and revolutionized the cultural, social, philosophical, and scientific conceptions of society and these changes over time evolved into a broader literary and artistic movement known as modernism. Some of the prominent writers known for incorporating characteristic themes and techniques of the modernist period, such as ‘religious scepticism, deep introspection, technical and formal experimentation, cerebral gameplaying, linguistic innovation, self-referentiality, misanthropic despair overlaid with humour, philosophical speculation, loss of faith and cultural exhaustion’ (Childs 5) in their writings are T.S.Eliot, William Faulkner, James, Joyce, Ezra Pound, Virginia Woolf, Gertrude Stein, Wallace Stevens. In the domain of art, it inspired artistic movements such as Surrealism, Dadaism, Expressionism, Vorticism, Cubism.

Marshall Berman in his book, *All That is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (1982), has categorized the progression of modernity into three periods: the first period (1500 to 1800) comprises of the promulgation of modernity and comprehension of its features and characteristics and a quest to integrate them into the daily workings of life; the second period (1800) is of a turmoil and turbulence, two major uprisings were witnessed, the American and the French revolution; the third period (1900) in which the entire world has fully integrated into the condition of modernity.

### **3.3. Western Discourse on Modernity**

There are multifaceted western discourses available on modernity and it is quite an ambitious task to recapitulate the entirety of the Western discourse on modernity. Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar in his work *On Alternative Modernities* (2001), has delineated Western discourse on modernity as a ‘shifting and hybrid configuration consisting of different, often conflicting, theories, norms, historical experiences, utopic fantasies, and ideological commitments’ (14). Some of the leading theorists of modernity are Ulrich Beck, Jurgen Habermas, Anthony Giddens, Zygmunt Bauman.

According to German sociologist Ulrich Beck in his seminal work *Risk Society* (1986), modernity is a *condition of risk*. Beck has extensively worked on the theories of modernity and he is of the view that Modernity is accompanied by risks. Beck theorizes that contemporary society has transitioned into a risk society. And as a result of the advanced evolution of science and technology the society once again has been plunged into the age of quandaries and disquietude, the same uncertainties that modernism aimed to obviate.

Jürgen Habermas, German social theorist, and philosopher, is a staunch proponent of modernity, its vision, and ideals. In an essay called *The Discourse of Modernity: Hegel, Nietzsche, Heidegger And Habermas* (1988) by Fred Dallmayr, Habermas theorizes his perspective on modernity, ‘modernity is intimately linked with the central aspirations of Reformation and Enlightenment’ (59). Habermas has been a consistent defender of secularism, rationality, logic, scientific discovery, subjectivity, the constituents of Reformation and Enlightenment, which gradually matured into a movement known as Modernism. In his book *The Theory of Communicative Action* (1991), Habermas presents his defence of modernity, defining it as ‘unfinished project’, hence maintaining his credence on the emancipatory and utopian prospects of modernity still to be experienced.

According to British sociologist and philosopher, Anthony Giddens, the modern epoch is yet to be exhausted, dismissing the notion of the postmodern era and hence names the contemporary situation as ‘radicalized modernity era’ in his book *The Consequences of Modernity* (2013). Giddens theorizes that reflexivity is central to modernity, as a result underpinning the dynamism of various social institutions and systems in modern society. (O'Brien, Martin, et al. 164, ). According to Giddens the self-reflexivity of modernity tends to enable the past actions and events to affect the daily workings of life, hence dissembling and resembling various social relationships and social arrangements (Giddens and Pierson 283).

Zygmunt Buman, a Polish philosopher, and sociologist, theorizes a shift of contemporary society from ‘solid modernity’ to what he calls ‘liquid modernity’ in his work *Liquid Modernity* (2013). From the initial stages, modernity came with an agenda to break free and overthrow a set of old traditions and social organizations, ‘melting solids’ but also with an inherent urge to comprehend, categorize, control, and rationalize every aspect of life. Hence for Bauman, this ambivalent nature of modernity

has redefined modernity in contemporary settings. The constant mobility, defining, and redefining of the boundaries, economy, relationships and values have given birth to 'liquid modernity'. 'Liquidity' or 'fluidity' the characteristic feature of the present-day condition of modernity, profoundly changed the notion and the course of identity and the self. The self previously conceived as stable and fixed has been altered into an entity that is fleeting, unmoored, and elusive, always for a lookout for momentous experiences rather than deep meaningful ones (Elliott 43-46).

### **3.4. Ashcroft, Postcolonial Modernities**

Francis Fukuyama in his book, *The End of History and the Last Man* (1992), characterizes the West as the governing centre of modernity. The encounter with modernity and a society undergoing the process of modernisation is often interpreted as the westernization of that culture or society. But one cannot ignore nor can abandon the origins and the progression of modernity from the West to the rest of the world. Bill Ashcroft in his essay *Postcolonial Modernities* (2014), characterizes the period of modernity as 'a distinctive and superior period in the history of humanity' (p.8) and especially for the West. Therefore, the sense of supremacy and preference of the new and present ways over the archaic and the past got further translated into the Western sense of superiority over different modes of organization that emerged out of modernity.

Max Weber discusses a long list of accomplishments and breakthroughs in various fields 'developed proper scientific procedures, historiography, musical notation, architecture, universities, parliamentary democracy and capitalism' (56) and denotes them to the West, in his work, *Collected Essays on the Sociology of Religion* (1920). This sense of superiority and self-confidence manifested in the form of Eurocentrism and imperial expansion. And as a result, Western modernity under the 'mission civilisatrice' utilized the dichotomy of modern and traditional, civilized and uncivilized, '...the sense of superiority over those pre-modern societies and culture which were 'locked' in the past.... whose subjugation and 'introduction' into modernity became the right and obligation of European powers' (8). Western modernity always had colonial and imperial inscriptions deeply embedded in it. And the facade of expansionism and exploration was used to carry out their venture for the acquisition of resources and power. Immanuel Wallerstein in his essay *The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis* (1974), put

forwards the theory that ‘the world system has been capitalism since the sixteenth century...that capitalism is the economic discourse of modernity, the natural concomitant of European imperialism’ (164).

Ashcroft in his essay *Postcolonial Modernities* (2014) put forwards the theory that the world is ‘characterized by the multiplicity of its modernities’ (5), hence subverting the notion of modernity having a governing centre (West) or a master narrative. According to Ashcroft modernity should no longer be perceived as having a single governing centre, the West, rather it has the potential of being ‘adaptable to cultural exigencies’ (5). This attribute of modernity being ‘adaptable to cultural exigencies’ is acknowledged as ‘alternative modernities’, ‘multiple modernities’, but Ashcroft prefers to call them ‘transformations of modernity’ because they do not set out to generate an entirely new system rather, they are adaptative in nature, depending on the cultural and historical context and adapting to the local needs. According to Ashcroft the essential components of ‘transformational modernities’ are ‘they emerge...out of a particular historical provenance and second, out of a *relation* to other modernities’ (6). The distinctive attributes of transformational modernity's are ‘appropriation, adaptation and transformation (6). Postcolonial literature and societies have a proclivity towards transformational or alternative modernities, as they themselves have the plausibility to be transformational and appropriating various ‘... global cultural forms, global technologies and practices to local needs beliefs and conditions’ (6). The process of transcultural interaction that takes place between the colonial and the colonized cultures enables the transformation of modernity into alternative modernity. Ashcroft regards the postcolonial site, where the intersection of the imperial and the colonial takes place an apt beginning for this transcultural process because ‘postcolonial cultures break the clear distinction between the identity of the colonizer and the identity of the colonized’ (10). In *Between Prospero and Caliban: Colonialism, Postcolonialism and Inter- Identity* (2002), Bonaventure Santos establishes it in the example of Brazil:

postcolonial identity must be constructed in the margins of representation, and by a movement that goes from the margins to the centre. This is the privileged space of culture and the postcolonial critic, a liminal, in-between or borderland space. Cultural enunciation creates its own temporality. This specific temporality is what renders possible the emergence of alternative modernities to western modernity,

precisely by means of “postcolonial translation.” The anti-colonial liberation struggle itself is hybrid and based on translation. It does not sustain itself either in precolonial ancestry or in pure and simple mimicry of western liberal ideals. (146)

Hence for Ashcroft, the postcolonial cultures and literature have the tendency towards alternative modernities because of their unique transcultural interaction between the colonized and the colonizers and thus subverting the grand narrative of modernity being exclusively Western. Ashcroft theorizes that many anticolonial and resistant discourses make use of various mechanics and constituents of the dominant Western modernity and transform them according to their local needs and values, thus resulting in transformational modernity.

### **3.5. Hobsbawm, Invention of Tradition**

Transformative and radical shifts took place, regarding modes of apprehending the world during the eighteenth century. It was marked by various insurrections and turbulent times, witnessing three major uprisings, American, French and Haitian revolutions. Benedict Anderson defines it as ‘the dawn of the age of Nationalism’ (11) in his book *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and the Spread of Nationalism* (2006). The emergence of the phenomenon of nation and nationalism during the eighteenth century was not accidental. The deep-rooted corruption of the clergy, religious obscurantism, and rationalist secularism led to the decline of religious beliefs and undermined its role in the lives of people, Anderson calls it ‘the dusk of religious modes of thought’ (11). And this led to a void in the conceptual framework which was taken up by nation and the spirit of nationalism. But according to Anderson in his book *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and the Spread of Nationalism* (2006), the cultural roots of nationalism and nation should not be understood in an isolation rather its understanding should be aligned with ‘large cultural and social systems, which preceded it, out of which – as well as against which -it came into being’ (12). Anderson characterizes these large cultural systems as the religious community and the dynastic realm.

The predominant religions along with their sacral language and written script held a firm gripping and the only legitimate access to the ontological truths. Whereas on the other hand the society was moulded around and under the dynastic realm of

monarchies, emanating its legitimacy through divinity and the only political system known by the masses. These two frameworks were linked together and worked as a point of reference and gave meaning to the daily existence of life. During the Enlightenment period, the expansion of the cultural, geographical, economic, and scientific horizons challenged the normative modes of knowledge. Therefore, these two systems, the cultural community, and the dynastic realm, lost their postulational hold, giving rise to the phenomenon of nation and nationalism.

The notion of nation is relatively a new and modern phenomenon, believed to be an attribute of modernity. The emancipatory efforts of modernity prompted new modes of political and social organization, thus the inception of the nation. Many theorists unanimously believe it to be of Western origins. But there exists a dichotomy regarding the historical origins and the development of nation and nationalism. The debate oscillates between the modernists and the traditionalists. Theorists like Hans Kohn, Elie Kedourie, Ernest Gellner, John Breuililly, Benedict Anderson, Eric Hobsbawm, and Terence Ranger all belonging to the modernist paradigm, regard the ideology of nation and nationalism as a product of modernity. Whereas the traditionalist scholars such as Andrew Hastings, Caspar Hirschi, Azar Gat believe that the ideas such as nations, national identity, and nationalism prevailed long before the advent of modernity. They like to illustrate the example of nations who developed into leading cultural and political communities, the likes of England, France, Sweden, and the Dutch Republic.

John McLeod in *Beginning Postcolonialism* (2020), denotes the nature of a nation as ‘fabrication’ (68). Nations do not come into being instinctively or naturally. They are a man-made phenomenon, ‘defended and bloodily contested by groups of people’ (68). According to Ernest Geller in his book *Nation and Nationalism* (1983), a nation is ‘not inscribed into the nature of things’ (49). Nations are formulated upon certain ideological visions and aspirations. On the other hand, Benedict Anderson in his work, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and the Spread of Nationalism* (2006), defines nation ‘...an imagined political community... because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion’ (6). Therefore, the quintessential ethos of a nation is of belonging, congruency, and

camaraderie, as Timothy Brennan aptly sums it as ‘natio- a local community, domicile, family, a condition of living’ (45) in his essay *The National Longing for Form* (1989).

Nationalism can be characterized as a sentiment or a movement. According to Ernest Gellner in his book *Nations and Nationalism* (1983), nationalism is a principle, ‘which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent’ (1). And this sentiment of nationalism rests on the axis of either the violation (anger) or fulfilment (satisfaction) of the principle. This political principle can be infringed in a variety of ways. For instance, failure to incorporate all the members of a nation or the inclusion of non-natives within the political boundary, can all lead to the violation of this sentiment of nationalism. The cardinal violation of this principle that could take place is when:

the rulers of the political unit belong to a nation other than that of the majority of the ruled, this, for nationalists, constitutes a quite outstandingly intolerable breach of political propriety. This can occur either through the incorporation of the national territory in a larger empire, or by the local domination of an alien group. (1)

And this type of violation can be witnessed during anticolonial rising and struggle. During revolutions, this national sentiment acts as an effective political tool against the colonial rule. Anti-colonial and liberation movements have been greatly facilitated and inspired by the notion of nation. The conception of a nation and anti-colonial nationalism plays an integral part in uniting people under a shared vision.

The construction of nations and the sentiment of nationalism strongly depends on a set of operations that help nurture and sustain the spirit of belonging, kinship, and allegiance among the members of a nation. Eric Hobsbawm in his essay *Introduction: Invention of Tradition* (2012), characterizes these set of operations as ‘invented tradition’ (1). According to Hobsbawm, these invented traditions are essential in bridging a nation’s present and its past, hence incorporating a sense of continuity in a nation’s history. These invented traditions comprise of:

a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past. (1)

Nations flourish and thrive upon certain inventions of national traditions, such as ‘national anthems, the national flag, personification of the nation in symbol or image’ (7). The sentiment of nationalism and a sense of togetherness is achieved through the ‘performance of various narratives, symbols, and rituals’ (McLeod 69). These set of national inventions play an essential part during anti-colonial resistance and movements in establishing a distinct national identity, separate from the colonial centre. The repetition of particular narratives, symbols, and rituals not only assemble members of a nation together but also provides a sense of national pride, with the potential of being memorialized as part of national history.

