

# The Siege of Krishnapur: Indian Resistance Against British Imperialism in Sepoy Mutiny 1857

**Khadananda Prasai, Anita Paudel**

Associate Professor, Shaheed Smriti Multiple Campus

Email: knptandi10@gmail.com

Email: anitapaudel2036@gmail.com

## ***Abstract :***

*The Siege of Krishnapur (1973) by J. G. Farrell is a fictional and symbolically real depiction of Indian resistance against British colonialism during the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. The novel is fabricated in colonial historiography that analyses how it reflects the military resistance and the ideological clash between colonizers and the colonized. The 1857 revolt represented by British colonizers as a mere mutiny that is reinterpreted here as a foundational act of Indian nationalism and anti-imperial struggle. This paper has analyzed how Indians demonstrated the resistance against British imperialism in Sepoy mutiny 1857 in relation to their freedom, justice, and rights; how they fought against the atrocity of the colonizers. This study is based on a qualitative, historical research design to explore the resistance of the sepoys portrayed during that time within the broader context of the 1857 Sepoy Mutiny. To accomplish this research, I have used books and journal articles as the secondary data on the locale of the sepoy mutiny 1857 in relation to the portrayal of Indian society and their dominated voices, the contradictory perceptions of Indian civilization and colonizers' barbarism often used to justify colonial dominance. The result of this study is significant in the sense that it has presented the power dynamics of the colonizer and the colonized.*

***Keywords:*** Sepoy mutiny, colonialism, resistance, imperialism, Emancipation, Identity

## **Background of Study**

The Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, also known as the First War of Indian Independence (Peers, 2011) marked a remarkable change in the history of British colonialism in India. In fact, it was the first organized revolution by Indian sepoys and the Indian folks against the British East India Company's atrocities. As the revolution was uprising and spreading widespread, different regions of India experienced it reflecting diverse social, political, and cultural contexts. According to Goodman, S. , the novels of J.G. Farrell (1935–79), reveal a writer preoccupied with the cultural representation of Britain in an era of post-imperial decline (37). In this regard, the literary texts written within that time shows the dominant colonizers who always subjugate and undermine the powerless colonized and how the colonized try to defend the biased ideology of

the colonizers. The novel simply depicts the real historical events such as the Siege of Lucknow and the overall unrest in North India during the rebellion. Krishnapur serves as a symbolic narration of British imperialism and the colonial mindset, offering a critical lens through which to examine the mechanisms of resistance and domination during the uprising.

The novel has presented the descriptive study of the military confrontation between Indian protesters and British powers and the description of the ideological, racial, and cultural discrimination of imperialism. It highlights the deep- tensions between colonizers and the colonized, the brutal realities of colonial governance, and the determined resistance of Indian society against foreign rule. According to Fakia Chehboub and Ramdan Mehiri it perfectly shows how colonization is justified and motivated by the desire to civilize the colonized, which is achieved by portraying them as inferior, barbarian, frail, and feminine (174). According to them, the colonial discourses are rich field of study that the British imperialism in India tried to justify its action with benevolent purpose. British rulers took the mission in India as White man's burden and they reasoned that they were physically present there not to grab anything from India, rather they were in the missionary purpose of educating, civilizing the savage, barbarous Indians. Entire purpose of ruling over India was to justify its philanthropic purpose. England wanted to represent her as a benevolent empire around the globe. British Empire, doing excellent things for the entire world, could not rule without justifying its mission; could not prove its legitimacy in the eyes of the people of the colonized country like India.

### **Objectives of the Study**

This study has studied how Indian resistance against British imperialism is represented in J. G. Farrell's *The Siege of Krishnapur*. It has narrated the ideological conflicts between the British imperialism and the colonized Indians, the depiction of colonial power structures, and the ways in which the novel challenges traditional colonial historiography through historical realism.

