

## **Imperialism and Resistance in Amitav Ghosh's *The Glass Palace***

**Ruqia Ali Al-Imad**

*PhD Scholar, Deptt. of English,  
Languages Faculty, Sana'a University, Yemen*

### **Abstract**

*The present paper represents analytical themes of Amitav Ghosh, *The Glass Palace*. It tries to analyze how the novel is related to empire. Amitav Ghosh attempts to investigate the imperialism that are laid bare in the novel under study. Setting from Michel Foucault's central argument of the interaction between power and resistance, it finally advocates the themes of resistance articulated in the current novel. When Amitav Ghosh highlights "we rebelled against an Empire that has shaped everything in our lives; Colored every Thing in the world as we know it. It is a huge, indelible stain which has tainted all of us. We cannot destroy it without destroying ourselves. And that, I suppose, is where I am (518). So Amitav Ghosh exposes the common people who become marginalized in their own country. He raises subalterns' voices against the oppressive forces of their society. His fictions explore his sympathetic attitude towards the subaltern. The problems of alienation; migration and existential crisis in life of the unprivileged class of the society are explored through Ghosh's fictions. The voice of the subalterns and their struggles get a prominent voice in a different way. He thus exposes poverty and homelessness of Indian nation during British empire. Rather, he narrates the societies and human beings and their inter-relationship. To bridge the gap that other writers leaves in terms of her neglecting of woman's role towards the British colonizer. Amitav Ghosh's fiction portrays the woman as the leading spirits, he avoids victimization and degradation of women. However, other writers depict woman and her experience in patriarchal societies with a deep sympathetic way.*

**Keywords:** *Imperialism Ideologies, Homelessness, Migration, Resistance, Subaltern Voices*

Reference to this paper should  
be made as follows:

**Ruqia Ali Al-Imad,**

*Imperialism and Resistance  
in Amitav Ghosh's *The Glass  
Palace,**

Notions 2018,  
Vol. IX, No. 4,  
pp. 20-32,

Article No.4

Online available at :  
[http://anubooks.com/  
?page\\_id=5005](http://anubooks.com/?page_id=5005)

*“I am Indian and my history has been shaped as much by the institutions of this empire as a long tradition of struggle against them”*(20).

Amitav Ghosh is one of the best-known Indian storytellers writing in English language. Amitav Ghosh was born in Kolkata (1956). His works are profoundly concerned with Indian myths; civilization, and history. His writings bring together the social; cultural and political events of the past. He has emerged to interpret the relationship between nation and individual, to enroll the nation in the construction of society, through the art of novel and literary writings, as Malathi and Prema have observed in *“Portrayal of Women in The Selected Novels of Amitav Ghosh”*:

The lists of contemporary Indian-English writers remain incomplete without the name of Amitav Ghosh...Amitav Ghosh has incarnated in himself the greatness and a great writer among world literary writers as well as philosophers and anthropologists. Amitav Ghosh possesses a sharp eye and sense of perceiving the human being and their societies in right earnest(1).

Amitav Ghosh attempts to negotiate the realistic picture of Indian nation through the representation of Indian history. Amitav Ghosh has received many awards, among them Commonwealth prize. Yet, he refuses the prize because he knows Commonwealth is related closely to imperialism.

Amitav Ghosh's *The Glass Palace* (2001) refers to the royal family's palace in Burma. The name of the novel is derived from *The Glass Palace Chronicle*, that are commissioned by King Bagyidaw in 1829. The occasion of writing this novel, when the fall of the last Konbaung dynasty of Mandalay was from 1752 to 1885 in Burma. They thus are defeated at the hands of the British; they are forced into house and they are sent to exile in the west coast of India called Ratnagiri. So Amitav Ghosh's narration exposes that Indian shifts from dominator to the dominated during British Empire through the late 19th and 20th centuries.