### **3.6. Research Methodology**

In accordance with the above-mentioned theoretical framework, the researcher has employed Catherine Belsey’s research methodology of textual analysis mentioned in her essay ‘Textual Analysis as a Research Method’, in Gabriele Griffin’s book *Research Methods for English Studies* (2005). The researcher aims to analyze the first novel, *The Glorious Cause* (2000) by Jeff Shaara, and then the second novel, *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) by Kenneth Roberts. It will look at how these two texts present different narratives of the Revolutionary war. It aims to juxtapose the different rhetoric of the Revolutionary war presented in the above-mentioned texts and will try to locate how transformational modernities facilitate American identity consciousness.

According to Belsey ‘textual analysis is indispensable to research in cultural criticism, where cultural criticism includes English, cultural history and cultural studies, as well as any other discipline that focuses on texts’ (Griffin 160). The Textual analysis permits the close reading of the text and hence makes the text open to multiple interpretations via the reader. Since the research being carried out is qualitative, exploratory, and subjective in nature, therefore Belsey’s textual analysis allows the researcher to consider multiple interpretations in the selected primary texts.

### **3.7. Conclusion**

The researcher has employed the theories proposed by Bill Ashcroft and Eric Hobsbawm in order to examine the selected primary texts, *The Glorious Cause* (2000) by Jeff Shaara and *Oliver Wissell* (1940) by Kenneth Roberts, attempt to explore the



proclivity of colonial societies\ cultures towards transformational modernities. And how both the novels conform to the Loyalist and Patriots rhetoric and shape American identity. Furthermore, Belsey's textual analysis has been chosen in order to carry out the analysis of the selected texts.

## CHAPTER 4

### DISMANTLING THE COLONIAL LEGACY: ANALYSIS OF *THE GLORIOUS CAUSE*

The journey of America from a colony to a nation cannot be put under a simple narrative of conquest and liberation. Unlike most colonies of the British Empire, America was a settler colony and shared a filial relationship with its imperial center. And for most of the settlers, America was an extension of their homeland. Therefore, the coming together of the thirteen colonies under the unified political designation, which later came to be known as the War of Independence, was not only incredulous but also incredible. This process of becoming American despite of irrefutable similarities with its Metropolitan center, like religion, language, and Anglo-Saxon heritage was not only unprecedented but also unique. The revolutionary war was impetus by the social, political, and economic restrictions imposed by Britain. And ideals like democracy, liberalism, and pragmatism become not only the driving force of this resistance but also the inherent component of America as an independent and separate nation.

A comprehensive and diverse amount of fictional yield regarding the American revolutionary war can be found, exploring the sentiments of the patriots, loyalists, and even the Hessians, the mercenaries. Novels like Jeff Shaara's *Rise to Rebellion* (2001) center around the founders and the visionaries of a new nation and capture the spirit of the events that played a pivotal role in the revolution. James Fenimore Cooper's *The Spy* (1821) encapsulates the patriotic fervor. Ann Rinaldi's *Cast Two Shadows* (1998) follows the journey of a fourteen-year-old Caroline Whitaker, trying to navigate the complex war politics and family dynamics, and loyalties amidst the Revolutionary war. Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *The Linwood's* (1835) explores the lives of a patriot and a loyalist family during the social and political upheaval and narrates a transformation of a loyalist to a patriot. Howard Fast's *The Hessian* (1972) told through the eyes of an outsider, narrates the fate of a Hessian boy captured by the militia and explores the ethical and moral grounds of the war. Therefore, the American literary consciousness acknowledges the various fissures present in the various groups of the nation.

Jeff Shaara is a critically acclaimed, American novelist. His novels fall under the genre of historical fiction and explore the theme of war and different key personnel involved in these epic adventures. He has authored more than fifteen novels, covering a range of wars, from World War, Korean War, Civil War, US Mexican War, and American Revolutionary War.

Shaara's *The Glorious Cause* (2002) plunges into the military encounters and combats from 1776 to 1783. The American revolution is at the heart of the American nationalistic rhetoric and historical discourse and Shaara's *The Glorious Cause* (2002) fortifies this through the idealization of the revolutionary heroes and their arduous task of craving autonomy against the mighty British empire and their army. *The Glorious Cause* (2002) is a nationalist version of the Revolution and it aims to establish the legitimacy of the cause by exhibiting the great fortitude and the steadfastness of the Continental Army and their officers against the world's greatest power.

In this chapter, the researcher has carried out the analysis of the novel *The Glorious Cause* (2000) by Shaara. In order to carry out the analysis, the researcher has made use of amalgamations of theoretical concepts outlined by Eric Hobsbawm and Bill Ashcroft. According to Ashcroft, the colonial enterprise was the subsequent result of the Enlightenment era and the period of modernity. And the interaction between the colonial and colonized results in a site of transformation and appropriation. And these transformations hold the plausibility of resulting in alternative or transformational modernities. The constructs of modernity are employed by the postcolonial societies to subvert the imperial rule, therefore, leading to an alternative modernity/present. The emergence and the evolution of nation and nationalism are a modern phenomenon. Eric Hobsbawm presents that there are set of operations, he terms them as 'invented traditions' which play an essential role in the formation and emergence of nations and the sentiment of nationalism.

In the following analysis, the researcher has tried to demonstrate the different ways the novel incorporates the revolutionary rhetoric to legitimize the cause of liberation and by doing so it questions the colonial enterprise of the British (present reality) and therefore opens up the potential of alternative modernity. The analysis will also try to present how the revolutionary war highlights the emergence of America as a separate nation through the use of 'invented tradition' outlined by Hobsbawm.

#### **4.1. Legitimacy of the Revolution (Questioning the Present Reality \Modernity):**

Through the use of different characters, their views points, narration, combat details and themes, the novel effectively incorporate the various nuances of a ghastly reality of war and battle encounters of the two armies. And these elements not only establish the urgency of a need of a new nation to rise out of the cruel clutches of an imperial empire but also legitimize and rationalize the cause of liberation.

One of the major claims put forth by the Congress and the Continental Army for the Revolution is the exploitative nature of the imperial encroachments. The Congress and the American people refuse to be of service to further the agenda of the colonizers, the British, of world supremacy and filling up the royal treasury. As Washington explains to the Prussian officer Von Steuben, the determination of the America to detach itself from its metropolitan center:

....to cast off an oppressive ruler. They have come to accept that they have rights, that no supreme power can command any of us to bow before him, except the Almighty God. (345)

America wants to break the shackles of the monarchy and wants to be liberated from a system of governance that heavily relies on the exploitation of the people and land resources of its colonies. Shaara further exposes the oppressive and barbaric demeanor of the British imperialism during the diplomatic meeting between Franklin and Lord Howe after the defeat of Brooklyn Heights. Franklin vocalizes British tranny and King George's subterfuge to reach a diplomatic end to America's claim of independence:

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

Here Shaara exhibits the true nature and the intention of the British as opportunistic and tyrannical, which will go to any length to protect its colonial enterprises. Shaara further facilitate his argument of the deceitful and exploitative nature and the policies of the British, when Lord Howe tries to reach some kind of diplomatic peace in order to put a stop to the proceeding of the war:

His majesty's most earnest desire is to make his American subjects happy, to offer whatever reforms will address their grievances. Surely, every American colonist understands that the king was only concerned with obtaining aid from his colonies, a means of assisting the royal treasury in providing protection to the colonies' very interest. (48)

The King George's statements and proclamations are in direct contrast to their imperial ventures and exploitative policies. It exposes the masquerade under which the imperialism works, capitalizing the resources and manpower of its colonies through its military dominance. It also exposes how blatantly British transgresses and disregards the wishes of its colonial subjects. Furthermore, Franklin once again staunchly condemns the British approach towards their colonies, in conversation with the British official, Paul Wentworth:

.... I have seen Ireland. I have seen what your domination has produced! You do not cooperate; you do not create a marketplace. You take, you plunder, you strip the land of those goods which suit you. You return only misery and oppression. (313)

Franklin is well aware of the hollow promises of the King George and quickly perceives the deception behind them. He refuses to form an alliance with the English, creating an empire together unlike any other the world has ever seen. He states how the colonial enterprises are maneuvered under the disguise of grandeur and glory, stating the fate of Ireland as an example.

And this venal attitude is not only attributed to the British but also indicated in the French and Spanish monarchy as well. These nations are able to enjoy and sustain the splendor and grandeur because of their imperial expansions. Shaara unveils this proclivity of the Empire towards opulence describing the halls and rooms of Versailles, "extraordinary hall" (Shaara 290), "luxurious detail" (290), "grand entryway" (290), "rich scarlet draperies", "wall...a creamy white, bordered in gold" (290). Franklin's grandson, Temple is critical of this condescending display of grandeur:

Yes, sir, I am impressed. I am impressed by how much money the French have spent decorating their halls. If America had this much gold in our treasury, the war would be already over. We would not need to come to this place to beg for our means. (290)

Temple is contemptuous at the opulent display of the imperial powers whereas they have to struggle for their survival and identity. This not only highlights the corrupt policies but also that America will not be swayed by the façade of the colonial administration. Similarly, Spain refuses to form an alliance with America because it will bring a blow to their colonial ventures:

.... little confidence that he [Charles III] could maintain control over the colonies of Central and South America, or his islands in the Caribbean against what might become the new fashion of that day, distant colonies rising against their oppressive monarchs. (307)

Once again Shaara highlights the self-serving and oppressive attitude of the imperial powers that will not at any cost jeopardize their control of their colonies. All these instances demonstrating the exploitative nature of the imperial encroachments depicts the discontent and the hostility of the Americans towards the entire colonial project. And this condemnation of the empire can be perceived as challenging the colonial rule. Thus, portraying the aspirations of the Americans to gain independence and founding a separate nation. And this American ambition of an independent nation is fueled by the sentiment of nationalism. Furthermore, the novel also portrays the heedlessness and indolence on the part of the empire to grasp the spirit and philosophy of American independence, when Charles III voices his concern regarding American liberation. “.... if America gained her independence.... would look towards .... other Spanish territories.....to add to her own lands” (Shaara 307).

Another technique employed by Shaara in the novel is the use of certain diction which further reinforces the conviction and the spirit with which the Americans are fighting the war to become a nation from a colony. The sentiment of nationalism is further heightened through the use of the diction. Whenever the war is alluded in the novel, it is referred to as “cause of liberty” (Shaara 155), “mission” (84), “odyssey” (84). Shaara designates vigorous and nationalistic nomenclature to the American conflict, this not only exhibits his own allegiance but also allocates the American struggle as esteemed and righteous.

The other prominent figures central to the American cause such as George Washington, the General Commander of the Continental Army, expresses their struggle as, “war about an ideal” (Shaara 345), indicating that it is not some futile struggle for

glory and prestige. Rather claims it to be “the cause [that] cannot be defeated” (345). Shaara put forth the American cause as upright and magnificent, titled the novel as “The Glorious Cause”, a cause that is not being fought for personal and political aspirations rather it's for the American people and protecting their home, as Washington urges his people to stand for their country: “All we are asking them to do....is defend their homes” (Shaara 105). Even Benjamin Franklin, on a diplomatic forum, urges the foreign powers to assist America because: “we are waging a war for our survival” (Shaara 189). Franklin reinforces the idea that the American cause is worthy and pure because it is not tainted by the personal aspirations and motivations of glory and recognition: “...principles for which we fight” (Shaara 190). Shaara takes the war away from the futile clanging of the swords and situates it as a fight for principles and ideals, thus aggrandizing it. Therefore, the revolution is rationalized and legitimized because of its moral supremacy.

The novel has used Col. Robert Magaw’s words as epigraph, “the most Glorious Cause that mankind ever fought” (Shaara 1), Shaara takes the notion of the American revolution and makes it as a symbol of liberation for the entire world. The moral supremacy and worthiness of the fight transforms the cause into a transcendental symbol of freedom for all the nations of the world. Franklin’s conversation with Charles Gravier, the Minister of Foreign Affairs to King Louis XVI, “if the Americans were successful, the passion for independence might spread” (Shaara 185), Franklin understands the significant position they are at as a nation, whose struggle for freedom can cause a domino effect for the rest of the world. Similarly, Washington views the revolution as messianic, “change the course of history.... create a revolution that could affect all of mankind” (Shaara 325). The significance of the struggle and its potential mark on the world can be noted through the words of these figures. The revolution has been designated as a benchmark that has never been achieved before by a colony and therefore it is perceived as a symbol of freedom, liberation, and democracy not only by the notable American officials but also by Shaara.

Shaara argues for the legitimacy and rationale for the American struggle against the British Empire through various elements such as exposing the exploitative and perfidious policies of the British, referring to the revolution in a dignified and esteemed titles and also grounds the revolution’s moral and noble supremacy by transforming it as a symbol of freedom, liberation and a source of inspiration for the whole world. And

this American quest for independence is propelled by the sentiment of nationalism, which according to Ernest Gellner is a principle. In his book *Nations and Nationalism*, it's a principle, 'which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent' (1). Therefore, in this case the sensibilities such as freedom, allegiance and devotion to a cause of liberation has resulted in bringing together the entire nation, unified under the sentiment of nationalism. It not only shows Shaara's own personal praise and fervor regarding the revolution but also becomes an auspicious journey of freedom and independence from the oppressive rule of the Empire.

#### **4.2. Criticism of the British (The Colonial Enterprise):**

In the novel Shaara has incorporated anti-colonial passion and feelings. The foundation of the American struggle is imbedded in the atrocities of the imperial power and the blatant rejection of their system of governance. The Americans refuse to associate themselves with blood stained and swindled glory of the British. The British officers and soldiers are portrayed as someone who are prejudiced against their colonial subjects, they take a certain pride on their pedigree, demeanor and education. During a meeting between Benjamin Franklin and a British official, Paul Wentworth, Shaara describes Wentworth:

carried himself with the stiffness of an English aristocracy, the attitude of a man who must force himself to endure the company of anyone of a lower station. (311)

The purpose of the meeting is to offer an alliance in order to withdraw the claim of American independence. The rigid demeanor of Wentworth reflects his total disregard towards the American struggle and his moral and national superiority. On a macro-level Wentworth's mannerism exhibits the Empire's patronizing and self-righteous behavior regarding its colonies and people. The rigid mannerism of the British official indirectly portrays the inflexibility and thus the failure of the British to comprehend the struggle of the Americans. This tendency of blithely dismissing anything that is American can also be witnessed in the area of academics and intellect:

scanned the document with mild disgust, a low disrespectful comment about Yale College, as though any colonial school was far inferior to the most lowly grammar school in England...some curse about teaching anyone to read in this godless land. (72)



A group of British soldiers passes snide remarks when they see Nathan Hale's Yale diploma. It demonstrates that the Americans are regarded as inferior not only in a genealogically and national sense but also morally and academically. And this attitude of the bigotry is displayed throughout the entire hierarchy of military.

