

CHAPTER I

CHAPTER I

RECONSTRUCTION

1.1 What is Reconstruction?

When one talks of reconstruction in general one is particularly reminded of the American reconstruction that dates back to the days of late 1860s in the wakes of the Civil War when America was undergoing the process of reconstruction. It was this time when the federal government officially took control over the South and attempts were made to address the inequalities of the black people by enforcing new civil rights through several constitutional amendments.

Literally, the word ‘Reconstruction’, however, simply refers to restoration. It implies the procedures and methods by which the entity that has been degraded, defiled, devalued or whose image has been tarnished will be restored to its former self. The Cambridge English Dictionary defines reconstruction as ‘the process of building or creating something again that has been damaged or destroyed’ (“Reconstruction”).

From the definition it can be taken into consideration that reconstruction at least involves three steps. The first one is of degradation, defiling or devaluation; the second one is the consciousness of that supposed degradation or devaluation and thereafter putting resistance to it; and the third one is an attempt for the restoration of the thing to its original form.

But while making an attempt to define reconstruction in the theoretical context one experiences the veritable impediment without finding a succinct,

codified theory to define it; the process rather invites a combination of multiple theories to explain it. The multiple theories range from Marxism to Feminism, from Post Colonialism to Subaltern Studies. It is interesting to note that as Arundhati Roy's sole concern is to expose and unmask the veiled bestial face of the imperialists / capitalists / hegemony and their tentacles by which they oppress, suppress, exploit the poor people / subject so she has used every possible means and method, first, to promote cultural awareness of the exploitation and marginalization of the poor people by providing physical evidence of the civil and terrestrial injustices inflicted upon them; and then to narrativize the possible methods of resistance and the subsequent reconstruction by contesting and reshaping the 'western ideologies of development' (Huggan and Tiffin 27). The present study, therefore, investigates the interface between these discourses in the non-fictional essays of Roy as her generic mobility, her art and activism, amalgamates within her narrative the multiple minoritarian perspectives.

The theoretical framework, for the present study, that helps us to arrive at a nuanced understanding of the discourses of resistance and the subsequent reconstruction begins with the Marxian reading of society in terms of class-conflict.

It is to be noted that the 'simplest Marxist model of society sees it as constituted by a 'base' and a 'superstructure' (Barry 151). The base or substructure comprises the forces and relations of production, distribution and consumption like - the employer-employee work conditions, the technical segregation of labour etc. whereas all other systems like - language, education, literature, philosophy, culture, art, religion etc. as the overt manifestation refer to superstructure. While the relationship between base and superstructure is not stringently one-dimensional as

the superstructure often determines the nature of the base but the hold of the base is undoubtedly overriding.

The French Marxist theoretician Louis Althusser, however, modified the 'simplistic notions of a one-to-one correspondence between base and superstructure' (Barry 157) and put forward the concept of 'ideological structures or state ideological apparatuses' (Barry 158) which are very subtle forms and practices brought upon by the capitalist state to ensure conformity to the normative order of capitalism itself. For Althusser the state is a 'machine' of domination which allows the governing classes to corroborate their sovereign control over the proletariat. The police, court, army, prisons, government, administration are the constituents of this machine of repression. They function primarily through repression – by taking punitive action against those who refuse to fall in line. On the other hand, the ideological state apparatuses function primarily through ideology. Religion, educational institution, family, law, politics, communication, culture etc. are the key constituents of the ideological state apparatuses. Despite the plurality of ideological state apparatuses, they are unified by the ideologies through which they function.

The discourse of Feminism, on the other hand, is a form of resistance against all forms of patriarchal claustrophobia, sexist exploitation and oppression. It interrogates the existing configuration of power - the ways in which this social order has fixed identities and thereafter seeks equal rights for women based on the idea of the equality of the sexes. Among the various forms of feminism, ecofeminism is particularly significant here as that would yield much fruitful analysis of Roy's critique 'on the hierarchy of dualisms' (Chae 519) that validates the manipulation

‘of nature by the human, of women by men and of the oppressed by the powerful’ (Chae 519).