### **Research Methodology**

As a postcolonial literary criticism, it is based on a qualitative historical research design. The historical novel which is contextualized on the framework of 1857 Sepoy Mutiny, and it is analyzed through close textual interpretation to study the representations of colonial ideology, resistance, and power relations. The analysis is based on using secondary historical and critical sources of postcolonial criticism which provides the interpretative meanings for examining colonial discourse, cultural domination, and resistance portrayed in the novel.

### **Textual History as Postcolonial Discourse**

Postcolonialism as a popular critical discourse, was developed in the early 90s with

the literary postcolonial writings of Frantz Fanon's *Wretched of the Earth* (1963), *Black Skin, White Masks* (1967), Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978), Homi Bhabha's *Nation and Narration* (1980), and Helen Tiffin and Bill Ashcroft's *Empire Writes Back* (1989) and they are the significant works that have contributed to the postcolonial writings. Edward W. Said is recognized as the initiator of creating the debate on postcolonial ideas when his revolutionary work "*Orientalism*" was published in 1978. He says that orientalism is as an ideological belief of the Occident (western people) to subjugate the orient (eastern people). In the Occident, the cultural, social, political, economic superiority has the responsibility and moral authority to transform the colonized culture into civilized one. Said (1978) further states "Orientalism isn't just a set of myths; it is an interconnected system of institutions, policies, and ideas (7)". According to him, postcolonialism is a critical framework that critically analyzes the long-term effect of colonialism on colonized cultures, identities, and power structures. Western representations of the East are formulated to justify and maintain imperial dominance. These representations by western discourses have depicted the orient societies as stereotypical, savage, backward, inferior, wild and powerless. The west has justified their qualities of civilized behavior, rational, modern thought through the conscious production of knowledge claiming that it is totally Eurocentric representation of the cultural, political, and social legacies of colonialism. The colonizers were proud of their arrogance and blind faith of narrowmindedness and so-called of the superiority. According to Patel (2022), these colonial enterprises were driven by economic exploitation, political domination, and cultural superiority. Colonizers imposed their languages, cultures, and systems of governance on the colonized, often erasing or marginalizing indigenous traditions and identities.

Similarly, Pramod K. Nayar offers a very comprehensive and appropriate definition of postcolonialism that it is a mode of reading, political analysis, and cultural resistance/ intervention that deals with the history of colonialism and present neocolonial structures (16). It is a mix of rigorous epistemological and theoretical analysis of texts and political praxis of resistance to neocolonial conditions.... Postcolonialism seeks to understand how oppression, resistance, and adaptation occurred during colonial rule. It is a disciplinary project devoted to the academic task of revisiting, remembering, and crucially, interrogating the colonial past. (17). In this regard, postcolonial discourses like Farrell's novel have included the deconstructing of these narratives and exposing how their cultural subjugation, power dynamics, and legacies have been destroyed by the marginalized people's resistance. Therefore, postcolonial criticism has criticized contemporary colonial perspectives with powerful substantial change in postcolonial nations like in India.

### **Traditional Colonial Historiography**

Farrell's *The Siege of Krishnapur* (1973) is an influential text that narrates the 1857

Indian Sepoy Mutiny through a postcolonial perspective which is different from the leading colonial narratives. Although the novel is penned by the British author, it explicitly analyses the colonial ideologies and moral contradictions of the British Empire from post-colonial perspectives. The novelist has not glorified imperial subjugation, supremacy, legacy rather he has used ironical discourses and historical background to question colonial subjugation, narrow mindedness and the supposed civilizing mission of the colonized. In this regard, Bart Moore- Gilbert (1997) elaborates that it is a distinct set of reading practices...preoccupied principally with analysis of cultural forms which mediate, challenge or reflect upon...relations of domination and subordination. Here, Gilbert basically opines the colonial discourses examine how their legacies shape identities of both colonized and the colonizers, their antagonistic power dynamics, and civilized and savage cultural representations, often emphasizing the voices and perspectives of the marginalized or silenced. In this context, his novel has been analyzed in response to depicting the effects of colonial domination.