Another anti-colonial sentiment found in the novel is how Shaara exhibits the obsession of the British soldiers with the notion of personal glorification and grandeur. During an official dinner in Philadelphia, Washington is exasperated by the display of personal aspirations of the British and French of soldiers, "so many men of loud ambition" (Shaara 230). This angst is also felt in the English quarters, Charles Cornwallis, a British General, sheds light on the petulant nature of his military officials, "guilty as he is of the sin of ambition. How dare this man usurp the glory rightfully due to General Howe?" (Shaara 240). Shaara has portrayed both the English and the French as power-hungry opportunists. Benjamin Franklin present in France for the official business to negotiate an alliance with France, also comes across the zealous disposition of the army officials and soldiers:

Then there were the soldiers, and Franklin categorized them as either genuine or counterfeit. In either case, they poured forth their requests, cloaked in a well-rehearsed passion for the American cause. Franklin had come to dread the appearance of a man in uniform. The more finery on the man's coat, the more outrageous his expectations. (281)

These instances expose the facile and frivolous attitude of the soldiers and how their efforts and beliefs are misplaced regarding such a grave reality like war. The notion of fighting for the sake of political status and monetary rewards is despicable to the Americans, "French officers continue to infect this army with their zeal for glory" (Shaara 305). This idea is alien to the Americans, because their fight is not driven by the notions of glory and grandeur rather it is an indisputable reality "a war for our survival" (Shaara 189), "defend [ing] their homes" (Shaara 105). Shaara lays out an astounding contrast between the English and the American resolution for fighting this war. The Americans are shown to be determined and empowered, "yet we have a purpose, and if we are allowed the opportunity, we will defeat you [them]" (Shaara 151), because they are motivated by a desire to build a new sovereign nation and are united in a cause. Whereas the English are shown to be seeking admiration and glory through this war, for them war is an opportunity to politically and financially elevate.

And this yearning for glory is shown to be present in both the English and the French armies, hence Shaara passing a commentary on the voracious mentality of the imperial powers. It not only depicts the total disregard for the human lives but also trivializes the horrendous reality like war, for the imperial powers war is “grand spectacle” (Shaara 123) an opportunity to advertise their resplendence and self-indulgence.

Another element through which Shaara highlights the anti-colonial feelings is the constant repudiation of the whole colonial system of governance and control. Shaara shows the biggest motivation behind the American struggle is to throw off the oppressive English monarchy. The ideology behind imperialism comes directly in clash with the aspirations of the Americans. Washington in a conversation with Von Steuben, the French commander, not only praises but also holds the members of the committee who came up with the Declaration of Independence in a certain aura of reverence, “I was a witness to an extraordinary gathering of genius” (Shaara 345), “it was as if God himself was speaking to us” (Shaara 325). Here, the moral superiority of the Americans and the worthiness of their cause is shown. Washington during his dialogue, clearly denounces the imperial administration and the monarchy, “we are saying to England, your system does not work here. We will build our own system, and we will make it work” (Shaara 345). This shows not only the desire of a colony to achieve autonomy but also to carve a separate identity because they are not like the English. Franklin calls the English empire ‘an ailing patient, rife with disease and infection’ (Shaara 314). For America the thought of being associated with the English is abhorrent, their struggle for the cause becomes a symbol of getting rid of the diseased part, ‘we have no interest in holding tightly to the sickness of the past’ (Shaara 314).

And this notion of America being a different land is emphasized through the musings of the foreign generals present in the Continental Army. Von Steuben, the French commander, who has joined the Americans to help train the soldiers, ponders over the rugged and yet the determined circumstances of the army:

In Europe, this army would have simply dissolved, great bloody riots.... but the Americans... simply endure. If this army prevails in this war, it may be by the very suffering they have endured here, by their very survival. It is as if they understand that their cause is more important than their suffering. The British will never understand that. Even King Frederick would not understand. In Prussia, Austria, France, you instruct a soldier what to do, and he does it. Here, you tell

them and they ask...why? Give us good reason. If the reason is adequate, the deed is accomplished. It is a curious people. (340)

Von Steuben is amazed and perplexed by the American people and for all they stand and fight for because it is unlike anything he has witnessed before. It also establishes a clear contrast between the spirits of the American people and the people living under the oppressive the monarchies. And it distinguishes the Americans from the rest of the nations. Similarly, the French military officer, Marquis de Lafayette is inspired by the ideals and principles of the American revolution:

The French army from which he had come would never be so outspoken against the authority of their king. America was a different land after all, and a land in the midst of a revolution with a spirit and substance that he appealed to him from his first readings of the words of Sam Adams and Tom Paine. (229)

Shaara once again portrays the difference between America and the rest world, by establishing a narrative of American land and its people as unique and different from rest of the world. Shaara's depiction of America and its people holding a unique and a special place in the world can be perceived as the birth of the notion of American exceptionalism. He presents this fact through the eyes of the foreign military officers, the same officer who are the constituent of the oppressive rulings of their kings, thus validating and legitimatizing the American cause through unbiased eyes. The introspection of these military personals exhibits their awe and their aspiration to become like America. It also shows a sense of admiration and respect for the cause and the people because as Benjamin Franklin states, "no nation on this earth has accomplished what America is attempting to do" (Shaara 190).

The desire to forge out a separate and a distinct identity different from the English can also be observed in the demeanor of Ben Franklin during his interaction and meetings with the French officials and the public. During his numerous walks Franklin becomes somewhat a fashion icon for the French people:

He would always wear his trademark plain fur hat and dull brown coat, and always the tiny glasses perched on his nose. By appearance alone his fame had spread, far beyond the drawing rooms of the elite...in clothing shops, merchants

begun to stock more goods of the color brown, described now as the franklin hue. Hat shops began to sell the franklin hat, his simple fur now reproduced as an object of popular fashion. (193)

Shaara portrays the fascination and the curiosity of the people. For them America is a unique nation, daring to venture out against the mighty colonial power, hence giving rise to certain appeal towards anything that is American. It also shows Franklin's clever maneuvering to establish a distinct and new identity in the eyes of general public. And Franklin's fashion statements and desire to stand out, to be recognized as an American can be understood as 'invention of tradition'. According to Hobsbawm there are some set of traditions and narratives that play a vital role in the emergence of nation and the sentiment of nationalism. These set of tradition and narrative inspire the origins of certain values, symbols and images through which the distinct and unique identity of a nation is personified. Similarly, Franklin's effort to look unconventional and his unorthodox style becomes an image and a symbol of American austere and conscientiousness. And this symbol and image of Franklin helps to establish a distinct and a unique character of the American people and thus promoting a sense of unity and belonging.

And this simple and yet elegant fashion statement intrigues the public because it is so unlike their own country, "to the poor and the working classes, his lack of concern for pomp and grandeur was making him a hero" (Sharra 193). And a congressman clothed so unostentatiously gives out a message to the masses, connects with them in a way which they have been unable to with the gentry of their own nation. The American representative, Franklin's efforts are commendable as he tries to inspire a spark of empathy in the masses towards the American cause as they try to dismantle the colonial subjugation. And this effort is conscious on Franklin's part to inspire and set a way to throttle the central and oppressive authority of the monarchy:

His image was not all accident. His purpose from the beginning was to show that America was not so obsessed with finery as with the substance of its own crisis. He had hoped that his appearance would at the very least draw attention to his purpose for being there, a humble man from a humble nation. (193)

It sets apart America as a beneficiary from the exploitative endeavors of the English empire and also lets the world know that the ideals upon which the foundation of American cause is laid are just, ethical and honest, unlike the English empire.

Another feature employed by Shaara in the novel to express to anti colonial sentiment is that he avoids capitalizing the initial letter 'e' whenever he mentions the word empire with reference to the English colonial administration. The complete lack of capitalizing the initial 'e': "still the empire" (Shaara 89), "the British empire" (Shaara 313) is done purposely to strip off the might and power of the English and its colonial enterprises. It also exhibits the nationalistic stance of resistance against the colonial masters. The recurrence of the small case letter 'e' also trivializes and degrades the universal claim of the British as being the savior and the upholder of the justice. It also challenges the self-assertive and conceited perception of the British as the sole ruler over the world's nation. Thus, Shaara's use of small case 'e' portrays his adherence to the nationalistic stance and strong condemnation of the British rule over America.

Therefore, throughout the novel Shaara has employed various elements to indicate anti-colonial sentiments such as the rejection of the English system, dismay at the prejudice attitude and obsession with the pageantry. Through these instances Shaara consolidates the American cause and reinforces the need of the birth of a new nation based on the ideals of freedom, justice and tolerance, unlike their imperial center. Franklin's deliberate efforts to stir and inspire the masses towards the American struggle and the use of small case 'e' in reference to the British empire, indicate the hostility and detestation of everything English. Shaara exhibits a strong sense of colonial resistance and disquietude towards the corrupt and exploitative facets of the English. The depiction of anticolonial sentiment is reiterated on numerous occasions in the novel, *The Glorious Cause* (2000) and it takes on the status of a 'tradition'. As the theorist Hobsbawm in his essay *Introduction: Invention of Tradition* (2012) outlines that there are set of traditions that comprises of narratives, rituals and symbols which play an important role in the origin of nation and nationalism. In the novel the Americans' disquietude towards their imperial masters and their anticolonial resistance has been employed as a narrative, which is not only repeated but also emphasized throughout the novel. And it is through this continuous reiteration of the anticolonial narrative that Shaara manages to invoke a sense of togetherness and solidarity and thus paving the way for an independent nation. Another important tradition that is demonstrated in the

novel is of Ben Franklin as a style icon. His outward manifestation of his personality through his smart and elegant dressing becomes a symbol of ‘Americanness’, creating a unique and distinctive identity, an identity unlike their imperial masters, an identity modelled around the values of honesty and righteousness.

### **4.3. Inefficiencies of the British army:**

In the novel Shaara has fictionalized the details of the combats and in the process unravels the struggles and the characters of the important military personnel engaged on both the sides. And because of this element of narrating the battle encounters and strategies, Shaara very cleverly provides the audience with a deep insight into the characters involved in the war. Shaara opens the novel through the narration of a fisherman, who lives in Gravesend Bay, who is not really bothered by the ongoing conflict. For him the notion of a rebel army standing against ‘the mightiest armada’ (Shaara 5) seems far-fetched and this sentiment is shared among the fellow villagers, ‘mostly laughed at the idea...threaten [ing] His Majesty’s navy’ (5). Shaara sets the scene where the American cause seems not only absurd but doomed from the beginning. They naively believe that the English are their savior and guardians:

He thought it to be odd that the people wanted to be rid of their king, the one man responsible for their security, for protecting them from what he supposed to be all manner of enemies: Indians, the French, even pirates, who could sail close to these very shores, attacking the helpless, stealing anything they pleased. (6)

Shaara portrays the awe and veneration of the common people for the English army and power, ‘spectacular sight’ (52), ‘show of martial elegance’ (10), ‘marvelous army’ (p11). But Shaara dismantles this image of benevolence and the keeper of the peace for the masses and also for the audience as well. The image of the English is deconstructed through the death of the previously mentioned fisherman. The fisherman’s salutations to the British crew are met with a musket ball being shot over his head, ‘he had not understood that, thought it a ridiculous, frightening mistake’ (Shaara 6) And as the English ships and flatboats reach the shore, the fisherman is killed with a bayonet by the soldiers for allegedly being a spy. The murder of a nameless person shows the ruthless and barbaric nature of the imperial soldiers. Shaara deconstructs the perception of the colonial masters by portraying the wreck and devastation caused on the American land, ‘the destruction of the houses, shattered glass,

broken doors, contents spread across the muddy roads' (35). There are instances of barbaric killings and destructions caused by the English scattered throughout the novel. The employment of the foreign mercenaries further adds to the horrific and monstrous deeds of the empire. Even the British officer, Charles Cornwallis, is rattled by their 'savage brutality' (Shaara 35), 'tendency toward mindless destruction, the brutalizing of any civilian' (Shaara 115), by some people are labeled as 'almost inhuman' (Shaara 15). Therefore, Shaara dismantles the polished and cultured image of the English and turns into the very image of the adversaries against which they are supposed to protect their colonies and the people.