The novel, *The Glass Place*, represents the history of three South Asian countries; Myanmar; India and Malaysia. Those places expose British empire<sup>2</sup>. Amitav Ghosh portrays his characters as victims of Empire. King Thebaw died a migrant in Ratnagiri. Even if his family immigrated to find a safe refuge, they do not know when it will be possible for them to go back to their homes. The Royal Family is reduced to the stature of prisoners in Outram House. Their residence is far from the city, very much unlike their Glass Palace in Burma. The Burmese refuse to maintain their duties towards their queen, "Their shikoes became perfunctory; they began to complain about sore knees and refused to stay on all fours while waiting on the Queen"(48). As Amitav Ghosh illustrates that "Father says they [British] want all the teak in Burma. The King won't let them have it so they're going to do away with

him” (TGP 13). The point of emphasis is not so much on colonialism rather it is on the weakness of the king to contain his kingship and country. The king finally leads to his permanent exile. The British Empire will do anything to expand their markets, so they had to remove the King from his position.

In this respect, Amitav Ghosh plays a major role in exposing the subaltern status in their own country, Srivastava portrays:

In his major novels Amitav Ghosh's sympathetic attitude towards the subaltern can be perceived. The problems of alienation, migration and existential crisis in life of unprivileged class of the society are explored through his fiction. The voice of the subalterns, their struggle and sacrifices which went unnoticed in the annals of the history began to get a prominent voice in the fiction of Amitav Ghosh in a different way (189).

*The Glass Palace* can be regarded as a significant figure of subaltern<sup>3</sup>. The protagonist character, Rajkumar, loses his son, Neel in the face of a war between the British and the Japanese in World War in 1942 interferes. Rajkumar is born Bengali, he is peasant. He has endured the hardships of the teak trade, he works together on an epic scale as elephants transport with large volumes of wood. Moreover, Amitav Ghosh portrays Rajkumar's bitter life:

Rajkumar's sharp excited voice cut through the buzz of speculation. "English cannon," he said in his fluent but heavily accented Burmese. "They're shooting somewhere up the river. Heading in this direction." Frowns appeared on some customers' faces as they noted that it was the serving boy who had spoken and that he was a *kala* from across the sea—an Indian, with teeth as white as his eyes and skin the color of polished hardwood. He was standing in the centre of the stall, holding a pile of chipped ceramic bowls. He was grinning a little sheepishly, as though embarrassed to parade his precocious knowingness (1).

This depiction asserts the subaltern's voice and illustrates that Rajkumar hoped to step out the boundaries. Rajkumar played a major role in exposing bitter experiences of subaltern, subaltern became a variable concept within the imperialism, such as; Rajkumar, Dolly and Ma Cho. Rajkumar is born in India and brings up in Burma. However, Dolly is born in Burma and brings up in India. Rajkumar exposes British's totalitarian regimes at the end of the novel, when Jaya goes to Myanmar to search for Dinu, who has opened a photo studio there. The officer tells her that she does not know how to write Burmese. He complains that he has spent a lot of time correcting the manuscript, it is full of red pencil marks. After pronouncing that it is not his job to teach people how to write, he tells Daw to take her paper and

leave. Amitav Ghosh wants to explore poverty; dispossession, and sorrow that are the result of the nation immigration during British empire. Amitav Ghosh exposes his sympathetic attitude towards the subaltern, he reveals the voice of the subalterns, their struggles. He depicts the problems of alienation and immigration. Thus, he begins to get a prominent voice of subaltern in a different way. They raise their voices against the oppressive forces of their society. In an interview with Ghosh, he responds:

I think this interest arose because of some kind of in born distrust of anything that appears to 'given' or taken-for-granted. This is why I distrust also the lines that people draw between fiction and non-fiction. I think these lines are drawn in order to manipulate our ways of thought: that is why they must be disregarded (Hawley 9).

Besides, both Dolly and Rajkumar suffers most of their lives in displaced locations. They ironically have a loyalty to the nation of their exile or displacement<sup>4</sup> which they have appropriated as home. Ghosh explores Indian displacement during British Empire<sup>5</sup> and how they are forced to immigrate to another land. As Rajkumar has confessed to Dolly:

My father was from Chittagong and he ended up in Arakan; I ended up in Rangoon; you went from Mandalay to Ratnagiri and now you're here too. There are people who have the luck to end their lives where they began them. But this is not something that is owed to us (269).

Although, Rajkumar wears European clothes, his face is against them. Rather, immigrants attempt to overcome life's bitterness with strengths of their own. In other word, Amitav Ghosh explores diasporic identity crisis of what he and other nation encountered during imperialism, as Amitav Ghosh portrays Rajkumar:

No matter how costly Rajkumar's clothes or how well fitting, it was a certainty that he would never be mistaken for a man who'd been born to wealth of office. There was a roughness to his face that was surety against that" (113).