As postcolonial discourse, the novel has deconstructed the popular the myth of the western empire and has criticized the imperial history through orient's perspective. Set during the 1857 Indian Rebellion, the novel revisits a moment of imperial subjugation of the Indian Sepoys and it has not glorified the British rule, rather it has critically analysed the ideological and moral assumptions underpinning colonial rule. Through irony, satire, and historical intertextuality, Farrell has constructed narratives that have challenged traditional colonial historiography.

At the beginning of the novel, the collector believes himself that he has the duty of civilizing

the mission of empire. He claims that the British ideology is socially, culturally, morally and scientifically superior. His colonial ideology is reflected in the novel in this way. He further says, "What we are defending is not just a few square miles of territory but a great idea: the idea of progress and Enlightenment (4)." This extract is central to the colonial discourses which clearly displays the domination of the British empire. The British rulers claimed that they were in India for bringing the light to the backward Indian civilizations. The novelist here challenges this claim throughout the novel, displaying the emptiness the hollow discourses of colonial ideals.

The novel also criticizes on how colonial rule depended on inflexible racial and cultural

discrimination. The British characters mentioned in the novel are presented themselves as civilized, rational, and superior and the Indians are labelled as irrational, savage, and dangerous derogatorily. The Magistrate, as a colonial representative, recounts his criticism to the savage Indians in this way, "They are treacherous by nature. You can

never trust a native (27).” This discriminatory, racial accusation to the Indians by the British has established the world view of the colonial discourse and the supremacy of the British empire. Farrell’s inclusion of such deliberate biased attitude is to criticise the colonial attitude to the colonizers, and it clearly illustrates that how such rigid discourse are foundation of the empire. One of the fundamental characteristics of postcolonial literature is the marginalization (Ashcroft, Bill and et,al. (2007) that has been narrated in literary text in dominated way. The colonized people are politically, socially, culturally, economically marginalized and they have to struggle hard for their survival. They are deprived of getting justice, equality and freedom and they are exploited in the name of civilizing them by the colonizers. In this regard, the colonizer named Mr. Collector said, “It is civilization that separates us from them (45).” The very word *them* here is used to denote the power of the British empire with the intention of othering the Indians. Top of FormBottom of Form

The emergent images of the collector named Mr.Hopkins, Doctor Dunstaple, civil surgeon at Krishnapur (2), his son Harry Dunstaple, vulnerable age (6) as the colonizers were civilized, educated, rational whereas the colonized as the common Indian sepoys who are not given assigned character names, were uncouth, uncivilized, inarticulate and irrational. Talking about the colonized people's identity as named by the colonizers, Anirudra Thapa in his article "Cast in the Print: The Indian Mutiny, Asiatic Racial Forms and American Domesticity" writes, " The popular perception of the orient was passive, stagnant, and a historical gave away to a new image of the Orientals as being lawless, murderous, and vengeful (9).

Thapa's observation also illustrates that British rule whose policies had undermined rights, status and position of Indians symbolizes this exploitation and the Indians are categorized into different names discourses. The division caused so much unrest among the peasants and that they started expressing their resistances against the British. So, the protest and resistance were mainly offered to displace ruling classes. People experienced a painful crisis in every aspect of life at the hands of the imperialists, primarily due to their power as well as their arrogance. This led to widespread discontent among the Indians. The adverse impact of the British rule on the political, economic and social spheres resulted in sharp reaction of the Indian people against them. This brought a series of anti-British movements throughout the country.

As a researcher of sepoy mutiny of 1857, Gautam Chakravarty (2005) observes the Indian resistance against British imperialism in subtle way that resistance was needed for rescue and vengeance (41). It came as outburst of anger and discontent that shook the foundations of colonial rule in large parts of India. The revolt really championed the rational threat to the British rule. Regarding the Indian resistance of 1857, he further clarifies:

The speed at which the revolt spread, as one after the other regiments rose,

murdered their officers, plundered the district revenue treasuries and massacred the local British community, was usually accompanied by varying degrees of civil rebellion, arson and unrest, and often by the installation of a rough and ready local government under a dispossessed regional ruler, landlord or military commander who in turn tendered allegiance to the Mughal emperor at Delhi. Where, as at Kanpur and Lucknow, the British dug in their heels either because they believed rescue would be swift, or because of the impossibility of evacuation – there began a war of attrition, while the rebel militias devised a more comprehensive revolt, or made largely ineffectual attacks on besieged garrisons (41-42).