Another way Shaara portrays the legitimacy of the American cause is through the character study of the Commanding Generals of the two armies, George Washington and William Howe. By diving deep into their demeanor and outlook at the ongoing event, Shaara tries to exhibit the nuances of the war. The manner in which Lord Howe is described immediately hints to the affluent and opulent nature of Lord Howe, 'the man dressed in robe, gold slippers beneath a long nightgown' (Shaara 82). Throughout the text Lord Howe shows a very casual and at times negligent attitude towards the war, rather being more concerned with 'thoroughly enjoying himself' (Shaara 127) and his preference of staying behind at everyone stop to set his 'lavish and comfortable headquarters' (Shaara 125). By showing Howe's engagement in the extravagancies of life amid the ghastly reality like war, Shaara seems to be indirectly commenting on the self-serving and self-indulgent behavior of the British Empire. The British demeanor during the war is portrayed as 'a parade of foppish finery' (Shaara 13) and the aura of grand majesty and splendor of the military officials and the soldiers, which for the masses becomes a source of awe but Shaara takes this exalted exterior of the Empire and exposes it as hollow and frivolous. Shaara has painted Lord Howe as incompetent and an opportunist, 'firmly focused on his own place in history' (209) who isn't troubled about strategic planning and attack, rather more worried about his image and possible easy victories against the Continental Army. The unbothered and insouciant approach of the British reveals the deep-rooted arrogance and pride, 'we are the British, we are centuries of history, and we are the mightiest army in the world' (Shaara 89), thus, exhibiting the jubilant proclamation of being an unchallenged power, which ultimately becomes their downfall in the case of this war. Shaara portrays instances of Lord Howe's recreational activities such as 'music coming from inside [headquarters]'

(126), 'plump blond woman who had been Howe's greatest priority in New York' (92), thus exhibiting another facet of Lord Howe. The licentious and lewd tendencies can be witnessed in all the ranks of the British military, the senior officers 'safely housed in the large estates, their debauchery brought to them' (Shaara 76), while the common soldiers and the Hessians. The glutinous nature of Lord Howe's is shown through his fondness of eating offal products:

procured some of the finest luxuries of our own country.....at the massive platters...one very large intestine.... Howe now stabbing at a fat sausage, the juice spraying the table.... Howe thoroughly enjoying himself. (127)

Even Howe's own general, Cornwallis is apprehensive at Howe's tastes. But Shaara employs this instance of Howe's animalistic taste as a metaphor, hinting at the bestiality and brutish reality of the colonial masters. Thus, Howe's character insights, the micro instances of debauchery and licentiousness, provides a panoramic view of the whole British Empire, an epicurean and opulent nation, plunged in decadence with no moral compass. Shaara employs Lord Howe's character as a symbolic representation for the whole British nation, thus through Howe's idiosyncrasies, exposes and critiques the English.

On the other hand, George Washington is the most inspirational and exhilarating character in America's struggle for independence. A certain aura of mystique and veneration surrounds the persona of Washington 'only in silhouette, the big man on the great horse caught in the sudden flood of moonlight' (Shaara 34). Under his command the army entailing 'band of amateurs, farmers' (Shaara 402) accomplishes 'a stunning victory' (Shaara 19). As a commander he is not intimidated by the might and pomp of the British army, rather he is able to captivate his army of 'barefoot men with rags for clothes' (Shaara 129) with fervor and tenacity, 'no because that was ever worthy was without its turmoil, its trials, its hopelessness. We are not defeated yet' (Shaara 135). Another noteworthy trait observed in Washington's personality is that he is not concerned about the acknowledgement and praise worthy proclamations from anyone, he believes in appreciating everyone's due part in their struggle for independence:

Everything you hold dear has been made more secure by your patriotism and your heroism.... but without you, I do not believe this nation can survive..... you will



preserve the cause of liberty. I believe it is this army alone that can decide our destiny. (155)

He is even ready to give up his position as commanding chief of the army, if the congress asks him to, because for him 'in the end, it is the goal that will matter, not who carries the torch' (Shaara 279), instantly pushing aside his personal aspirations and dreams. He truly believes in the cause, 'the cause cannot be defeated. No king, no army can capture a man's mind or the mind of an entire country' (Shaara 345), exhibiting his determination to serve no matter the circumstances. Shaara portrays Washington not only as enlightened and capable but also courageous and valorous at the face of impending danger. During the battle of Princeton, he readily jumps into the battle ground, as he believes 'a commander must lead his men' (Shaara 176), for Washington carrying his nation to independence is such a worthy mission that he is oblivious to his own safety and life. Washington's compassionate and humanitarian side is explored during his walks among the camps at night time, to learn about his men's condition and spirits, 'I thought perhaps it would be a good thing, that I should walk among the men and hear their words' (Shaara 259). Shaara further humanizes his character when he is dejected and sorrowful at the loss of his men during the British attack on Fort Washington, 'hears soft sounds ... Washington's grief digging into him. Could not look at Washington's tears (111). Even the officers of the opponent army are intrigued by Washington's courage to lead an army against the mightiest power of the world, Cornwallis, British general, acknowledges Washington's sagacity and conviction:

He was already seeing Washington in a different way. He is a man who learns. Yes, he understands that his men cannot stand up in a general engagement. Washington knows his own limitations, his army's weaknesses. He is a soldier after all... (159)

Shaara pays homage to Washington's fearless and heroic pursuits of the enemy for the cause of liberty. Washington is portrayed as a messianic figure for the American nation,

tall man on the large white horse had led them through the battles that had inspired their nation, shocked their enemy, and changed the war. (178)

Therefore, through Washington's character study unfolds the purposefulness and the turmoil of a nation fighting to break off the chains of the

imperial power. Washington symbolically stands for the whole American nation and the cause of liberty. The ideals portrayed such as valor, honor, honesty, justice and determination in Washington's persona are the same principles which the American foundation was laid upon. By portraying the contrast between Lord Howe's and Washington's character, Shaara shows the dissimilarities between the two nations, clash of their ideologies and thus, declares the rightness of the cause. The American cause of liberty is not only legitimated but also established on a moral and ethical grounds. Furthermore, through the portrayal of the characters of the Commanding Generals of the two armies, George Washington and William Howe, Shaara has constructed a contrast, both of these characters are a foil to each other, thus they both attain a status of symbol in the American journey of liberation. The characters of General Washington and Howe both are symbolized to represent their respective nations. The attitude, qualities and the demeanor of both the Generals depicted in the novel is a direct representation of the ideology behind both the nations. The character of the General Washington has been presented as a symbol of anticolonial movement. Honesty, assiduousness, humbleness and righteousness are some of the ideals and principles that are embodied in his character and on a macro level they are emulated in the American cause and hence encapsulating and inspiring the origin of an independent nation. Therefore, General Washington is depicted as a symbol of American liberation and freedom and this symbol is reinforced throughout the novel, inspiring the Americans' struggle against the colonial rule. On the other hand, General William Howe's character also operates on a symbolic level, representing the inefficiencies, self-indulgences and the capitalistic mindset of the entire colonial enterprise.

Shaara in his novel *The Glorious Cause* (2002) has portrayed the military encounters and combats from 1776 to 1783. The American struggle and fight against the empire is the subject matter of the novel. Shaara (2002) has employed American nationalistic rhetoric and historical discourse and fortifies it through idealization of the revolutionary heroes and their struggle against the empire.

The novel *The Glorious Cause* (2002) is a nationalist version of the Revolution and it aims to establish the legitimacy of the cause by exhibiting the great fortitude and the steadfastness of the Continental army and their officers against the world's greatest

power. In this chapter the researcher has carried out the analysis of the novel *The Glorious Cause* (2002) and has tried to demonstrate how the novel has incorporated the revolutionary rhetoric to legitimize the cause of liberation. America was the settler colony of the British empire and according to Bill Ashcroft the interaction between the colonial subjects and the imperial masters is a site of transformation. And due to the unique transcultural interactions between the colonizer and the colonized the post/colonial societies hold the potential of transformations. These transformations take place in the context of anticolonial discourse and resistance. And colonized societies make use of the constructs of modernity in order to subvert the colonial rule. Although the analysis aims to foreground the competing and contrasting versions of the colonial subjects (Patriots and Loyalists) regarding the American Revolution, but the actual war continues to remain in the background and hence cannot be ignored. The physical and tangible manifestation of the revolutionary and nationalistic rhetoric incorporated in the novel can be witnessed in the actual war happenings in the background of the novel's setting.

In the novel, *The Glorious Cause* (2002) the settler colony, America is portrayed in the midst of a war against the empire. And the rhetoric of revolution and the legitimacy of the cause is highlighted through set of traditions. According to Eric Hobsbawm in his essay *Introduction: Invention of Tradition* (2012) outlines that there are set of traditions that comprises of narratives, rituals and symbols which play an important role in the origin of nation and nationalism. And the notion of nation and nationalism are constructs of modernity. And these constructs of modernity are employed by the Americans during their struggle for independence. One of the important narratives that is established in the novel is the empire's cruel and exploitative nature and mindset. The Americans wants to break free from the shackles of the monarchy and be liberated from a system of governance that heavily relies on the exploitation of the people and land resources of its colonies. Hence this narrative helps to cultivate the anticolonial sentiment among the Americans.

Another narrative that nurtures the anticolonial sentiment and revolution is the belief that America and its people are unique and different. The colonial system of governance will not work on the American land and its people. Therefore, this narrative fosters the American struggle as it inculcates the notion of America being a distinct and a unique nation from their mother country. This notion of being a distinct and a separate

nation is further emphasized through the portrayal of the character of Ben Franklin. Franklin's character becomes not only a symbol for America's unique character but also represents the values of modesty and austerity embodied in the ideal of America as a sovereign nation.

Another symbol that plays a vital role in the in American Revolutionary war is character of General Washington. General Washington's character is the embodiment of all the principles and aspirations of the American struggle. Washington's endurance, persistence and determination during military combats symbolically represent the entire American nation's struggle towards their independence. And Washington's personality traits like valor, honor, honesty, justice and determination symbolically stands in for the ideals upon which the foundation of American nation was envisioned. Hence Shaara has depicted General Washington as a messianic figure for the American nation who is memorialized as an iconic symbol of American freedom and democracy. The symbol of Washington has been mythologized in American history and in its journey of independence. These various narratives and symbols prompt the sentiment of nationalism and hence leading to emergence of sovereign nation.

Similarly, the American revolutionary war was set in motion because of anticolonial narrative and through various symbols which induced the spirit of nationalism (construct of modernity) and hence the desire for a separate independent nation. As Ashcroft believe that the interaction between the colonizers and the colonized subjects can become a site of transformation, he terms these transformations as alternative modernities or transformational modernities. Hence in the case of America and their struggle for independence, manifested in the form of revolutionary war can be perceived as transformational modernity. As the Americans wanted to establish a separate and a distinct identity, an identity different from the colonial master, hence their conflict with the imperial power and their independence leads to the emergence of alternative or transformational modernity. Therefore, modernity brings about transformation in American identity and consciousness, as after their liberation from British rule, all the association and confederation with the British empire was removed. America emerged as a sovereign independent nation on the world map. But at the same time modernity also accentuates and consolidates the fissures present during the American Revolution. As the Patriots' victory entails the defeat of the Loyalists, hence widening the divide.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **THE IMPERIAL NOSTALGIA, CHALLENGING THE REVOLUTIONARY RHETORIC: ANALYSIS OF *OLIVER WISWELL***

The American revolutionary war was one of the most poignant turns in American history, which solidified its identity and status as a nation on the world map. The venture of disassociating with the British Empire was not only a highly politicized event but also initiated massive changes in the social, economic, and political fabric of America as a nation.

In this highly charged patriotic atmosphere, a group of Americans that are often forgotten and pushed to the peripheries in popular historical and literary narrative are the ones who wanted America to constitutionally remain under the control of the British empire. These people with their predilection towards the British control were referred to as tories, royalists, the king's men, or the loyalists, by 1780 the term 'loyalist' had gained wide popularity (Ward 37). For the loyalists of that time, the revolution was not a war for independence rather they viewed it as mere anarchy or mobocracy, which had all the makings of a civil war, similar to the English Civil War in the seventeenth century (Ward 37). The loyalists experienced various trials, were condemned and penalized because of their dissenting political opinions and their abnegation for the revolution. They were targeted for public tarring and feathering, rail-riding, theft of property, and destruction of their houses and shops.

Therefore, to avoid public retribution and humiliation, many loyalists had no option but to go into exile, according to Harry M. Ward, 'the war had caused the loyal Americans deprivation and severe stress that made them refugees from their homeland (48). A large population of the loyalists moved to parts of Britain and France during the early phases of the conflict, while the majority of the loyalist relocated after the war, settling in Canada, the West Indies, Bahamas, Bermuda (Ward 45).

The American Revolution was such an avant-garde, that it instantly struck the chords of fervor and spirit among the Americans of that time, who were weary of the British economic and political policies. Thus, the journey of a decrepit army daring to stand and defeat the world's mightiest army became a popular axis of the revolution

because of its stimulative and peculiar nature. The Loyalists and their trials got somewhat sidelined in the popular narrative. Edward Larkin in his essay 'American Revolutionary War writing' discusses the depiction of the revolution in literary fiction and how the majority of the works emphasize its cultural and political motivations and merits. The American loyalties were divided (the patriots and the loyalists) but most of the literary and historical work seems to endorse the patriot's point of view of the revolution. Larkin is of the view that the revolution has been portrayed as an ideological event and how most of the popular narrative endeavors to preserve it as a cultural memory rather than an event leading to violence and bloodshed. Whereas in written accounts of the loyalists who were subjected to violence and prosecution, the revolution and the war is depicted in a more jarring manner, 'the war feels much more present in the writings of the loyalists than it does in those of the patriots' (Larkin 131).

Some of the notable historical fiction written from the perspective of the loyalists include *Royal Raiders: The Tories of the Revolution American* (1963) and *Flight from the Republic* (1967) by North Callahan. Callahan with the use of dialogue and with historical fact, details an account of the loyalists' struggle and confrontation with rebels and their inevitable exodus. Thomas H. Radall's *His Majesty's Yankees* (1942) and *The Governor's Lady* (1960), both are set in the Nova Scotia, it explores the lives of the British officers and loyalists who fled the pillage and the devastation of the revolutionary war. Some of the well-known contemporary novels with loyalist outlooks are: *Liberty's Exiles: The American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World* by Maya Jasanoff, it tells the story of a group of loyalists who were exiled overseas and struggles to fit in a new world far away from their homeland. George A. Henty's *True to the Old Flag*, traces the journey of a man who is determined to join the war from the British side. *The Loyalist's Wife* by Elaine Cougler, explores the repercussions of the war on a micro-level. The novel depicts a life of a couple torn apart by the war.

*Oliver Wiswell* is a 1940 novel written by Kenneth Roberts. Roberts was an American journalist and author known for his historical fiction and especially novels reconstructing the American Revolution. Roberts's historical fiction is marked with a desire to reconstruct and rehabilitate unpopular narratives. Similarly, his novel *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) unfolds from the point of view of a Loyalist officer during the Revolutionary war. It recounts the journey of Oliver Wiswell, who aspires to be a historian and but ends up caught in the upheaval of the revolution; which not only takes

a toll on personal relations but also outlasts him from his home and city. *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) remains one of the most representative works produced by the Loyalists. Robert Allen, an authority on the Loyalist literature has declared it ‘the classic Loyalist novel’ (25)

In this chapter, the researcher has analyzed the novel *Oliver Wiswell* by Kenneth Roberts, the purpose and the aim of the analysis was to demonstrate how the novel *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) conforms to the Loyalist version of the American Revolution. And how modernity has transformed American consciousness by demonstrate the polarizing effect of the struggle for independence from the rule of the British Empire.