Amitav Ghosh portrays other characters who suffer in their life, such as the conversation between Arjun and Rajan, when Arjun asked Rajan, "What was it to be a slave?", Rajan replied, "No-for even animals had the autonomy of their instincts. It was being made into a machine: having your mind taken away and replaced by a clockwork mechanism. Anything was better than that"(450). In this quote, Ghosh illustrates that Arjun lived in middle class. Amitav Ghosh reveals the forgotten history during the imperialism, such as; subaltern experience. When Arjun engaged Rajan in conversation about his motives, his idea of India, and the experience of plantation, this relationship is reflected through Rajan's words as Arjun spoke to him about India in the jungles of Malaya:

And India...What was India to them? This land whose freedom they were fighting for, this land they'd never seen but for which they were willing to die? Did they know of the poverty, of the hunger their parents and grandparents had left behind?...India was the shining mountain beyond the horizon, a sacrament of redemption—a metaphor for freedom in the same way that slavery was a metaphor for the plantation (450).

On the other hand, Amitav Ghosh exposes British empire that expands British markets, enslave Indian nation as well. As Sankaran mentions in *History, Narrative, and Testimony in Amitav Ghosh's Fiction*, when Amitav Ghosh asks during interview, "Why this furious movement –people taken from one place to another, to pull rick shaws, to sit blind in exile?(1). Rather, *The Glass Palace* reveals British empire towards subaltern Indian. Other characters represent subaltern, such as; Dolly, Mo Chao, Arjun and Kishan Singh. Uma felt exiled with the royal family. She grew up in India from her childhood. She felt more at home in India, so she says, "If I went to Burma now I would be a foreigner – they would call me *kalaalike* they do Indians"(96). For Dolly, her life in Outram House was the only life she knew and surprisingly she was the most assertive, in her place of exile. She asked Uma, "Where would I go?" Dolly smiled at her. "This is the only place I know. This is home"(102). Both Dolly and Uma are victims of the imperialism. Therefore, Amitav Ghosh's *The Glass Palace* portrays the royal family suffering; displacement, exile, alienation and identity crisis. Amitav Ghosh hope a better life of Indian nation in the future, as Sharma illustrates:

In Amitav Ghosh's fiction the historical facts in terms of time and space forms an integral part of a work of art transcending the creative expression to achieve wider dimensions of universality induced with both social and political consciousness...Amitav Ghosh evokes postcolonial situation, social milieus, cultural dislocations and anxieties to look for better perspectives. He combines his professional skills as social historian with a literary flair to create works of art which are profoundly concerned with civilization and history...Ghosh mediates upon a core set of issues from a new perspective; the legacy of colonial knowledge; colonized societies, people, ideas: the formation and re-formation of identities in colonial and postcolonial societies; skepticism and socio-economic struggle for survival; and an engagement with cultural multiplicity through economic migrants, travelers, students, prisoners, researchers, settlers, peasants and indentured laborers. Wealth, Power and Privilege establish new strife among the people, societies and nations (596- 597).

The novel, *The Glass Palace*, portrays another victim of the imperialism, the character Arjun. Arjun is Indian officer in the British army in order to form INA (Indian Nation Army). Arjun becomes in the hands of British military discourse and he feels proud of being in the British army. Arjun was fighting against his own country and was simply facilitating the British policy to expand in his own country. Arjun called his group:

First True Indians...Punjabs, Marathas, Bengalis, Sikhs, Hindus, Muslims. Where else in India would you come across a group such as ours – where region and religion don't matter – where we can all drink together and eat beef and pork and think nothing of it? ... Look at us!' Arjun would say, after a whisky or two 'we're the first modern Indians; the first Indians to be truly free. We eat what we like, we drink what we like, we're the first Indians who're not weighed down by the past (125-126).