Though colonial writers concern their writings on the superiority of European culture and the rightness of the empire, Farrell sounds to be critical and questions towards British rule in India. His distinctive writing in this novel consolidates resistance of the Indians against the imperial power, settlement of territory, and exploitation of resources. Therefore, he distances himself from other writers regarding mutiny writing of 1857. In his novel *The Siege of Krishnapur* he elaborates:

Krishnapur itself had once been the center of civil administration for a large district. At that time European bungalows had been built there on a lavish scale, even small palaces standing in grounds of several acres to house the Company representatives of the day who lived in magnificent style and sometimes even, in imitation of the native princes, kept tigers and mistresses and heaven knows what else. (1)

Farrell portrays the town in a different way that it was the center of attraction, and it was modified and decorated in the British design for residence as well as the shelter for animals. The Indians were not happy of the westernization of India. The British imperialism had been conquering India bit by bit; popular discontent and hatred against foreign rule was gaining strength among the Indians. Revolt 1857 or Sepoy Mutiny as the British imperialism called it, was the discontent that burst forth into a mighty popular revolt. The ensuing violence widened into a massive civil rebellion. This further generated the gulf between the colonized and the colonizers. This was regarded as the "watershed event" (Thapa, P., 8) in history of British India. V.A. Stuart in his book *The Sepoy Mutiny* mentions:

The first tangible warning came early in 1857, with the incident of the greased cartridges... The composition of the greased patch and the instruction to bite through it might offend against the religious scruples of high caste Hindu sepoys, of whom there were a great many in the Bengal army. They retaliated with the claim that the new Enfield cartridges were smeared with the fat of the cow (sacred to Hindus) and of the pig (considered unclean by Muslims). Biting it,

the lascar jeered, would destroy the caste of the Hindu and the ceremonial purity of the Muslim. The story spread like wildfire throughout the native regiments. (235).

The above quoted passage basically highlights the process of decline of the British Empire in India by giving reference to the wrong policies of the English authority towards their religious practice. Stuart here points out that the use of cartridges to destroy their religious beliefs was against religious principle of the meek Indians. The cartridges became the means of destruction since the English used them as weapons. This resistance against the British rule came as the culmination of popular discontent with British policies and imperialist exploitation. They in fact wanted to force the Indians to change their religion and converted them into Christianity. As the British Empire believed in the stereotypical images of threat and despotism, they were surprised by the solidarity, rivalry displayed by the Indians. In this regard, the critic of post-colonial studies Elleke Boehmer describes:

Alongside rivalry from without, there were threats to power also from within the Empire, most notably with the outbreak of the Indian Mutiny or war of Rebellion of 1857. From this time British imperial policy began to concentrate on firm rule and showed greater caution in reform. It was more openly acknowledged that the strength and security of the empire had to rest on force, that authoritative control and 'responsibility' alone would guarantee its permanence. (34)

As the Indians were trying to be conscious regarding their status, they were inclined towards the process of rebellion. The rulers were good at technology, and they came there not for consent but for conquest. The subjugation of the people with the immense exercise of power was used by the British rulers for the excessive utilization of resources. In fact, it was politically, materially motivated. These colonial powers were interested in increasing their own political power and in exploiting the colonies' resources. Most of the native people of colonial territory were oppressed and enslaved by the occupying power. Sometimes they were even deported from fertile land or murdered to make room for new settlements. At the same time, they were forced to give up their cultural heritage and to assimilate into the colonizers' culture. This strategy was also known as cultural colonization that was supposed to manipulate the colonized peoples' minds. These cultural stereotypes of colonial discourse can still be found in science and historical writing. Raja Rao in his famous novel *Kanthapura* adds, "... Hindus to eat cow's flesh and the Mohomedan to eat pig's flesh, and the army rose and fought against the Red-man – that is why they call it the Soldier's revolt in their language- and the king and that king said," Now this is the time to strike the English," and they gathered together, and the worthiest of them was Rani Lakshmi Bai of Jhansi" (109). Rao also mentions immense complications and violence after the arrival colonizers in India. He advocates why resistance was inevitable for