### **5.1. A Divided Land:**

The novel *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) elucidates to the fissures within the American society during the revolutionary war. The opening scene of the novel alludes to the atmosphere of unrest and turbulence. Oliver Wiswell encounters a mob on his way home and first-hand experiences the mistreatment and the abuse being inflicted by the Boston mob. The mob reminds Oliver of the similar incident taking place during his childhood:

...had made an assault upon my father’s dearest friend, Thomas Hutchison, chief justice and governor of Massachusetts, enraged against him for no reason except that he held office under the Crown. Like my father every other man of sense in the Colonies, Hutchison had done everything in his power to prevent the Stamp Tax. (10)

Through the use of Oliver’s childhood reminiscence Roberts demonstrates the divide between Oliver; his circle of people and the mob. Oliver not only disassociates with the mob on the basis of politics but also on the level of intellect as well, “Like my father every other man of sense in the Colonies....” (Roberts 10), “worst sort of ignorant yokels” (Roberts 28) he clearly sets apart his group of people from the people of the mob. Oliver on his return from Yale senses a change in the aura of the surrounding towns:

something’s happened in these parts since I went away the last time.... I felt it ten or fifteen miles south of Worcester.... I was going... (28) (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix)

The Patriots fighting for the cause of liberation are considered as ‘rebels’ (20) and as a ‘mob’ (23) and the protagonist Oliver perceives them as a source of discord and disharmony. This narrative of Patriots being a frenzied, inhuman and hot-headed group is reiterated throughout the novel. And this narrative helps to conjure up the sentiment of nationalism among the loyalists, who have come together as a unit, because they all share a certain ideological vision and aspiration. Roberts makes use of Oliver’s physical backdrop to demonstrate the changes taking place in people’s opinions and behavior. The way the landscape of Milton is described, it not only illustrates the underlying rift but also a clear demarcation between worlds of the patriots and the loyalists:

...the beauties of the country about Milton is the rolling nature of the land.....higher hills that flow from the base of those five smoothly rounded blue knobs that seem, to residents of Milton to stand like a sheltering rampart between them and the turmoil of the outer world. (9)

Here Roberts portrays the natural landscape of Oliver’s hometown as serene and peaceful indirectly showing the calm and harmonious nature of the people living there, unlike the one who are causing all the unrest and the violence. After rescuing Thomas Buell from the mob, Oliver refers to his hometown as ‘civilization of Milton’ (Roberts13), perceiving the patriots and their world as lacking certain refinement, sophistication and intellect. Amidst the chaos and unrest of the outside world, Roberts establishes Oliver’s town and father’s house as a ‘sanctuary’ (13), a small haven against the injudicious and violent outside world. Therefore, from the beginning of the novel Roberts gives us a glimpse of two distinct groups existing during the revolution through the use of diction and natural scenery. And this anti-patriot narrative plays an important role in giving rise to the sentiment of nationalism and allegiance towards the British empire. It is due to this sentiment of nationalism that the Loyalists refuse to take part in Patriots’ movement of independence. And as it was discussed and established in the analysis of the novel *The Glorious Cause* (2000) that the phenomenon of the revolutionary war is an instance of transformational modernity. And modernities have the potential to transform or alter the present reality. Hence in this novel *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) the ramifications of the fight for the independence can be witnessed.



Another way Roberts has shown the divide within the American society during revolution is through the use of interpersonal relationships in the novel. One of the most important relationships in Oliver's life is with his beloved, Sally Leighton. As the country tumbles into the ravages of the war, Oliver and Sally's relationship also suffers. In the initial meeting Sally refuses to acknowledge Oliver's concern regarding the changing social and political situation, "... she seemed distressed.... pleading, 'I mustn't talk politics'" (The rest of the quotation can be read in the appendix) (Roberts 29). Oliver's need to confide in his most horrific experience with Sally is rejected, 'Don't speak of it, not to a soul!' (Roberts 28). Sally belongs to a family that supports the cause of the patriots and who believe in overtly persecuting anyone who doesn't conform to their set of opinions regarding the revolution. Sally's demeanor and responses are measured because she has assessed the precariousness of social and political unrest; '...pressed her palm against my lip. 'You're not to tell me! .....If anybody asks me, I want to say I don't know'' (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 29). Sally's realization of the fact that their affection for each other can jeopardize not only their lives but also their family's lives infuriates her: 'I can't bear to have such things come between us!' (Roberts 29).

The divide between the loyalists and the patriots is further emphasized through Sally's diction, when she comes to warn Oliver about the oncoming mob: "'They Sally? Who is *they*? `.... Our people killed...our people fought....'" (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 40). The clear distinction between the two groups is shown through the use of diction 'our' and 'them'. After Oliver and his family is forced out of their hometown, the author uses Sally's letters as a technique to demonstrate the dilemma of people who are divided by political antagonism:

I'd come to your defense, dear Oliver, if any words of mine would help; but they'd only make things worse. If I didn't agree with them, they'd say I was British myself. They'd call me a Tyrant.... (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (100)

Sally's helplessness is evident in this passage. But over the course of the novel and as the war progresses, the tone of Sally's letter changes, 'I wonder, dear Oliver, whether you know all the things that our brave army has learned....' (The

rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 221). Sally externalizes the glorious endeavors of her army and seems to undermine Oliver's cause and fight. Roberts further highlights the dilemma of divided loyalties, where Sally's love and her allegiance for the cause overlaps, 'there are times when I think I hate everyone who's against our Cause.... I know I shall never hate you!' (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 370). Despite of staying loyal and true to her cause, Sally's fondness and care for Oliver never wavers, '... [I] pray that nothing more insurmountable than an ocean will ever come between us. I've prayed for you since' (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 370). Therefore, Sally's letters demonstrate the trajectory of their relationship amidst the chaos of divided loyalties and antagonism, hence explores the confusion, agony and gruelling realities of people plunged in war.

Another relationship that turns sour is Oliver's life time neighbors and friends, the Leightons: 'not one of them looked at me or said a word.... I was puzzled....by this strange conclave of Leightons, this uncivilized supper hour...' (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 30). Oliver is surprised and appalled by the changed behavior of the Leightons. For Oliver it is unfathomable to break all relation on the basis of difference of opinion: "...it seemed to me that hatred had breathed upon me there.... of course, I'd had difference of opinion with one or another ...' (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 35). Oliver firmly believes in the independence of thought and he is perplexed by the persecution he faces because of his different views by his closest allies, the Leightons: "It's strange... I don't see why the Leightons feel they have to hate me personally" (Roberts 35). This dilemma of Oliver is shared by thousands of Americans because of their contrary views on the state of affairs during the revolution. Later in the novel, for Oliver meeting his friend after a long period of time, in the havoc of the war, seeing a familiar face is exhilarating. He discovers his childhood friend, Soame, a patriot, in a prison camp:

If Soame had, in days gone by, been nothing more than a neighbor, my heart would have leaped at sight of him; but he was vastly more than that.....I shouted his name ... (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (264)

Despite of the trials and injustices Oliver still cares and feels passionately for his friend despite of him belonging to the opposite side, ‘‘why didn’t you tell me you were here?’’ (The rest of the quotation can be read in the appendix) (Roberts 265). But once again the political differences comes in between and takes precedence over a lifelong friendship. Soame who is recruited by the Continental army doesn't want any kind of association or ‘suspicion of being friends with Tories and traitors’ (Roberts 265). Oliver still wants to salvage their friendship and is confounded by the fact that they are unable to continue the friendship because of contrary views on the country’s future, ‘... Nobody’s going to be such a fool as to think hard thoughts of you because one of your friends holds different opinions’ (Roberts 265). But Soame casts Oliver as ‘a man who isn’t an American’ (Roberts 265) and whose actions are seen as ‘try[ing] to stab your mother to the heart’ (Roberts 265). Through the portrayal of various interpersonal relationships of the protagonist Oliver, Roberts has symbolically demonstrated the political and social turmoil of the nation. The distance and dispute witnessed in various relationships of Oliver is emblematic of the larger American society inflicted by political and social divide and disunity during the period of revolution.

British intelligence officer Paul Wentworth uses an analogy of Salem witch trials to describe the harassment and the victimization of the Loyalists during the revolution: ‘...the leading ..... word of a few vicious servant, and hanged hundreds of innocents of men and women for witchcraft’ (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 408). Wentworth describes the war, the blatant violence and relentless persecution of the Loyalists as ‘mass sickness, mass blindness, mass madness’ (Roberts 408). Hence portraying the American revolution as a disease that has infiltrated the social and political fabric of America and thus segregating the people into two groups. And because of this political divide Oliver suffers grievances not only through his close relations but he also finds impossible to get their debtors to pay, ‘I ain’t obliged to pay a debt to a Tory...’ (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 67), hence finds himself short of funds. The chaos and the lawlessness amidst the revolutionary war and with majority of the population against the British supporters, Oliver finds himself unable to financially sustain his family.

In the novel, Roberts has portrayed, the protagonist Oliver Wiswell, as a historian and this character trait is integral to the context and setting of the novel. Roberts as an author reconstructs the American revolution from the point of view of the Loyalists, a narrative that is often forgotten and sidelined in favor of the popular and triumphed narrative. Similarly, Oliver realizes the importance of recording the events as they were happening during his course of life. Oliver works for three years on his manuscript *Civil War in America- The First Four Years*, but nearly all the publishers refuses to publish his book. Oliver's book is rejected because it refuses to indulge any specific groups involved in the revolution. Therefore, Oliver finds himself unable to publish in Britain because, 'your book libels some of the most respectable characters in the British Army....' (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 455). Similarly, in America 'the rebels will kill any man who tries to tell the truth about them' (Roberts 456), Oliver is exasperated by the repudiation and refuses to make changes in his book to accommodate a specific view point. Oliver's situation demonstrates the challenges of reconstructing event which do not necessarily coincide with the popular history. Hence it also observes the maxim 'history being written by the winners, Oliver being a loyalist, (Loyalists lost during the revolution) his depiction of the events are deemed incompatible to the prevalent political majority in America and the Great Britain.

Therefore, Roberts in *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) makes use of landscape and diction to show the underlying tension between the patriots and the loyalists. The landscape of Oliver's interpersonal relationships is used to demonstrate the divide among people during the revolution. The reason behind the social and political divide is the clash of the narratives of the two groups amidst the Revolutionary war. According to Hobsbawm the inception of a nation heavily relies on the performance of certain narratives. Through the illustration of the social and the political divide in *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) Roberts establishes a particular narrative, the narrative of the Loyalists. And this narrative plays a vital role in invoking the sentiment of nationalism among the Loyalists. The Loyalists feel compelled to protect and safeguard their country against the 'mob' rule. Therefore, this sentiment of nationalism along with the narrative of the Loyalists helps to establish a sense of belonging, congruency, and camaraderie among the Loyalists. And according to Hobsbawm, it is these set of values (belonging, congruency, camaraderie) that not

only establishes but also sustains the construct of a nation. In the novel *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) the Patriots are the outsiders, 'the rebels' and therefore they are not considered part of (or loyal to) their nation America. Hence, the Loyalists' narrative and the sentiment of nationalism brings them together as a unit, a nation, from which the 'rebels' are excluded.

Throughout the course of the novel and as the war progress, it becomes a daunting experience for Oliver to interact with his friends and fellow citizens because of the conflicting views regarding American independence. Oliver is constantly labelled and targeted because of his political affiliations. This segregation among the people not only takes a toll on Oliver's relationships but also shatters his financial and professional prospects. Roberts successfully manages to illustrate the tumultuous, divided and chaotic political and social landscape of America during the Revolutionary war.

## **5.2. The Refusal to Endorse the Cause:**

Kenneth Roberts in his novel *Oliver Wiswell* (1940), sets out to explore and represent the Loyalist's approach towards the event of the American revolutionary war. In the novel Robert conforms to the Loyalists perspective through continual subversion of the Patriots' cause and ideology. This narrative of the Patriot is challenged through tenacious refusal of the Loyalists to endorse the cause and the struggle for the revolution. The sentiment of nationalism and loyalty to the mother country plays a vital role in Loyalists' refusal to acknowledge the patriots' cause.

In the world of Roberts' *Oliver Wiswell* (1940), the daily occurrence of conflict and dissension is not viewed as a struggle towards the American independence from the British rule, rather the Loyalist regards it as a 'civil war' (22, 24, 35,79,482). Throughout the novel the revolutionary war is termed as a 'civil war', it is an absurd notion for the Loyalists to betray their mother land and hence the idea of independence seems not only outrageous but irrational as well. The claims put forward in order to propel the revolution are deemed unscrupulous '.... Hurroaring and hurrooing about the rights of man- rights they're bound nobody but themselves shall have!', rather the struggle becomes incitement for hatred, violence and lawlessness (Roberts 64). The rebels' cause and their agenda for the independence is regarded as renegade against the Crown, 'they've defaulted in their

sacred duty to their kings' hence for the Loyalists' it becomes an inherent conflict, which abets their resentment and animosity towards the patriots (Roberts 162). Like the rest of the Loyalists, Oliver does not support the patriot's ideology and is of the view that the whole dispute is easily negotiable with the mother land '.....We're all of us against what English's doing here.....that she ought to be taught by constitutional mean....' (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 22). Oliver firmly believes on the principles of freedom, liberty and non-violence. Therefore, for Oliver the dispute seems a matter that can easily be resolved through nonviolent means. Oliver is highly infuriated by the antagonism displayed towards the people (loyalists) who doesn't actively support the cause of independence. The public domains like the universities, 'who's almost forgotten that he's an educator, and wants to jam his political opinions down the throat of his student' (Roberts 22) and the newspaper, 'they'd burned Henry Wade's barn and tarred and feathered this man. He'd been keeping a printing press at Wade's' (Roberts 17), which are vital informational hub, are adulterated by the political climate. The political infiltration of huge institutions like the academics and the printing press clearly shows the popularity and the influence of the revolution. The patriots' vehemence is not only limited to the blatant and overt resistance but to anyone who comes under the suspicion of being a 'Tory' (67), '.... were guilty, probably, of nothing but speaking their mind....' (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix). (Roberts 47). As a result of their political opinions, Oliver and thousands of loyalists are forced out of their home and properties, '.... had taken from us the liberty to live in our own homes unmolested' (Roberts 74), hence facing formidable circumstances merely just because of holding contrary political views.