Later, Arjun realizes and expresses scepticism of his own country, when he says, "Where is this country? The fact is that you and I don't have a country, so where is this place whose safety, honour and welfare are to come first, always and every time?"(287). In fact, he realizes his condition as a puppet of this colonial discourse and then he decides to create some distance from it, he is left with nothing. Further, he cannot speak, there is no language that would help him build a new self with other, he feels that he must die in order to destroy the empire. As Amitav Ghosh portrays:

Arjun finds himself at a loss... But if it were true that his life had somehow been moulded by acts of power of which he was unaware—then it would follow that he had never acted of his own volition; never had a moment of true self-consciousness. Everything he had ever assumed about himself was a lie, an illusion. And if this were so, how was he to find himself now? (372).

Arjun was fighting neither to defend nor to extend the territory of India. He has been a mere tool in the British army. Amitav Ghosh adds:

Arjun did become a pivotal character for me. He is so much like people, I went to school and college with, in some sense, I could both sympathize with him and be appalled by him. His character because a very interesting figure for me. And, of course, Arjun reflects the experiences of so many Indians, who served in the British Army. (63).

In this respect, *The Glass Palace* represents another theme of British ideology that is mimicry, when Indian nation have the desire to be very similar to the British colonizer but not quite. *The Glass Palace*, Indian officers live with westerners, they do the same work and they ate the same food, when Arjun accepted

that “When we joined up we didn’t have India on our minds: we wanted to be sahibs and that’s what we have become”(379). Another character represents the mimicry of the colonizer’s language was Saya John. He is orphan and he is Chinese Christian, as Ghosh states that “Catholic priests, in a town called Malacca. These men were from everywhere—Portugal, Macao,Goa”( 9), he was Rajkumar’s friend, he said to Rajkumar, “But, Rajkumar, you can’t even read English; how do you think you’re going to make this bid? Rajkumar grinned, It’s true that I can’t read English, Saya, but I’ve learnt to speak it. And why do I need when you can do it for me?Saya?”(67). Moreover, Saya suggests to Rajkumar to learn European’s way, as he said to Rajkumar, “This is UBa Kyaw, He was a valet to an English planter in Maymo. He can teach you many things, like how to eat a European table with a knife and fork”(112). John becomes assimilated and believes that the British mimicry has got a better life in future, when he said, “Just to bring you luck”(113). Thus, John is a clear picture of language’s mimicry, as Ghosh said about him “Would always change into European clothes, a white shirt, duck trousers”(62), so he attempts to hide his own identity whenever he would go on business with Englishmen.

On the other hand, Amitav Ghosh portrays characters’ identity fragmentation during British empire, such John’s son, Mathew. Mathew grew up in Singapore and he went to America for studies, where Mathew adopts American culture, as John narrates his conversation with the soldiers at the military hospital:

The soldiers there were mainly Indians and they asked me this question: how is that you, who look like Chinese and carry a Christian name, can speak our language? When I told them how this had come about, they would laugh and say, you are a *dhobi ka kutta* – a washerman’s dog – *na ghar ka na hat ka* – you don’t belong anywhere, either by the water or on land, and I’d say, yes, that is what exactly I am (9).

Thus, Mathew ends up as a secret and an ambiguous photographer that shows the Myanmar dictatorship.

In addition,*The Glass Palace*, represents another face of British empire. When Amitav Ghosh portrays two types of diasporas; new diaspora<sup>6</sup> and old diaspora<sup>7</sup>,as Bhautoo-Dewnarain has mentioned:

The complex ontology of migration rooted in the distance between the new Indian diaspora of the twentieth century and the old plantation labour diaspora of indentured workers informs the novel’s essential tenor. What drops out of her discussion is that the new diasporic formation is stratified in its nature, propelled as it is by new economic opportunities and shifts in the economic changes of late capitalism. Theorizing the paradigms of the South Asian diaspora (qtd. in Sankaran 44).

Thus, Amitav Ghosh challenges the division between Old and New diaspora in his characters. Rather, Amitav Ghosh portrays the connection of two diasporas, they live and interact as one family, he criticizes the discrimination of Empire regime rule, such as Uma's relationship with Dolly. In other words, the division of Indian nation into two parts has a strong affect in British expansion as well as explores the ideology of colonizer. Amitav Ghosh asserts that classes discrimination is neglected in Indian nation so they share a deep understanding and respect each other, such as the relationship between Dolly and Uma. They were acknowledged of their respective status. Dolly was quiet for a moment and Uma began to worry that she had offended her. Then Dolly spoke up, "You know Uma", she said in her softest voice, "Every time I come to your house, I notice that picture you have hanging by your front door..." "Of Queen Victoria, you mean" "Yes" Uma was puzzled, "What about it?" "Don't you sometimes wonder how many people have been killed in Queen Victoria's name? It must be millions wouldn't you say? I think I'd be frightened to live with one of those pictures. A few days later Uma put the picture down and sent it to the Cutchery, to be hung in the Collector's office" (97).