India from the British rulers in his novel. This rebellion was a major anti-colonial movement against the aggressive imperialist policies of the British. In fact, it was an economic, political and social struggle against the British rule. This outburst of anger and discontent shook the foundations of colonial rule in large parts of India led by Laxmi Bai, Mangal Pandey (Stuart, 237). The imperialists ignored the assumption that religion was an important factor in the configuration of national identity and unity.

### **Postcolonial Power Relationships, Identity, Resistance and Emancipation**

The novel focuses on the luxurious lifestyle of the British colonizers and portrays the English making conscious effort to be unlike Indians in their everyday life. The Collector, like the others, finds it hard to believe that one was in India at all (p. 17). But as the siege begins and progresses, they are pushed into situations in which they become like the most desperate and helpless people. The Collector, with his faith in the 'superior culture' of his own country, fails to establish any meaningful ties with Indians. Harry Dunstaple's knowledge of the Indian language is 'limited to a few simple commands, domestic and military' (43), the Magistrate is too 'irrational for Indians and cannot see things from Indians' point of view' (98). The English ladies like Louise, Miriam Lang, the collector's wife have only a hearty contempt for the natives. And most characters in *The Siege of Krishnapur*, including the Maharaja's son, Hari, Ram had been brought up on the express instruction that anything Indian is contemptible and therefore should be shunned like the plague (37). The Englishmen and women lived as though they were in England, throwing lavish parties, going out for picnics and arranging balls in the typical English style. Presenting the stereotypical images of the British people, Farrell throws in sharp focus of the nobility of well-fed colonists. The extravagant dinners and parties of the British are sharply contrasted with 'hundred and fifty millions of people living in cruel poverty in India (78). But, as the siege began, the white community was forced to give up one luxury after another.

As the attack on the residency at Krishnapur was about to begin, the English rulers in the country took shelter in the Residency and its surrounding buildings. Once the rebellious sepoys started their attack, the more capable younger men deferred the orders of incompetent general of the English side. The causes of revolt in the Indians were many, from feelings that soldiers' religious beliefs were being maltreated to racial abuse and discrimination. Government buildings were destroyed, treasuries were plundered, barracks and court houses were burnt and prison gates flung open. Farrell narrates the siege moment in this way:

The men of the relieving force, which was a large one, handsomely equipped with field batteries, were not surprised to find Krishnapur deserted as they advanced in the direction of the iron bridge. As they marched through the empty streets, however, a little old man put himself in front of the marching column and led the way, beating a kettledrum and pronouncing the restoration of the

Company Bahadur. When they reached the sepoy lines, it was obvious that the mutineers had been there not long before; fires were still burning, and private belongings lay scattered about. From the sepoy lines they could see that the Residency had been abandoned, but a tattered Union Jack still flew over the banqueting hall.

(122).

Especially, the above passage depicts the loss and shameful defeat of British rulers in front of the India people and soldiers. For the British, their life was orderly and refined. Then the sepoys at the military cantonment mounted in revolt and the British community treated it with shock. They prepared to fight for their lives with what weapons they had. In fact, the collector had the fear of the resistance of the Indians' revolt against the rule. So, he suggested to "disarm the native regiments"(116).