To put it simply ecofeminism links ecology with feminism. It is the ‘theory and praxis’ (Puleo 28) and it envisages to come together and juxtapose themselves with the belief that ‘dialogue will enrich both’ (Puleo 28). The Oxford English Dictionary defines ecofeminism as an unification of theory (both philosophical and political) and movement that attempts to amalgamate ‘ecological concerns with feminist ones, regarding both as resulting from male domination of society’ (“Ecofeminism”). In other words, environmental destruction and social injustice to woman have a common cause and it is none other than this patriarchal, androcentric attitude towards woman and nature. Ecofeminism, therefore, seeks to address the ecological concerns stemming from the ‘categories of patriarchy, androcentrism, care, sexism and gender’ (Puleo 30).

With the emergence of ecocriticism during the last decade of the 20th century environmental consciousness got another dimension. It takes a more holistic approach than ecofeminism because ‘environmentalism is not always feminist’ (Puleo 28). As Arundhati Roy’s narrative intersects Post Colonial concern with the issues of environmental degradation, an understanding of ecocriticism is, therefore, quite necessary.

Ecocriticism, often referred to as ‘Green Studies’, is an interdisciplinary study that attempts to add an environmental dimension to their respective disciplines. It acts as an interface between the human and the non-human. In the words of Cheryll Glotfelty :

Eco-criticism is the study of relationship between literature and physical environment. Just as feminist criticism examines language and literature from a gender-conscious perspective, and Marxist criticism brings an awareness of models of production and economic class to its reading of text, eco-criticism takes an earth-centred approach to literary studies. (Glotfelty xviii)

Rejecting the concept of human supremacy eco-critical texts argue that the global environmental crisis stems not from the normal ecological functioning rather it is the effect ensuing from the polyvalent manufacturing, mining, commercial and neo-colonial activities of the modern world. The rising awareness of the writers from different arenas has, therefore, made eco-criticism an umbrella term where there is the convergence of the other branches of the environmental studies ranging from anthropology, sociology, humanistic geography, ethics, history etc.

Since the discourses of resistance and the subsequent reconstruction aim to bring the unsung misfortunes of the left-out millions into the centre by confronting the dominant and oppressive structures – an understanding of Post Colonialism and Subaltern Studies is, therefore, quite inevitable.

Based on ideological considerations such as opposition to Euro-centric universalism, cultural imperialism in the name of modernism, Post Colonial approaches to literature contest the very notion of essentialism by petitioning for ‘hybridity and cross-culturation’ (Nixon 235). By foregrounding differences and diversity, it considers plurality and ‘otherness’ as potential sources of vitality and change; and by rejecting notions like standardization, conformity, universalisation - which are viewed as sources of power, hegemony and domination – it demands that

‘history must be re-imagined and re-told by multiple and multi-ethnic voices’ (Nixon 235) so as to enable the subjugated voices re-construct their identities on their own terms. In other words, Post Colonialism implies a movement to liberate the oppressed as well as to re-structure the colonized system by linking the missing links between the visible and the hidden, by de-centering the dominant centre; and eventually by centering the ‘Other’.

Subaltern Studies, an offshoot of Post Colonialism, also champion heterogeneity. By foregrounding the notion of ‘multiplicity of histories’ (Loomba 17) it attempts to retake history for the under classes by redeeming it from the clutches of the elites and by re-writing the Eurocentric version of prevalent imperial history from the multiple minoritarian perspectives.

As Roy’s critique problematizes multi-faceted issues ranging from corporate globalization to privatization and commodification, from neo-fascism to terrorism, from eco-degradation to the pathetic plight of a large number of common people exploited and oppressed by their own government – an interface between these discourses of resistance, therefore, provides the critical framework for the present study.

1.2 Reading Reconstruction in Political Writings

The function and responsibility of art and artist in society has remained one of the continual contentious issues whose origin can be traced back even to Plato who wanted to deport poets (writers) from his Ideal State. Later his disciple Aristotle, however, in *Poetics* defended the poets thus waiving off the blemishes propounded by Plato. Since then there has been a long line of critics, poets, authors, philosophers who tried to jot down their arguments, their own version of the poets / writers.

Mention may be made of Longinus' *On the Sublime* (1st Century AD), Horace's *Ars Poetica* (19 BC), Sidney's *Apology for Poetry* (1595), Wordsworth's *Preface to the Lyrical Ballads* (1800), Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria* (1817), Eliot's *Tradition and Individual Talent* (1919) etc.

However, things began to change with the beginning of colonialism. The writers, who were so far busy in perceiving truth and beauty in nature, were dragged into the politics of empire building as the people in power endeavoured to use literature as tools of hegemonic expansion.