Another expansion of the Imperialism in India is Japanese invasion. The havoc is caused because of Japanese invasion in Burma and its effect on Indian nation with tragedy; wars, deaths and dislocation, such as Uma's husband, Beni Prasad Dey is an Indian-Bengali and he works with the British Government, he is a dedicated huge supporter. He told King Thibaw about the Japanese victory over Russia:

Japan's victory has resulted in widespread rejoicing among nationalists in India and no doubt in Burma too...The Empire is today stronger than it has ever been. You have only to glance at a map of the world to see the truth of this... Britain's Empire is already more than a century old, and you may be certain(91).

In this quote, Ghosh's texts show intellectual responses to the imperialists' discourses, that lead to slavery.

Therefore, *The Glass Palace* has a major role in resisting the imperialism. Rather, Amitav Ghosh believes that the female characters should be a part of a cosmopolitan society, and he portrays that women attempt to look for different phases of liberation, as Malathi and Prema add:

Amitav Ghosh portrays his women sensitively and in fact, they are the leading spirits in his fiction. They are distinct portrayals of a cultural construction. He never presents his women as overt radical feminists nor as the stereotypical images of Sita and Savithiri. They are the characters of real life and in his novels he portrays the women characters in a realistic manner (1).

In fact, his narration avoids humiliation of women. Further, he has explored strong female characters that are ambitious, such as Uma Dey replies Dolly, when they heard about Queen Supayalat, “Don’t you sometimes wonder how many people have been killed in Queen Victoria’s name? It must be millions; wouldn’t you say? I think I’d be frightened to live with one of those pictures(97). After Uma’s husband has died, she visits Europe and America. In London and New York, she joins the movement against colonial rule in India and she becomes a leader of the movement to free India. Later, she becomes revolutionary against the British Empire. AmitavGhosh’sconcern is to place woman within national space rather than man’s sexual desires.Uma’s family is from the Bengali Badhrolok and her father is an architect, he is from high class. Uma’s family depicts the middle class and the elite educated Indian. *The Glass Palace* presents Uma as a clear depiction of nationalism, she struggles against Indian officers and soldiers serving in the British army, along with other Indians living in America, as AmitavGhosh portrays:

Among Uma’s contemporaries, in New York there were many who took their direction from a newsletter published from the University of California, in Berkeley, by Indian students. This publication was called Ghadar, after the Hindustani word for the uprising of 1857...and the people who served the British Empire as soldiers now have “become dedicated enemies of the Empire (192).

Another quotation asserts Uma’s resistance, when she said to Rajkumar:

Did you ever think of the consequences when you were transporting people here? What you and your people have done is far worse than the worst deeds of the Europeans...lay bare native collusion with imperial commodification of peasant subjects. Yet we have in turn Rajkumar’s Marxist response to her comment, of asking her in turn if she had ever “Given a single person a job? Improved anyone’s life in any way? (214).

Even though, Uma likes the modernity and fashionable things, when she stayed in Europe and America.Uma thus her journey to Europe and America after her husband’s death leads her to the Indian Nationalist movement. *The Glass Palace*portraysthe characters’ voices towards the British empire throughout their textual resistance.

Besides, Amitav Ghosh illustrates another nationalist against British empire, Queen Supayalat, as Amitav Ghosh portrays:

Visitors were expected to walk in and seat themselves on low chairs around Her Highness, with no wordsway of preserving the spirit of Mandalay<sup>8</sup> protocol: since the representatives of the British were adamant in their refusal to perform the shiko, she in turn made a point of not acknowledging their entry in her presence (91).