The constant scrutiny to which the people are subjected to, brings forth further indignation for the revolution and everything it represents, for the Loyalists. Liberty and freedom, the two major tenets of revolution turn out to be the source of torment for the Loyalists. In the novel Roberts exhibits the hypocritical and gratuitous proclivities of the revolution, '.... The Sons of Liberty are suppressing freedom of speech, silencing the voice of truth....' (Roberts 45), disguised under the righteous and noble cause of independence. Oliver is exasperated at the duplicitous and delinquent facet of the patriots and their claims, '.... those lovers of Liberty who won't allow anyone the liberty of disagreeing with them!' (Roberts 18), the

prejudiced behavior and treatment at the hands of the patriots, diminishes any hope of loyalists' future acquiescence to the revolution and the cause.

Despite of incessant harassment and atrocities, Roberts portrays the resolve and determination of the Loyalists, '.... every man's entitle to his opinion.... I'll be against the Sons of Liberty to my dying day ....' (Roberts 57), '.... rather than submit to the rule of the mobs (Roberts 186) hence showing the tenacity and perseverance to the principles they hold important, even at the face of grave danger. Another instance of this perniciousness can be witnessed between the conversation of Seaton Wiswell, Oliver's father and George Leonard, 'you can't destroy ideas by force, and you can't hide `em by silence' (Roberts 57), showing even after losing everything (home, property, business and the city), Seaton Wiswell's resolve to adhere to his beliefs and principles.

Another way Roberts challenges the narrative of the revolution and the struggle for independence is through nomenclature. The loyalists refer to the patriots as a 'rebellious mob' (Roberts 17), 'mad men, riff raff out of gutters' (Roberts 28). The novel identifies the people supporting the cause and struggling towards independence as 'rebel' (Roberts 20, 36, 54, 65, 79) and their campaign as 'rabble's whims (Roberts 99). As the entire revolutionary struggle is considered a civil war, 'tribulations that had so long oppressed America (Roberts 186) and the partisans as 'lunatics' (Roberts 59), 'fanatics' (Roberts 73). After being rescued, Thomas Buell contemplates about the deteriorating political and social situation of the country and is daunted by state of affairs 'every American who loved his country.... wanted to see it saved from mob rule and civil war ...'(Roberts 21). Buell whose rights and property have been brutally violated and infringed upon by the 'mob' (Roberts 20, 23,46), makes use of an ironical term 'lovers of Liberty' (Roberts 17), for the supporters, to bring forth the oppugnant facet of the revolution amidst their propositions of sovereignty and liberty. Likewise, Oliver and his father, Buell is dismayed by the escalating turmoil, '.... Sons of Liberty who were turning all our colonies into madhouse' (Roberts 21), wants to safeguard the future of America from the 'mob rule' (21).

Furthermore, the quintessence of the entire revolution and the cause it fights against is deprecated through the portrayal of its supporters. Throughout the novel the supporters are established as unenlightened and primitive people. Apart from

being characterized as ‘rebel’ (Roberts 20) they are labelled as ‘miserable looking men...worst sort of ignorant yokels’ (Roberts 28), thus Roberts deconstructs the larger-than-life image of the revolution, all the constituents it entails and its partisans. For many of the Loyalist the struggle for independence becomes reprehensible mainly because of the people leading it. A sense of the harrowing abhorrence is apparent when Oliver's reminisces about the disturbing mob incident, ‘all the human dregs of the country are rising to the top’ (Roberts 28). Hence, the rebels and their entire endeavor for independence is represented in a certain jingoistic manner.

Moreover, the entire discourse of zeal and fortitude surrounding the revolution is disassembled through relegating its custodians, the patriots. A vast discrepancy can be observed in the manner both the factions, the patriots and the loyalists, are delineated in the novel. As already mentioned above, the patriots are branded as ‘rebels’ (20), ‘fanatics’ (299). The patriots are shown to be the proletariat, ‘shoemaker, horse traders, storekeepers, fishermen’ (Roberts 409) ‘...making shoes and spreading fertilizer’ (Roberts 224). Whereas the loyalists are established as the bourgeois, ‘...they’ve even turned on every physician and surgeon .....merchants, soldiers, printers, ship captains, country gentlemen, officers of the Crown (Roberts 58). The novel establishes the loyalists as highly enlightened and distinguished members of the society. The juxtaposition of the social and economic disparity of these two factions is used not only to accentuate their political schism but it also facilitates in subverting the Patriots’ claim for sovereignty. This tendency of treating the revolution disdainfully and cavalierly is also apparent in Mrs. Byles and Mr. Wiswell’s conversation, where they perceive the revolution as preposterous ‘this isn't a logical war’ (Roberts 103).

Likewise, the forerunners of the revolution such as Sam Adams, John Hancock and the leading commanders such as George Washington are unabatedly admonished in the novel. At the occasion of rescuing and treating Thomas Buell, an exchange takes place between Mr. Wiswell and Dr. Josiah Miller, where the latter is skeptical about the Patriots endeavors, ‘...you can’t make me believe Sam Adams and Hancock would push this country into a civil war just to further their own crazy ideas’ (Roberts 22). Mr. Wiswell and Thomas Buell warns the doctor of the fraudulent nature of Sam Adams, calling him a ‘demagogue’, ‘a rabble rouser’.



(Roberts 22). In the novel Adams is portrayed as an unscrupulous and a despicable character a 'liar' (Roberts 59), a spymaster, '...watching us - watching every man that he suspects of wanting to settle our differences with England in a peaceful way....' (Roberts 22). Sam Adams' entire campaign and advocacy for American sovereignty is regarded as a mean of disguising his vindictiveness towards the British Empire. The sense of sanctity, adulation and grandiosity associated with the notion of fighting for your country's autonomy is vulgarized, '...wants us to fight England and turn this country into a slaughterhouse' (Roberts 23). John Hancock, another prominent advocate of the revolution is depicted as notorious malefactor. In the novel, he is hundreds of thousand pounds in debt to the Empire and widely known as a 'convicted smugglers' (Roberts 23).

Similarly, General Washington is deemed as untrustworthy and someone lacking fortitude. During an interaction between a Tory officer, John Harris Cruger and a British officer, Charles Stedman, the former comments on the capricious nature of Washington,

.... That's Washington ...I met him... a year ago.... He made a speech- said the greatest calamity that could come to this country would be for it to be independent of England... (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (311)

The author Roberts, sketches the persona of General Washington through the eyes of the veterans like Cruger and Stedman. After this instance, the novel uses the character of Oliver, who doesn't have much insight into the world of combat, to demonstrate the banality of General Washington:

'If ever saw a pitiable spectacle, it was Washington he drew out his sword and used it as he might have used a goad on stampeding cows.... His mouth was wide open from the violence of his shouting..... (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (313)

Hence, the novel takes General Washington's character, a celebrated and a notable political leader of the Patriots, who played an integral role in American independence, and strips away the notions of nobility and reverence associated to Washington. He is regarded as an inept and a disingenuous character. In the novel, the groundwork has been laid down through the use of characters and their

perceptions, in order to deconstruct the entire grandeur associated with the Patriots' leaders. The entire regime of the Patriots is labelled as 'miserable leadership' (Roberts 259) and 'reckless leaders' (Roberts 262) and hence once again demonstrating the Loyalists' sentiment of condemnation and repudiation not only towards the revolution but also its commanders. And the very idea of independence and its constituent is regarded as cataclysm propagating mayhem and dissension all over the country, '... Only a few years ago our country was the happiest... Now it has no government, no credit....' (The rest of the quotation can be read in the appendix) (Roberts 163)

The incidents of violence and harassment faced by the people at the hands of the rebels is another major theme found in the narrative of the novel. In fact, the novel opens up with an episode of vandalism by the Boston Mob, burning Henry Wade's barn and the brutal assault of Thomas Buell. Through these prefatory scenes of rampage and lawlessness, Kenneth Roberts lays down the ground for the imminent conflicts that will engulf the entire nation. Oliver Wiswell, on his way home is met with an ominous sight, '...the sliver of flame opened out at the top into a billowing cloud of glowing smoke.... heard a singular wailing chorus like the clamor of far-off sea gulls' (Roberts 10). The author draws not only the readers but also the protagonist, Oliver Wiswell's attention and hence alludes to the turbulent times ahead in the novel. Oliver is appalled and disgusted by the display of brutality and frenzy, he delineates a certain brutish and feral characteristic to the people in the mob, '...seeing something ferocious and dangerous, something crazier than any wild beast.... their yelling mouths contorted to senseless shapes...' (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 11).

The manner in which the novel undertakes the depiction of the mob, immediately invalidates the readers' and Oliver's any preconceived notion of the revolution being virtuous and chivalrous. The mob and the supporters of the revolution are portrayed as barbaric and murderers, they are addressed as 'black demon' (Roberts 12), '...they maintained a kind of howling: threatening, exultant, wolfish' (Roberts 10), hence portraying people in the mob and the revolution as being devoid of any humanistic traits and qualities. The animalistic and sadist inclination of the mob can be observed in the ambush and the torture of Thomas Buell and a mare.

Thomas Buell becomes the victim of the mob's vehemence and savagery, his printing press and the barn, he was residing in, is burned down. He goes through one of the most mortifying experiences of being tarred and feathered. Tarring and feathering has been used for centuries as a form of punishment. Especially at the time of the revolution, tarring and feathering became one of the most effective and powerful tactics which enabled the mob to propagate the atmosphere of intimidation and terror among Loyalists. Oliver is a witness to Thomas Buell's assault:

....it was like a strange enormous bird.... that had shed a part of its feathers to reveal here and there a skin of repulsively shining black. Except for the feathers, this black lacquered was as naked as an antique statue.... the attackers of this horrible Black figure thrust a fence rail between his legs.... others poked at him, continually with long sticks, hilariously maintaining him astride the rail. (12)

Oliver also witnesses an abominable act of torture of an animal at the hands of the mob:

...wrenched the mare's head until she fell to the ground beside the colt. Others caught her legs. One of those who had thrown her down whipped a knife from his pocket. Another pried open her jaws.... (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (12)

These instances of torture and violence acts as examples of disarray and chaos on a micro level, thereby implying how the entire nation is in the state of anarchy, and swamped by the rebels' vendetta. And the blatant display of abuse and brutality cripples Oliver to the extent of immobility for a little while, 'It made me ashamed of being a human being' (Roberts12).

Amidst this terror and turmoil, Oliver emerges as a savior, he rescues Thomas Buell, '.... he was upon his knees. I reached down, caught him by the arm and dragged him to feet....and set off hell bent for...the sanctuary of my father's home' (Roberts 13). Oliver's valor and solace shown to Buell, 'I'd put my greatcoat about him as we rode...helped him down as gently as I could...picked the garment and wrapped it about him' (Roberts 14), is antithetical to the mob's atrocities. The Wiswells' are aware of the fact that rescuing and abetting an opponent of the revolution inevitably jeopardizes their lives and safety. The Wiswells' show of

compassion and care are juxtaposed to the inhumane and heinous transgressions of the rebels. The anti-loyalist agitation already prevalent in the area starts to stir up and the Wiswell family comes under their radar because of Buell, ‘all morning .... he had been conscious o something usual. He had seen men hurrying singly along the roads with muskets over their shoulder and haversacks on their hips...’ (Robert 38)

The ostracization and the eventual eviction of the Wiswell family is another instance of mob violence and infringements against the Loyalists. The entire house is besieged by the ‘dark figures’ (Roberts 43) of the mob consequent of rescuing Buell, ‘...you’ve given aid and comfort to enemies of this country... You’ve got to leave this town- you ‘...’ (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 44). The mob is full of nervous energy ‘...shouting, and fists and clubs... (Roberts 44) and vehemently threatens to burn the house down, ‘... Hell, burn the house now!... Let’s have a quick fire! Burn it! Burn it!’ (Roberts 45). Amidst the mob’s frenzied cacophonies of mayhem, Oliver’s fraught pleadings are overlooked, ‘.... leave this town? We can’t do that. Why it’s our home! This land is ours!.....’ (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 44). Once again, through the interaction between the mob and the Wissell family, the author has portrayed a notable difference between the Patriots and the Loyalists’ sense of ethical and moral obligations. Oliver’s father refuses to take arms against the mob’s lawlessness, ‘...I don’t believe I want them... I wouldn’t care to shoot my own townsmen over a difference of opinion about politics’ (Roberts 42), hence denies the right to defend himself on conscientious grounds, and therefore the author establishes the moral and ethical transcendence of the Loyalists over the Patriots. Thereby undermining the revolution and its fight against tyranny and injustice. Oliver also believes that taking up arms against each other will not solve the conflict. Even at the tragic and sorrowful occasion of his father’s death, Oliver is devastated and traumatized at the entire ordeal of his father’s death, but Oliver refuses to take arms even in this situation,

My father distrusted and hated the mobs that were ruining America, and so do I.....I’m a New Englander, and I don’t want to go to war against other New Englanders. After all, they’re my own people. (170)

Oliver feels a sense of sympathy and compassion for his country fellows and despite of their various atrocities, he feels obliged to protect and defend them. Oliver knows many of people around him, his neighbors and classmates, who have shifted their loyalties to the other side and Oliver is unable to go against them. And it is because of this sentiment that he refuses to take a position in the British army offered to by General Howe. And he only agrees upon the position of being a spy for the army because he realizes the fact that he will not be taking arms against anyone directly. Here the instance of Oliver agreeing to take up the position of the spy is an example of appropriation. As Ashcroft outlines in his essay *Postcolonial Modernities* (2014) that transformations in modernity do not occur randomly rather they are born out of cultural or historical context and therefore adapt to the cultural or local needs. In the novel *Oliver Wiswell* (1940), Oliver never wanted to get caught up in the middle of the revolution, he always believed that everyone had a right to their own opinions and beliefs and once should respect each other's views. But he gets caught up in the whirlpool of violent assaults and insurgencies and making it impossible for him to take a passive role in the political and social scenario of the country. Thus, Oliver's decision to become a spy is an instance of appropriation, as he sacrifices his own personal beliefs and adapts to the requirements of the political situation. Oliver believes that he can help his country fellows and play a part in bringing freedom to his country from the clutches of 'fanatics' (299).