As the novel goes on, the native revolt spreads. The local treasury is looted by traitorous sepoys. "They wore dhotis instead of uniforms and carried heavy, oddly shaped burdens on their shoulders and around their necks; they had broached a cartload of silver rupees and filled the legs of their breeches with them. Now it seemed that they were staggering away with heavy, trunkless men on their shoulders" (87). As this excerpt illustrates, Farrell describes the rulers' ignorance of the Indians' revolt against them. They had the common belief that Indian people would not dare to break their control since they did lack the culture, value to resist British dominance there. As the situation became worse, the British and their followers had to withdraw to first the Residency and then the treasury. The process of declining the British rule and the glorious resistance of the Indians is very illustrative at this point:

"The rim of darkness beneath the horizon began to sparkle like a firework and immediately the air about them began to sing and howl with flying metal and chips of masonry ... then in a wave came the sound. Daubs of orange hopped at regular intervals from one end of the darkness to the other. Suddenly, a shrapnel shell landed on the corner of the verandah, and all was chaos"(84).

The natives in the novel empowered with the emergence of national consciousness and freedom, equality, justice, independence, the resistance movement at first advocated the politics of assimilation among the natives including colonized people and the sepoys under the British rule. The colonial authorities might be willing to improve the outward appearance of social inequality, exploitation and allow limited forms of non-white representation but they were not prepared to dismantle the social, economic and religious hierarchies on which their control rested. Instead of being liberal and loyal to the Indians as Boehmer writes, " ... to see Americans, Indians, or African peoples and their lands as blank slates on which the British easily imposed their plans and designs (86), they emphasized bloodshed and violence. Farrell draws the attention of the

readers to the wrong policy adopted by the rulers:

"Stand to! Prepare the fire!"

The Collector waited until he estimated their distance at two hundred yards and shouted: "Fire!" This was at the limit of the effective range of canister, but he could afford to wait no longer; his men were so weak, their movements so sluggish that they would need every extra second if they were to re-load and fire another charge before the enemy reached the ramparts. As half a dozen cannons flashed simultaneously at the ramparts, gaps appeared in the ranks of charging men and horses thrashed to the ground. "Spike the guns!" he shouted, but no one could possibly have heard him (115).

The above narrative displays the violent scene of attack of the Indians against the British residency which caused no hope of survival in India. The inhumane perpetration of violence was further intensified by the British to justify their power of colonization. The rulers were so vulnerable that they attacked the innocent Indians mercilessly and the Indian sepoys in the British rule rebelled against their colonial supremacy and serious conflict broke out. The British inhabitants of Krishnapur noticed the unrest. Trapped in a declining number of buildings, subject to repeated attack, and suffering both from sickness of high fever and cholera and the oppressive heat of summer, the British community soon found them under threat. The collector lectured them on the need to help each other through difficult times and live as a community but his efforts to keep them in harmony suffered a serious setback in a scene. After the loss of his faith in the superiority of his sophisticated culture over the Indian culture, the collector utters the following lines:

"Culture is a shame," he said simply. "It's a cosmetic painted on life by rich people to conceal its ugliness." Fleury was taken aback by this remark. He himself had a large collection of artistic objects of which he was very proud. "There, Mr Hopkins, I cannot agree with you," he declared loudly. "No, culture gives us an idea of a higher life to which we aspire. And ideas, too, are a part of culture . . . No one can say that ideas are a shame. Our progress depends on them . . . Think of their power. Ideas make us what we are. Our society is based on ideas . . ."

"Oh, ideas . . ." said the Collector dismissively (120).

At the end of the novel, the Collector realizes that Indian and British cultures are totally different and consequently two different things; they cannot be compared and categorized as superior or inferior to one another. The collector is the representative of the Company. Therefore, he is the stereotype of English man in India, who believes in British colonial policies. Even his choice of a job as a collector of revenue and establishing peace is functional. Especially in the passages depicting the collector's

defense-strategies against the sepoys, he gives morale to other English people in the Residency (84). He believes in the continuity of the British rule in India by claiming that it is beneficial for the Indians. As opposed to him, Fleury, a young English man, sometimes questions the superiority of the English culture over the Indian culture. He believes, "One or two mistakes, however serious, made by the military in their handling of religious matters, were surely no reason for rejecting a superior culture as a whole (88).