Queen Supayalat went to secure her husband's throne, King Thebaw. Thebaw considers one of the historical importance in Burma. Supayalat took eighty-nine potential heir to the throne of Burma. Thus, Supayalat asserts that the Anglo-Burmese war is considered the main reason that led to the fall of the Burmese empire. Again, she wants to give up the British demands, "The Queen had prevailed and the Burmese court had, fused to yield to the British ultimatum" (19). Even in her exile she still keeps her Indian tradition, she seems to embody a story within herself:

Once or twice a year the Queen would ride out with her daughters, her face a white mask, stem and unmoving, her lips stained a deep, deathly mauve by her cheroots... but she never seemed to notice anyone or anything, sitting as straight as a rod, her face stern and unmoving (67).

Another quotation represents Supayalat who fights in a Nationalist battle against the British's colonizer, as Amitav Ghosh mentions:

During the day Ma Cho was a harried and frantic termagant ... But by night ... a certain languor entered her movements. She would cup her breasts and air them, fanning herself with her hands: she would run her fingers through the cleft of her chest, past the pout of her belly, down to her legs and thighs. Watching her from below, Rajkumar's hand would snake slowly past the knot of his longyi, down to his groin (7).

In this respect, Amitav Ghosh's resistance stands in the face of other oppressions and negotiates US power that ignores other nations. Meanwhile, marginalization has a major role within imperialism ideology. So Amitav Ghosh exposes their margins that are connected to race; class, gender and religion. He has added to such critiques by developing the nationalist thinkers and activists who put both intellectual and cultural grounds for self-determination and independence. The nationalists' need of constructing the idea of their nationhood are considered a crucial element of anti-imperialism. Rather, his critiques claim the participation of the nations in various dimensions; economic, cultural, political and social construction. So, immigrant writers express some of the greatest hopes in their future life. Unfortunately, they face difficulties and suffer, when they are not allowed to participate in several fields; economy, education, social and national fields. Thus, they prefer to leave their homeland.

Amitav Ghosh represents another face of resistance, when he depicts the mixture of their languages; India and Burma, when Saya John addresses Rajkumar in 'broken Hindustani', the boy asks him 'in Burmese, "how did you learn to speak an Indian language?" (9), Saya John replies, "They spoke many languages, these priests, and from the Goans I learnt a few Indian words (9). Even though, this dialogue discusses English words but with an Indian tone or accent, as Biswas expresses:

In *The Glass Palace*, Ghosh depicts a scenario from India to Burma and the intrusion of the British into it; and the mixture of their languages. Rajkumar, an Indian boy, settles in Burma and come across the Burmese language and words like 'longyi' and many others. Ghosh shows Indian society as King Thebaw and Queen Supayalat of Burma along with the whole family are exiled in Ratnagiri of India. Indian expressions like, ... 'jaldi' 'bhangra' and many others are used. Here, the Indian language has become a part of English: "Kanhoji would issue scoldings from his bench, telling the villagers to clear the way for the Collector's gaari" Here 'gaari' is used with such ease that it seems like part of the English language (48).

Amitav Ghosh asserts that Burmese words are still kept even though they write in English, when Ghosh portrays Ma Cho's European clothes, "A shirt, trousers and a pith hat" (7), and Ma Cho asks in English, Rajkumar understands what he asks, but Rajkumar intends to answer him Indian words, he said that "Kaisahai? Sub kuchhtheek-thaak?" (7). Not only Rajkumar keeps his own accent, he keeps Indian clothes, when Ghosh depicts his mother's death:

Rajkumar had covered his mother with all the saris in her cloth bundle, with longyis borrowed from the boatmen, even a folded sail. But he'd no sooner finished than her teeth began to chatter again, softly, like dice... She showed him a knot on the tail end of her sari... Rajkumar. Live, my prince ;hold on to your life (11).