But over the period of time as Oliver spends his time amongst the British army, he comes to an epiphany. He realizes the futility of his mission and role in the army. The arrogance and inefficiencies of the British army become apparent to Oliver, 'he must be quite an admiral...if he takes more'n three months to sail across the Atlantic Ocean' (224), the negligence and laziness of the British army and their officers are demonstrated by the author. And Oliver is exasperated at the General Howe's lackadaisical and indolent behavior, 'What's General Howe's reason for not attacking? One is the fort's so easy to take, he'd be wasting lives if he assaulted it. He prefers to take it by regular approaches' (272). Oliver even compares the British army with that of the rebels', highlighting the incompetency and unreliability, 'it's strange, but these professional commanders seem incapable of using ordinary common sense!' (309). After seven years of serving in the British army Oliver acknowledges the failures and shortsightedness of the British army regarding the

Americans, ‘For seven year I've seen things go wrong in this war. For seven years British army haven't followed up their victories, British ministers have refused to believe what they were told....’ (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 642)

Oliver becomes disillusioned with the entire narrative of the war and everything glorious and heroic it stands for. Oliver has witnessed and gone through the turmoil and the devastation of the war. Meanwhile thousands of people are uprooted from their hometown and marched to Boston, a safe haven for the Loyalists. During this journey the severity of the turmoil and havoc dawns upon Oliver, ‘...had erected barricades to keep the troops from coming out of Boston...an assemblage of people who, in appearance and behavior were such a crowd as might gather....’ (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 48)

The novel portrays harrowing and grievous dioramas of diasporic people, ‘the children were like cowed animals...some whimpering...the women's faces were pale...hair was disarranged; their clothing dusty and draggled...the men with them were silent and watchful’ (Roberts 49). The displacement of hundreds of people is another major motif employed by the author to show the vacuity of the revolution and its contentions. During the incident of vessel hijacking, Oliver's father dies, unable to endure arduous conditions of the exile, stripping Oliver of his most venerated person of his life. After losing not only his home but also Sally, Oliver is devastated and contemplates the loss of his father, ‘...my outer body was a rigid shell, and that my whole inner self had passed into a cold and dark chamber, around which my thoughts stumbled rapidly and without emotion....’ (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 154)

The Wiswell family become the focal point of the narrative and through their atrocities and bereavements, the author depicts the vast canvas of the entire nation being ravaged by war, death, corruption, disease and chaos. The trials of anguish, despair and homesickness, the experiences of the Wiswell, alludes to the devastation taking place throughout the country on a larger scale. Therefore, the novel demonstrates various incidents of mass violence incited by the Revolutionary war and thus highlighting the vapidness and malignant nature of the cause. In the initial days of the revolutionary war the protagonist Oliver, weary and despondent by the traumatic ordeals, in his beguiling naivety pines for the return of the old days, ‘... I

had a yearning for home and for those blue hills and green meadow and wood ... I was sore with homesickness' (Roberts 73). And gullibly believes that eventually everything will go back to the same old times: 'the day must surely come, we still thought, when the mobs must be dispersed; when the courts would be opened and judges be allowed to sit....' (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 99)

But Roberts, demonstrates the improbability of things returning or remaining unchanged in a land scarred by the horrors of war. Oliver ponders and laments over the deterioration of the natural landscape, 'those meadowed hills, all treeless grazing ground, showed no sign of human or animal life upon them....' (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 75). But over time Oliver concedes to the fact that they have lost their country to 'mass blindness' and 'mass madness' (408). He is deeply distraught by the entire cycle of violence brought on by the revolution, 'but this is beyond politics. It's a question of humanity - I mean of inhumanity- horrible inhumanity' (Roberts 29), his spirit to fight and love for the nation, now broken and shattered. Their native land, America, ceases to evoke the emotions of love, devotion and pride, 'our souls wouldn't be our own if we tried to live in our old home' (Roberts 671), hence the author contemplates the irrevocability of the things lost in war and violence. Oliver nostalgically laments the loss of his home, 'Boston could never again be for me the friendly Boston of my boyhood, its streets filled with my father's friends, kindly and helpful. This Boston was hard and hating...' (The rest of the quotation can be found in the appendix) (Roberts 681)

Oliver realizes that there is no place for Loyalists like him, '...need of a land to which the Loyalists could go to escape the persecution of rebels and the mismanagement of the English' (Roberts 657) and hence decides to settle in Nova Scotia. Oliver and the rest of the Loyalists decide to leave America as they no longer see it as their home, with the rebels being victorious, they fear that they will not be allowed to live peacefully. Hence the Loyalist sorrowfully leaves in search of a new homeland where they will not be prosecuted. The migration of the Loyalist is an instance of alternative modernity. In the novel it is portrayed how the Loyalists questioned their present reality, that is the Revolutionary war because their allegiance lies with the British empire. Oliver joins the British army in order to bring about a change in the present political scenario, hence he is appropriating and trying

to adapt the phenomena of modernity according to his needs and values. But over the course of the novel Oliver becomes disillusioned by the cause and fight of both the sides, the British and the rebels. Oliver through his experiences believes that the loyalists have been exploited and outcasted by both the political factions of the revolutionary war. Therefore, Oliver decides to forsake his homeland and migrate to Nova Scotia and hence leading to the emergence of an alternative modernity. Oliver's decision to migrate is an instance of alternative modernity, as neither of the realities: siding with the British Empire or living under the Patriots' rule, conforms to Oliver's perspective or worldview. Oliver from the beginning refused to endorse the American Revolution but over the course of the novel, he gets disillusioned with the narrative of the British Empire as well. He believes that both modernities do not align with his worldview. Therefore, he decides to leave, hence forging his own separate path, different from the current modernities portrayed in the novel.

As the loyalists conforms neither to the ideology of the empire and nor to the rebels, they establish their own modernity. Roberts has portrayed the divide among the Americans regarding the Revolutionary war in *Oliver Wiswell*. And this divide is further accentuated through the emergence of alternative modernity (Loyalists leaving their homeland and settling in a new land). The Loyalist find themselves not only country less but also with no identity, they are considered neither 'American' nor 'English', according to the path they have chosen (alternative modernity). Hence, modernity widened the conflictual divide present in the American Revolution among different factions (Patriots and Loyalists).



## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSION

This chapter aims to summarize the entire thesis premise and the theoretical framework that has been employed to analyze the primary texts to conclude the thesis. The researcher has carried out the analysis of *The Glorious Cause* (2000) by Jeff Shaara and *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) by Kenneth Roberts through the critical lens of Bill Ashcroft's *Postcolonial Modernities* (2014) and Eric Hobsbawm's *Introduction: Invention of Tradition* (2012). The researcher has utilized Catherine Belsey's method of textual analysis from her essay *Textual Analysis as a Research Method*, in order to carry out the analysis of the selected texts mentioned above. Furthermore, the qualitative approach has been employed for the analysis of the primary texts, hence the analysis is largely explanatory, subjective, and interpretative in nature.

The study has attempted to explore the proclivity of colonial societies\ cultures towards transformational modernities. And how both the novels conform to the Loyalist and Patriots rhetoric and how modernity plays a vital role in shaping American consciousness and identity.

The Enlightenment period led to the advent of modernity. Modernity not only altered but also revolutionized the social, political, and economic fabric of the society. It encouraged the notion of expansionism and capitalism, inspiring countries like Britain, France, Portugal to venture out and explore new lands and marketplaces. Therefore, the colonial project was the product of modernity. Similarly, the emergence of modernity brought an influx of changes into all fields of society. It altered the sociopolitical setting through the introduction of the notions of nation and nationalism. According to Hobsbawm nation and sentiment of nationalism are relatively modern terms and in his essay *Introduction: Invention of Tradition* (2012) theorizes that nation comes into being and flourish through the sentiment of nationalism and a set of 'invented traditions'. These set of traditions comprises of various narratives, symbols, and images that are repeated over through the course of a nation's journey.

Ashcroft in his essay *Postcolonial Modernities* (2014) theorizes that the world is 'characterized by the multiplicity of its modernities' (5) and colonial/

postcolonial societies have a certain proclivity towards transformational or alternative modernities. According to Ashcroft the transcultural interaction between the colonial master and the colonized subject is a site of transformation which gives rise to transformational or alternative modernities. The colonial/ postcolonial cultures appropriate and adapt certain constructs of west modernity and conform them according to their local or cultural needs.

In the analysis of the primary texts, *The Glorious Cause* (2000) by Jeff Shaara and *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) by Kenneth Robert, the researcher has attempted to explore how the American Revolutionary war fiction is marked with divide and how both the selected texts challenge their present modernity in their respective settings. And how challenging the present modernities lead to the emergence of alternative modernities.

The novel *The Glorious Cause* (2000) by Jeff Shaara plunges into the military encounters and combats from 1776 to 1783. The American revolution is at the heart of the novel *The Glorious Cause* (2000). Shaara argues for the legitimacy and rationale for the American struggle against the British Empire through various elements such as exposing the exploitative and perfidious policies of the British, referring to the revolution in dignified and esteemed titles, anti-colonial sentiments and narratives such as the rejection of the English system, dismay at the prejudice attitude and obsession with the pageantry. All these elements help to shape the narrative for the Revolutionary war for the Patriots. These various elements also managed to incorporate the revolutionary rhetoric to legitimize the cause of liberation.

Shaara also grounds the revolution's moral and noble supremacy by transforming it into a symbol of freedom and liberation for the entire world. Even the military personnel such as General Washington is turned into a symbol. He is portrayed as a messianic figure for the American nation, an iconic symbol of American freedom and democracy. Whereas his counterpart, General Howe of the British army, is depicted in a reprehensible and inept manner. Shaara highlights the self-serving and self-indulgent behavior of General Howe in through his various interactions and conduct in the novel.

Hence this American quest for liberation is facilitated by a set of operations such as narrative (independence, anti-colonial) and symbols (of freedom and democracy). These set of operations also known as 'invented traditions' by

Hobsbawm are essential in invoking the sentiment of nationalism among the Patriots and motivating them to establish their separate sovereign nation. Thus, the Patriots challenging the British rule (present reality/ modernity) opens up the path to alternative modernity.

Whereas the novel *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) reconstructs the American revolution through the point of view of a Loyalist officer. In the novel, the Loyalists challenge the narrative of the Patriots, the narrative of the American Revolution, and the struggle for independence from the rule of the British Empire. Roberts in *Oliver Wiswell* (1940) demonstrates the unwillingness and aversion of the Loyalists to conform to the narrative of the Revolutionary war. The analysis of the novel has illustrated and highlighted the refusal of the Loyalists to endorse the narrative of the Revolutionary war through the use of diction, landscape, incidents of violence, and interpersonal relationships of the characters. In the novel, the Crown is portrayed as a symbol of unification for the Loyalists. Even the diction used by Roberts in the novel supports the Loyalists' perspective, the Patriots are termed as a 'mob'(53) 'rebels'(20) and their struggle is viewed as 'mobocracy'(56). As the entire nation tumbles into the ravages of the war, Roberts makes use of the interpersonal relations of the protagonist, Oliver, to depict the political and social divide and the segregation among the people of America.

Hence this refusal to conform to the Patriots' narrative for independence unite all the Loyalists under a cause, thus invoking their sentiment of nationalism. A sentiment that is being violated by the Revolutionary struggle.

According to Hobsbawm the sentiment of nationalism plays a vital role in the notion of a nation. The clash of the ideologies witnessed between the Loyalists and the Patriots gives rise to another narrative, which is antithetical to the Patriots'. Therefore, the Loyalists' narrative and the sentiment of nationalism that it invokes, unite all those who are against the revolution, thus bringing them together under the principles of camaraderie, belonging, and congruency, which Hobsbawm deems to be fundamental in the inception and functionality of a nation. The group of the loyalists can be perceived as a unit, considered to be a nation because they all share the same vision and aspiration regarding the Revolutionary war.

As Hobsbawm theorizes that the sense of togetherness and nationalism is achieved through the performance of certain 'invented traditions', such as certain narratives and symbols. The analysis of the novel *Oliver Wiswell* (1940)

demonstrates the unification of the Loyalists under a specific narrative (the rejection of the revolutionary war) and the symbol of revolution, which has come to symbolize dissent, duplicity, and disloyalty towards their nation and the Crown. It is through the performances of these set of operations or ‘invented traditions’ that the Loyalists manage to find a sense of belonging and camaraderie thus coming together as a unit.

These set of operations (narrative, symbol) also known as ‘invented traditions’ by Hobsbawm, opens the way to the possibility of alternative modernity. The Patriots in the novel *The Glorious Cause* (2000) challenge and rebel against their present reality (modernity), similarly it is witnessed in *Oliver Wiswell* that the Loyalists challenges their present reality (living amidst the Revolutionary struggle). The Loyalists are loyal to the British empire and they want to remain part of the mother country. But over the course of the novel *Oliver Wiswell* (1940), the transcultural interaction of the Loyalists with the Patriots and the empire, results in alternative modernity. The Loyalists realizes that their ideology doesn't coincide with either side and therefore they end up forging their own separate path, hence the alternative modernity.