The complexity and controversy regarding the role of art and artist grew further with the advent of modernism. The barbarity, cruelty and the devastating nature of the First World War shocked and appalled people all over the globe. T.S. Eliot's *The Wasteland* (1922) seems to be the classic example that brilliantly captures the degenerated state of the modern arid Europe. Along with T.S. Eliot, James Joyce, Ezra Pound, Marcel Proust, Andrew Gide, Franz Kafka and a host of other writers have shown their tremendous interest in the contemporary socio-political, socio-cultural and socio-economical issues of the time through their creative works.

The increased awareness of the artists / writers to use their creative art / writing as tools of mass awareness as well as of bringing about socio-cultural transformation assumed another dimension in the post-Second World War period. The Holocaust memories, the devastating nature of the Second World War and the detonation of the nuclear warheads on Hiroshima and Nagasaki implied that art can no longer remain confined in pursuit of aesthetic delight only. Moreover, the

countries – Asian and African that were freed from centuries of subjugation, tried to re-interpret, re-present and even produce their own literary oeuvre.

This increased interest of the writers to get involved in socio-cultural, socio-political and global affairs of the contemporary world got distinctly manifested in the works like *Things Fall Apart* (Chinua Achebe, 1958); *The Wretched of the Earth* (Frantz Fanon, 1961); *Dance of the Forest* (Wole Soyinka, 1963); *De-colonizing the Mind* (Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 1986); *In Other Worlds* (Gayatri Spivak, 1987); *The Empire Writes Back* (Bill Ashcroft, 1989); *Culture and Imperialism* (Edward Said, 1993); *No Logo* (Naomi Klein, 1999) etc.

Another significant characteristic of this post-modern world that moulded the perception and attitudes of the writers is that the world has now grown into a global village; it is now more like a market place, a jamboree with no fixed 'rules'. Modern communication and information technology, quantum physics, the theory of relativity have turned everything relative with no fixed point of reference. We are now in a state of virtual reality. Money instead of values, constant displacement instead of fixity, multinational conglomerates instead of local bodies are driving the world. All these have indubitably a lasting impact on art and artist.

A bird's eye view of the gradual development of the evolving role of art and artist on the Indian literary firmament – especially in the sphere of Indian writing in English also shows the burgeoning involvement and commitment of the writers towards the cause of society. Raja Rao's observation in the *Foreword to Kanthapura* (1938) that :

...We cannot write like the English. We should not. We cannot write only as Indians. We have grown to look at the large world as part of us. Our method of expression therefore has to be a dialect which will some day prove to be as distinctive and colourful as the Irish or the American. Time alone will justify it. (Rao v)

– is a testimony to it. R.K. Narayan's tragic trilogy - *Untouchable* (1935), *Coolie* (1936), *Two Leaves and a Bud* (1937); Mulk Raj Anand's *The Guide* (1958); Khwaja Ahmad Abbas's *Inqulab* (1955); Khushwant Singh's *Train to Pakistan* (1956); Chaman Nahal's *Azadi* (1975); and many other works of the time amply testify the growing consciousness of the artists to use their mighty pen as medium of articulation and representation of the contemporary socio-political and national issues.

Another significant aspect of the post-modern Indian Writing in English is the advent of a cluster of progressive women writers like – Sashi Deshpande, Rama Mehta, Geetha Hariharan, Kamala Das, Anita Desai, Keran Desai, Bharati Mukherjee, Arundhati Roy etc. who have engendered far-reaching and profound modulation and innovation in the writers' attitude on socio-cultural traditions by interrogating the orthodox, androcentric notions and beliefs and bringing under implacable dissection the age-old praxes and dehumanizing taboos of the society.

Thus, it can be said – be it in India or elsewhere in the world – the role of art and artist has been subjected to consequential changes with the advancement of time.

And now the question comes to the fore: 'should literature be political?' and if 'yes' then 'what will be the purpose of such literature?' At this point it must be

understood that politics does not only mean the narrow communal or sectarian politics or the thirst for power; it rather implies the larger power structure, the art of governance, the strategies and policies of the country that work synchronously to affect the ways that a nation's people come to understand themselves and the world around them. Literature, on the other hand, is restricted to the sphere of creative imagination – poetry, drama, fiction, non-fiction and in whatever forms because the postmodern information and communication technology has now opened up so many vistas beyond the printed format of a 'book'.