Furthermore, Amitav Ghosh portrays some students activities and arguments about the military dictatorial rule, such as Hitler and Mussolini in Dinu's photo studio. This studio is called 'The Glass Palace' in Rangoon. These photographs elaborate Indian's resistance, against the dictators in Burma that are based on the experience of Indian Diaspora in South East Asia. The photographs represent the blurring of lines that are visible not just through colonial displacements but also the binarism between colonized and colonizer that is under scanner. Besides, another photo studio is represented by Jaya who went to Myanmar to search for Dinu, Jaya has opened there. Thus, this photographs depict the existence of totalitarian regimes at the end of the novel, the officer told her that she does not know how to write Burmese. He complains that he spends lot of time correcting the manuscript, which is full of red pencil marks. After that, he asserts that it is not his job to teach people how to write, he told Dinu to take her paper and leave. Dinu used the language of photography and of the image as a representative system to illustrate those spies, who have been sent by British empire, have no access:

Today for example, I was talking about Edward Weston's theory of pre-visualisation... that you must see the truth of your subject in your

mind...after that the camera is incidental, unimportant...If you know the truth of what you see, the rest is mere execution. Nothing can come between you and your imagined desire... no camera, no lens...‘He shrugged, smiling. To that list I could have added: No band of criminals like this regime...But I did not have to tell them that in so many words...They understood what I was saying...they knew...you saw how they laughed and clapped...Here in *the Glass Palace* photography too is a secret language(509-510).

Thus, as he claims that their truth comes from the West dominance, and the people at Dinu’s studio are not forced to withdraw into complete silence, but they are able to remain in the realm of discourse, to clarify different discourses from that regime.

#### References

- 1 Bhautoo-Dewnarain,Nandini.”Reconnecting Two Diasporas.*History, Narrative, and Testimony AmitavGhosh’s Fiction*.Ed. ChitraSankaran. New York: State University of New York Press, **2012**. Print.
- 2 Biber, Douglas et al. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*.British: Pearson Education Ltd, **2001**. Print.
- 3 Biswas, Dipa. *AmitavGhosh and his depiction of Historical Aspects and Global Interaction, and Experimentation with Language*.Mohakhali, Dhaka: BRAC University, The Department of English and Humanities, April 18, **2013**. Print.
- 4 Edward, Said. “Resistance and Opposition: Themes of Resistance Culture.”*Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, Inc., **1994**.Print.
- 5 Ghosh, Amitav. *The Glass Palace*. New York: Random House, **2001**. Print.
- 6 Malathi and Prema. *Portrayal of Women in The Selected Novels of AmitavGhosh*.Thudupathi: Department of English, Erode Sengunthar Engineering College.308\_malathi< article<www.tjells.com Accessed7<sup>th</sup>April, **2014**.
- 7 Sharma, Anita. “Skepticism and Historicism in AmitavGhosh’s Sea of Poppies,” *An International Refereed e-Journal of Literary Explorations*, Vol. 2, Issue IV, Nov.**2014**.Print.
- 8 Srivastava, Pooja. “Amitav Ghosh Perspective on Subalternity& His Novels,” *International Journal of English Language Literature and Humanities*. India: Amity University, Uttar Pradesh, vol. II, Issue IX, Jan. **2015**. Print.

#### Footnotes

1. Commonwealth: It refers to the British commonwealth of Nations, i.e. political community constituted by the former British and consisting of

the united kingdom, its dependencies and certain former colonies that are now Sovereign nations (Ashcroft et al. 44).

- 2 British Empire: ( formerly) the united kingdom and the territories under its control, which reached its greatest extent at the end of World War1 when it embraced over a quarter of the world's population and more than more than a quarter of the world's land surface ( British Dictionary definition).
- 3 Subaltern: First, the term was used by Antonio Gramsci who supports us with the history of subaltern. After that it was adopted to Subaltern Studies by Ranajit Guha that means to subordinate South Asian society and address them in different way; cast , class, gender, race,..etc
- 4 Displacement: The term 'displacement' literally means a change of address. However, it is used to mean non-resident Indian writers who their societies and culture has changed.
- 5 British Empire: ( formerly) the united kingdom and the territories under its control, which reached its greatest extent at the end of World War1 when it embraced over a quarter of the world's population and more than more than a quarter of the world's land surface ( British Dictionary definition).
- 6 New Diaspora: It referes to West that constituted both the United Kingdom and the United States.
- 7 Old Diaspora: It referes to low class of Indian nation, such as; peasants and indentured laborers that have been forced to work during British Empire.
- 8 Mandalaya:"It is a cosmopolitan world in itself. 'Cosmopolitanism' can in this context be defined as "the idea that all human beings, regardless of their political affiliation, do (or at least can) belong to a single community, and that this community should be cultivated"(TGP144).