As Ashcroft believes that the world is ‘characterized by the multiplicity of its modernities (5) and through the analysis of the selected novels the researcher has tried to show that how the American society was subjected to multiplicity of modernities and how these alternative modernities have shaped the American consciousness and identity. The colonial subjects: Patriots and Loyalists, both offered competing visions and versions of the American Revolutionary War and this conflictual representation was further enabled and consolidated by modernity. Both the factions (Patriots and Loyalists) challenge their respective present reality (modernity) and in doing so leads to alternative modernities. Modernity played an important role in transforming the American revolutionary experience, leading to a divided sense of identity and consciousness. Modernity helped in decentering the rule of the Empire, leading to an emergence of an exclusive American identity hence a new kind of nationalism.

The case of the American Revolution was not only incredulous but also incredible in nature. The process of becoming American despite of irrefutable similarities with its Metropolitan center, like religion, language, and Anglo-Saxon heritage was unprecedented and unique at that time. And from the very beginning, there was a schism in the political and social fabric of America which gained its full

force during the struggle for independence. This schism came into being because of the ideological differences between the Patriots and the Loyalists. Hence America was not only trying to fight against the Empire, which they considered to be a foreign power but also against a faction within their society. These two factions, the Patriots and the Loyalists had different visions and aspirations regarding the American Revolutionary war. Therefore, both these factions witnessed and interpreted the struggle for independence in an entirely different manner, leading to different versions and visions of the same event. This research has first tried to demonstrate this divide in American consciousness regarding the Revolutionary war and secondly how this divide led to the emergence of alternative modernities.

Therefore, modernity facilitated in transforming the American identity and consciousness. In the case of the Patriots, it assisted in giving rise to the anti-colonial discourse and sentiment (by challenging their present reality/ modernity through a set of 'invented tradition') which led to the Patriots being victorious. And thus, establishing the sovereign nation of America. Whereas in the case of the Loyalists a set of 'invented traditions' assisted in challenging the narrative of the Patriots (the struggle for independence) but after the victory of the Patriots, the Loyalists migrated away from their homeland, refusing to live under the rule of 'mob' (Roberts 20), hence leading to alternative modernity.

The research has tried to demonstrate how the American Revolutionary war fiction is marked with a divide and how these fissures lead to alternative modernities and hence leading to different visions and versions of the American Revolutionary war.

## WORKS CITED

- Adams, James Truslow, and Howard Schneiderman. *The Epic of America*. Routledge, 2012.
- Allen, Robert S. *Loyalist Literature: An Annotated Bibliographic Guide to the Writings on the Loyalists of the American Revolution*. Dundurn, 1982.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso, 2006.
- Arrighi, Giovanni. *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times*. Verso, 1994.
- Ashcroft, Bill, et al. *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. Routledge, 2003.
- . *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. Routledge, 2003.
- Bailyn, Bernard. *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution: Fiftieth Anniversary Edition*. Harvard University Press, 2017.
- Baker, J. S. *The Readers' Advisory Guide to Historical Fiction*. USA: American Library Association. (2015)
- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Belsey, Catherine. "Textual Analysis as a Research Method." *Research Methods for English Studies*, edited by Gabriele Griffin, Edinburgh University Press, 2013, pp. 190-178.
- Berman, Marshall. *All that is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. Verso, 1983.
- Breen, Timothy H. *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence*. Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Buell, Lawrence. "American Literary Emergence as a Postcolonial Phenomenon." *American Literary History*, vol. 4, no. 3, 1992, pp. 411-442, [academic.oup.com/alh/article-abstract/4/3/411/190689?redirectedFrom=fulltext](http://academic.oup.com/alh/article-abstract/4/3/411/190689?redirectedFrom=fulltext).
- Buell, Lawrence, et al. *Postcolonial theory and the United States: Race, ethnicity, and literature*. Univ. Press of Mississippi, 2000.
- Buskirk, Judith L. *Generous Enemies: Patriots and Loyalists in Revolutionary New York*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.

- Cohen, Lester H. "Explaining the Revolution: Ideology and Ethics in Mercy Otis Warren's Historical Theory." *The William and Mary Quarterly: A Magazine of Early American History*, vol. 37, no. 2, 1980, pp. 200-218.
- Crane, G. *The Cambridge Introduction to the Nineteenth-century American novel*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Cullen, Jim. *The American Dream: A Short History of an Idea that Shaped a Nation*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2004.
- Dallmayr, Fred. "Discourse of Modernity: Hegel, Neitzsche, Heidegger." *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity: Critical Essays on The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, edited by Maurizio P. d'Entrèves and Seyla Benhabib, MIT Press, 1997, pp. 38-64.
- Elliott, Anthony, editor. *The Contemporary Bauman*. Routledge, 2013.
- Foner, Eric. *The Story of American Freedom*. W. W. Norton & Company, 1998.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Cornell University Press, 2008.
- Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Giddens, Anthony, and Christopher Pierson. *Conversations with Anthony Giddens: Making Sense of Modernity*. Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Greenfeld, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Jefferess, David. *Postcolonial Resistance: Culture, Liberation and Transformation*. University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- Jensen, Lotte. *The roots of nationalism: national identity formation in early modern Europe, 1600-1815*. Amsterdam University Press, 2016.
- Jussila, J. Power and politeness in historical novels set during the American Civil War. (2015) (Master Thesis at University of Jyväskylä, Finland)
- Kalaidjian, Walter. *The Cambridge Companion to American Modernism*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Kay, Marvin L. "An Analysis of a British Colony in Late Eighteenth Century America in the Light of Current American Historiographical Controversy." *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2008, pp. 170-184.

- Leudtke, Luther S. "What Is American about American Literature: The Case of The Great Gatsby." *Understanding the USA: A Cross-cultural Perspective*, edited by Peter Funke, Gunter Narr Verlag, 1989, pp. 177-190.
- Mackenthun, Gesa. "America's Troubled Postcoloniality: Some Reflections from Abroad." *Discourse*, vol. 22, no. 3, 2000, pp. 34-45, [muse.jhu.edu/article/9649](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/9649). Accessed 2 Nov. 2021.
- McLeod, John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. 2nd ed., Manchester University Press, 2020.
- McLoughlin, Kate, editor. *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Middlekauff, R. *The glorious cause: The American Revolution, 1763-1789*. Oxford University Press, 1982
- O'Brien, Martin, et al. *Theorising Modernity: Reflexivity, Environment & Identity in Giddens' Social Theory*. Routledge, 2014.
- Paine, Thomas. *Complete Works of Thomas Paine: Containing All His Political and Theological Writings; Preceded by a Life of Paine*. Edited by Philip S. Foner, Citadel Press, 1969.
- Rachum, Ilan. "From "American Independence" to the "American Revolution." *Journal of American Studies*, vol. 27, no. 1, 1993, pp. 73-81, [www.jstor.org/stable/40464078](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40464078).
- Robbie, Shilliam. "Modernity and Modernization." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*, 2010, [oxfordre.com/internationalstudies/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.001.0001/acrefore-9780190846626-e-56](https://oxfordre.com/internationalstudies/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.001.0001/acrefore-9780190846626-e-56). Accessed 2 Nov. 2021.
- Rogers, Alan. *Empire and Liberty: American Resistance to British Authority, 1755-1763*. University of California Press, 1974.
- Sabine, Lorenzo. *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution*. Applewood Books, 2009.
- Schueller, Johar M. "Postcolonial American Studies." *American Literary History*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2004, pp. 162-175.
- Tyne, Claude H., and Van Halstead. *The Loyalists in the American Revolution*. Heritage Books, 1989.



- Van Der Veer, Peter. "The Global History of "Modernity"." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, vol. 41, no. 3, 1998, pp. 285-294, [www.jstor.org/stable/3632415](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3632415). Accessed 2 Nov. 2021.
- Wachtel, Andrew. *Alternative Modernities*. Duke University Press, 2001.
- Ward, Harry M. *"Going Down Hill": Legacies of the American Revolutionary War*. Academica Press, LLC, 2009.
- . *The War for Independence and the Transformation of American Society*. Psychology Press, 1999.
- Yokota, Kariann A. *Unbecoming British: How Revolutionary America Became a Postcolonial Nation*. Oxford University Press, 2010.

## APPENDIX

*'something's happened in these parts since I went away the last time.... I felt it ten or fifteen miles south of Worcester, almost as soon as I left Connecticut. Men kept stopping me on the road, asking me who I was and where I was going...' (Roberts 61)*

*'... she seemed distressed, gave me a troubled side glance that seemed to carry a pleading, 'I mustn't talk politics'' (Roberts 62)*

*You're not to tell me! I don't want you to tell me! I won't know how you feel- I won't! If anybody asks me, I want to say I don't know` (Roberts 63)*

*"`They Sally? Who is they? `.... Our people killed...our people fought.... other-other people are being harried into Boston" (Roberts 63)*

*I'd come to your defense, dear Oliver, if any words of mine would help; but they'd only make things worse. If I didn't agree with them, they'd say I was British myself. They'd call me a Tyrant. That's the name, now, for anyone who holds contrary opinions. He's a Tyrant! You wouldn't want me to be a Tyrant, would you, Oliver? (Roberts 63)*

*I wonder, dear Oliver, whether you know all the things that our brave army has learned. I am sure that if you knew the cruel things your associates have been guilty of, you would have a change of heart' (Roberts 63)*

*'There are times when I think I hate everyone who's against our Cause; and then I remember you're against us; I remember you're doing what you think is right; and I know I shall never hate you!' (Roberts 63-64)*

*'... [I] pray that nothing more insurmountable than an ocean will ever come between us. I've prayed for you since you took your father.... it's been every night since then, Oliver, and it'll be every night as long as I live' (Roberts 64)*

*not one of them looked at me or said a word.... I was puzzled....by this strange conclave of Leightons, this uncivilized supper hour, this frosty reception for neighbors with whom I'd been on close terms all my life' (Roberts 64)*

*'...it seemed to me that hatred had breathed upon me there.... of course, I'd had difference of opinion with one or another of Sally's brothers at times, but never once an argument or dispute that ended in ill feeling...' (Roberts 64)*

*'If Soame had, in days gone by, been nothing more than a neighbor, my heart would have leaped at sight of him; but he was vastly more than that.....I shouted his name as though he were still my dearest friend and not a sympathizer, at least, with the mob that had driven my father and me from Milton'* (Roberts 64)

*'Why didn't you tell me you were here? Are you hurt? Are you all right? '* (Roberts 65)

*'...the leading citizens of Massachusetts unhesitatingly took the word of a few vicious servant, and hanged hundreds of innocents of men and women for witchcraft'* (Roberts 65)

*'I ain't obliged to pay a debt to a Tory, and there ain't any legal way he can make me'* (Roberts 66)

*'Your book libels some of the most respectable characters in the British Army and Navy.... Your book is too favorable to the Americans to have a sale in England'* (Roberts 66)

*'.....We're all of us against what English's doing here.....that she ought to be taught by constitutional mean; but there's some who say she can't be taught without a fight'* (Roberts 68)

*'... were guilty, probably, of nothing but speaking their mind, and were therefore undergoing banishment from their home'* (Roberts 68)

*'... That's Washington ...I met him at dinner a year ago, when he was on his way to Cambridge to take command of the rebels. He made a speech- said the greatest calamity that could come to this country would be for it to be independent of England. Now he wants to be independent of England and to kill every Loyalist!'* (Roberts 72)

*'If ever saw a pitiable spectacle, it was Washington he drew out his sword and used it as he might have used a goad on stampeding cows.... His mouth was wide open from the violence of his shouting; his face deathly pale and glistening with the sweat.... he looks sick and shattered. His sword hung slack beside him; the bridle was loose in his finger.....he sat staring at them and never moved'* (Roberts 72)

*'... Only a few years ago our country was the happiest and most contented on the face of the globe. Now it has no government, no credit; no law-abiding man can speak his mind without being in danger of losing his life'* (Roberts 73)

*'...seeing something ferocious and dangerous, something crazier than any wild beast... their yelling mouths contorted to senseless shapes. These creatures all in violent action and gesture, were unkempt; pale and dirty they had come out of cellars and out of gutters.... they were pink and ragged grotesques, wholly unrestrained and apparently incapable of ever becoming human again' (Roberts 73)*

*'.... wrenched the mare's head until she fell to the ground beside the colt. Others caught her legs. One of those who had thrown her down whipped a knife from his pocket. Another pried open her Jaws; and the man with the knife seized her tongue and cut it off. From the tongueless mouth came that dreadful and unbearable sound. The man with the knife capered triumphantly, threw the bleeding tongue on the ground, and went for the colt' (Roberts 74)*

*'...you've given aid and comfort to enemies of this country... You've got to leave this town- you and your father, too' (Roberts 75)*

*'... leave this town? We can't do that. Why it's our home! This land is ours! My father built this house more than thirty years ago. We've no other place to go!' (Roberts 73)*

*'For seven years I've seen things go wrong in this war. For seven years British army haven't followed up their victories, British ministers have refused to believe what they were told, British fleets have delayed too long, the wrong men have been Pitt in high positions, Loyalists have been treated cavalierly by the very men who should be most grateful to them' (Roberts 77)*

*'Had erected barricades to keep the troops from coming out of Boston...an assemblage of people who, in appearance and behavior were such a crowd as might gather upon the outskirts of a burning town' (Roberts 78)*

*'...my outer body was a rigid shell, and that my whole inner self had passed into a cold and dark chamber, around which my thoughts stumbled rapidly and without emotion... I didn't want anything except an opportunity to make somebody pay for the injustices, the inhumanities that my father had suffered' (Roberts 78)*

*'The day must surely come, we still thought, when the mobs must be dispersed; when the courts would be opened and judges be allowed to sit; when every man's property would be as secure as it was before Sam Adam' (Roberts 79)*

*'Those meadowed hills, all treeless grazing ground, showed no sign of human or animal life upon them.... those same hills had become the thunderous fountainhead of rebellion, hatred, destruction' (Roberts 79)*

*'Boston could never again be for me the friendly Boston of my boyhood, its streets filled with my father's friends, kindly and helpful. This Boston was hard and hating. It had hated my father for his loyalty. If he were alive, it would still hate him, as it still hated all of us who had dared to be loyal' (Roberts 79)*