Though they took the Sepoy war as a dismissed and chaotic act, unorganized peasant uprising, the unorganized peasants of India fought against the most powerful empires in the world to near defeat with limited resources and more valor. Nevertheless, the lesson of the Sepoy war is not one only a victory but also a sign of resistance. Brian Williams in his article "*Sepoy rebellion was a national uprising against British rule*" writes, "The rebellion took on the character of a national revolt against British colonial rule .... the first general center of resistance which the Indian people was ever possessed of. For the first time, soldiers of the Indian army, recruited from different communities, Hindus and Muslims, landlords and peasants, had come together in opposition to British rule "(np.).

### **Conclusion**

By and large, the false representation of superiority and invulnerability that have sustained them began to deteriorate. Farrell's characters, from the local priest, the doctor to the young men and women who had come to India to make their fortune or marry, live a lavish lifestyle are shown responding to this challenge in unexpected ways. Oppression and exploitation of the people were the main reasons for the rebellion and resistance to British rule in India. The Revolt of 1857 was a big challenge to British authority. It was led by the sepoys and supported by the common people. The revolt of 1857 was the first sign that the Indians wanted to end British rule and were ready to stand united for this cause. Even though they failed to achieve their objective, they succeeded in sowing the seeds of resistance among the Indians.

The novel serves as a fabricated postcolonial narrative of British colonialism during the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. It has depicted the British imperialism through the colonial perspective, but it has criticized the imperial narrative by the colourful descriptions of the corrupted and hypocritical mindset, and divided paradoxes within the colonial enterprise. Through the miniature picture of Krishnapur, the novelist has analysed the illusion of so-called British superiority of civilizing mission of the savage Indians. From a postcolonial theoretical perspective, the novel has displayed the ideological foundation of colonial rule of supremacy, and the colonial characters are described in a sense of privileged position and cultural, social, religious, supremacy but their supremacy has been collapsed in the face of Indian resistance. Similarly, the Indian characters are presented a silent but powerful force of resistance.

## **Works Cited**

- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203933473>.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*. 2nd ed., OUP, 2005.
- Chakravarty, Gautam. *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*. 1st ed., Cambridge University Press, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511484759>.
- Chehboub, Fakia, and Ramdan Mehiri. "The Fall of British Imperialism in James Gordon Farrell's Works: Silent Native Characters in *Troubles* and *The Siege of Krishnapur*." *Revue des Sciences Humaines*, vol. 35, no. 2, June 2024, pp. 55–61.
- Farrell, J. G. *The Siege of Krishnapur*. Carroll and Graf Publishers, 1985.
- Goodman, Sam. "Mongrel Nation: Animality and Empire in the Novels of J. G. Farrell." *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d'Histoire*, vol. 22, no. 5, 2015, pp. 757–770. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2015.1070121>.
- Moore-Gilbert, Bart. *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics*. Verso, 1997.
- Nayar, P. K. *Postcolonial Literature: An Introduction*. Dorling Kindersley, 2008.
- Patel, Dharmesh Kumar Sunilbhai. *Postcolonial Literature: Its Importance and Modern-Day Relevance. Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, vol. 28, no. 1, 26 Jan. 2022, pp. 240–244, <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v28i01.6996>.
- Peers, Douglas M. "Sepoy Mutiny (1857–1859)." *The Encyclopedia of War*, edited by Gordon Martel, 1st ed., Wiley, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444338232.wbeow565>.
- Rana, Kishan Swaroop. "Exploring the Elements of Postcolonialism and Its Exponents." *The Creative Launcher*, vol. 6, no. 5, Dec. 2021, pp. 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.53032/tcl.2021.6.5.06>.
- Rao, Raja. *Kanthapura*. Orient Paperbacks, 1970.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Stuart, V. A. *The Sepoy Mutiny*. McBooks Press, 2001.
- Williams, Brian. "Sepoy Rebellion Was a National Uprising against British Rule." *The Militant*, vol. 65, no. 42, 2001, <http://www.themilitant.com/2001/6542/654254.html>.