Man cannot live by bread alone and quite naturally we, the human beings, do not live in isolation. We are all citizens wherever we are and, therefore, we are all entangled in politics. Whether we like it or not our lives are constantly affected, shaped by the political decisions. Therefore, quoting the words of Olive Senior, the famous Jamaican poet, novelist, short-story and non-fiction writer, it can be said that : 'Literature is political because we, the creators of literature, are political animals; it is part of accepting our responsibility of being human, of being citizens of the world.'¹

Toni Cade Bambara, the famous Afro-American social activist and writer, also opines the same thing. She firmly asserts that any creative artist 'ought to try to put her/his skills in the service of the community' (Baul and Sanasam 35). Toni Morrison, another prolific Afro-American Nobel laureate also stated the same urgency in her seminal essay "No Place for Self-Pity, No Room for Fear" that : 'In times of dread, artists must never choose to remain silent' (Morrison).

This statement of Olive Senior or T.C. Bambara, however, does not imply that literature should be in the service of politics; on the contrary it implies that

literature is an art, it is meant for transformation and evolution. In the words of Olive Senior :

It is about taking one thing and making something else of it, changed but recognizable. So politics might be the subject matter, but only as the raw material. Literature does not need to employ polemics or confrontation. Nor it is about telling readers what they already know, but enabling them to contemplate what they didn't know they knew. It is not a question of avoiding issues but of being crafty in portraying them.²

From this vantage point it can be affirmed that the aim or purpose of all literature is, at bottom, 'storytelling'. And according to Chinua Achebe these 'Storytellers are a threat' (Achebe 146) because:

Storytellers, poets, writers, have always found ways of confronting tyranny, especially in spaces where such actions are dangerous and deadly. Throughout the ages, writers have developed and employed myriad literary devices and explored the fullest limits of language through satire, magical realism, fantasy, fable and so on. Writers over the ages have found ways of talking about issues – like politics – without seeming to talk about them. The function is not to present the world as it is, but to present it in a new light through the narrative power of art.³

However, when creative writing becomes explicitly and exclusively political, it often becomes limited to time and space. It may lose its universal appeal and validity with the passing of time. But in spite of that it must be said that such kind of

literature is written with a purposive strategic intent to articulate, address and negotiate some urgent socio-economical, religious, national or socio-political issues that have been methodically either sidelined or silenced by the Power/State. Such sort of political writing, often termed as resistance literature, serves as a rejoinder to the violence and injustices inflicted upon the poor toiling masses in the name of progress and development, party politics, caste, sex, religion, nationalism and what not. Numerous authors, writers, poets, novelists like – Alice Walker, Maya Angelou, Langston Hughes, Toni Morrison, Zora Neale Hurston, Wole Soyinka, Ngugi wa Thiong’o, Nadine Gordimer, Chinua Achebe, Doris Lessing, Orhan Pamuk, Noam Chomsky, Saul Bellow, Gunter Grass, Margaret Atwood, Khet Mar, Barbara Kingsolver, Salman Rushdie, Taslima Nasrin, Jean Dreze, Amartya Sen, Arundhati Roy, Vandana Shiva and a host of other writers have time and again, used their mighty pen to explore the discursive ways so as to generate the culture of protest and thereby to propound alternative methods of restoration and reconstruction by resisting the politics of excision.

1.3 Arundhati Roy as a Reconstructionist Voice

Arundhati Roy rose to prominence with her Booker Prize Winner inaugural novel, *The God of Small Things*. The book has widely been acclaimed as the finest, the boldest and artistically adventurous novel to appear in recent times in India. It is the embodiment of a vibrant rebellious spirit seeking to break away from the conventional paradigms in its selection of a challenging theme and narrative modes. Despite concerning the tragedy of a single family, the novel poignantly reflects the Post Colonial condition – the sense of aridity, despondency, futility and frustration. It indeed stands for an indictment of all totalizing systems – from Christian

hypocrisy to Hindu casteism, capitalist exploitation to patriarchal domination of women, from colonialism to nationalism. Post Colonial in its self-awareness and postmodern in its glorification of the teeny-weeny, the insignificant and the outcast, *The God of Small Things* is indeed a roistering of the primeval energy waiting to be liberated from the manacles of ideologies that try to circumscribe everything into their inflexible frameworks.

Besides its theme, the novel becomes distinctive and quirky once again from its semantic and semasiological perspectives too. Roy here engineers a style which is unique and markedly different from that of her predecessors. Roy breaks, subverts and even moulds the normative canonical use of the English language. She accepts the English language but only to appropriate and ratify it into Indian climate. Her deliberate manipulation of the English language is highly significant and quite indispensable in the context of her need for such a moulded and flexible language to convey to the world the culture she represents. In a sense 'the use of weird English is a calculated effort' (Ch'ien 5) of Roy to demonstrate her 'strategic intent' (Ch'ien 5). Roy's linguistic experiments include moulding and twisting of normal spelling of words, copious use of capital letters interspersed in the text, distortion of speech sound, abundance of italics, disappearance of spaces between the letters or words, 'single word sentences, change of word classes, clustering of word classes, and a variety of other techniques' (Surendran 52).

In many ways the novel, therefore, forged a new future for Indian literature.

But what is unique about Roy is that the sky-rocketing success of the book did not sway her from her avowed mission. Soon she realized that the success of the novel is being manipulated to serve the corporate interest; that the novel has 'got

taken over by the roar of international publishing markets' (Anjaria 3) and the deliberate 'exoticization and commodification of brown women's bodies' (Anjaria 3) is turning the book into another 'notch in the global capitalist-patriarchal enterprise' (Anjaria 3). An enraged Roy, therefore, turned away from this genre and pledged herself to use her fame to publicize various injustices inflicted upon the laymen in the name of greater common good.

It is to be noted that Roy's appearance on the literary firmament coincides with India's acceptance of globalization, her opening up the market by signing in the General Agreement on Trade (GAT) and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), embracing of nuclearization, the rise of *Hindutva*-based political entity and the subsequent spurt of communal violence that manifested itself in the demolition of Babri Masjid in 1992 and the 2002 Gujarat pogrom. On the other hand, in the international arena the unprecedented incident of 9/11 terror attack on US and the subsequent unleashing of global War on Terror, leading the world to a perpetual state of war, just changed the entire power dynamics.

Clear-eyed Roy understood what is happening in the name of big ideologies or mind-blowing mega developmental projects that capture the imagination and hog newspaper headlines are not necessarily the best means of all-inclusive growth and development. What is even more worrying for Roy is that corporate globalization and neo-liberalization instead of providing economic prosperity to all people – as it had been pledged – has started to erode the basic principles of pluralistic democracy as it is accumulating wealth and money to a handful of capitalist people depriving the common people of their due share. Instead of grooming and nurturing the

principles of egalitarian society, it has sown ‘the seeds of inequality, exclusion, fundamentalism, and violence’ (Shiva, *India Divided* 78).

Under the given circumstances silence would be a crime. In an interview to HarperCollins she herself states that :

I’m prepared to grovel. To humiliate myself abjectly, because, in the circumstances, silence would be indefensible. So those of you who are willing : let’s pick our parts, put on these discarded costumes and speak our second-hand lines in this sad second-hand play. But let’s not forget that the stakes we’re playing for are huge. Our fatigue and our shame could mean the end of us. The end of our children and our children’s children. Of everything we love. We have to reach within ourselves and find the strength to think. To fight.⁴

A Passionate writer about the wrongs of the world, Roy, therefore, has channelised all her might and energy to transform herself into an author-activist whose primary concern is to spill the beans of the insidious means and methods of appropriation and exploitation by which the Power / Authority subjugates the margin. Besides, Roy has consistently been active in unmasking the ugly, manipulative nature of US imperialism, neo-liberalism and contemporary state capitalism which in many ways have brought about disastrous consequences in the lives of the numerous non-American people all over the globe.

It is interesting to note that an in-depth study of Roy’s texts brings home the fact that she has drawn from multiple paradigms of critique – from Marxism to Post Colonialism, from Environmental Feminism to Subaltern Studies – so as to constitute a complex, multi-layered discourse of resistance in terms of class, caste,

gender and the Post Colonial condition. This stance of Roy, however, has often been hotly debated and discussed. As for instance noted literary critic Graham Huggan, while assessing Roy as a Post Colonial environmentalist, argues that on whose behalf Roy is speaking is not clear :

...of whom Roy believes herself to be speaking for (Adivasi “oustees”? The Narmada Bachao Andolan? International environmental activists and “eco-warriors”? The Indian people?) – an open question that blurs the boundaries between the underclass victims of ecological disaster and their privileged supporters, and that makes Roy vulnerable to the criticism that she is silencing those on whose behalf she wishes to speak. Roy’s tirade against the state seems to want to claim a victory for the people. But which people? (Huggan, *Interdisciplinary Measures* 70)

Roy’s crusade against destructive development and neo-imperial injustice can be best understood when they are contextualized on the broad social-historical-political context they belong to. As Roy’s main concern is to make visible the invisible ‘intricate connections between the private lives of India’s people and the powerful, pervasive local, state, and global forces that work synchronously to affect the ways that a nation’s people came to understand themselves and the world around them’ (Jacqueline N. Kerr) – so she has constructed this poly-vocal narrative method first, to context and reshape the flawed ‘western ideologies of development’ (Huggan and Tiffin 27) pursued at present, and then to reconstruct the marginalized into the centre. Susan Comfort’s comment on Roy’s multi-layered discourse of resistance is worth quoting here :

In the mixture, what emerges is an environmentalist critique that operates on several levels simultaneously. One puts emphasis on the loss of a sustainable way of life and ecological poverty on a local level, while another critiques the development state as an agent of capitalist expansion and bourgeois appropriation at the national level as well as in a neoliberal global context. (Comfort 129-30)

Till date Roy's creative output comprises of four volumes of non-fiction : *The Algebra of Infinite Justice* (2001), *An Ordinary Person's Guide to Empire* (2005), *Listening to Grasshoppers* (2009) and *Broken Republic* (2011) along with numerous lectures, talks, interviews and reporting in *Outlook*, *The Hindu* and a host of other newsletters and periodicals. All are eloquent and at the same time harshly critical in laying bare the seamy side of the violence of global capitalism and its neo-liberal policies, the onslaught of US imperialism and its global War on Terror, the increasing dangers of embracing nuclear arsenal, Maoist insurrection, the growing politics of fear and rising intolerance in India and the inability of the Indian political leadership to provide a dignified life to the disempowered and oppressed people – the so-called poor farmers, tribal people, dalits, Adivasis, slum dwellers, religious minorities and so on.

Through her sharp, analytical and argumentative polemics Roy has tried to negotiate the reality of the grand narratives of growth which has often been propagated under the feel good banner by the State / Power. As for instance in her essay "Greater Common Good" Roy has succinctly pointed out that the Sardar Sarovar dam 'fits into a larger history of irresponsible and destructive big dam use in India' (Mezey 57-8), that the dam is being built less for the poor people to solve

their problem of water, food, irrigation and electricity than for the rich and affluent. For Roy this is none other than sheer callousness and virtually ‘the state’s undeclared war’ (Mezey 58) against these subjugated and marginalized communities as since Indian independence, for the construction of dams, more than thirty-three million hapless inhabitants were dispossessed – rendered homeless by the so-called welfare Indian government! In another essay “Power Politics” once again Roy has shown the bitter effect of corporatization and commoditization of the key infrastructural facilities like water and electricity. She has meticulously pointed out how the US corporate giants like Enron, Bechtel are looting and plundering the third world countries under the pretext of development.

Roy’s crusade against oppression, exploitation and any kind of domination and injustice did not limit her to India only, she soon became a staunch critic of US foreign policies and the tentacles like International Monetary Fund, World Bank etc. by which US imperialism expands its hegemony. She has blatantly argued that no other nation in the world has exerted such enormous pressure on other countries to fulfill its own hegemonic interest. Since the Second World War America has engaged itself with war - at least with eighteen nations, not to mention the numerous CIA mediated coups and proxy wars. Iraq, Syria, Libya, Afghanistan and a host of other nations have been devastated – pounded by missiles and bombs only because of America’s oil greed and its own hegemonic interest. The global War on Terror has only globalized war. The world has witnessed the rise of ISIS and its barbaric activities. Because of the flawed foreign policies of US, Europe and other first world countries are also fast becoming vulnerable to terror attacks.

Roy, therefore, has used her mighty pen not only to globalize dissent but also to construct the discursive ways – to create room for debate and discussion so as to generate newer methods of alternative homogenous growth which would be socially just and environmentally sustainable.

From this Vantage point it can be said that Roy is doing the same thing what Edward Said has said in his *Representations of the Intellectual* :

So in the end it is the intellectual as a representative figure that matters – someone who visibly represents a standpoint of some kind, and someone who makes articulate representations to his or her public despite all sorts of barriers. (Said 12)

Truly Roy's constant effort in voicing the de-voiced, in re-centering and reconstructing the marginalized people makes her a Saidian humanist intellectual who is passionately concerned about the wrongs of the world.