Tribhuvan University

Narratives of Marginality and Resistance in Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English, T.U.

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Master of Arts in English

By

Lekhak Baduwal

Roll No.86

Symbol No. 280689

T.U. Regd. No.: 6-2-552-28-2015

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu,

February 2025

Letter of Approval

This thesis titled " Narratives of Marginality and Resistance in Arundhati Roy's The *Ministry of Utmost Happiness",* submitted to the central Department of English Tribhuvan University, by Lekhak Baduwal has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

_____

Dr. Tara Lal Shrestha

Internal Examiner

`

_____

Dr. Mani Bhadra Gautam

External Examiner

_____

Prof. Dr Dhruba Bahadur Karki

Head

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

Inspiration always plays vital role in every progress of human life. I am greatly indebted to Dr. Tara Lal Shrestha and Dr. Mani Bhadra Gautam whose inspiring suggestion and guideline helped me to prepare this thesis. It is being very much grateful to Professor Dr Dhruba Bahadur Karki head of the Central Department of English for the approval of this research. I sincerely thank all the respected lecturers of the Central Department of English. Their valuable suggestions have greatly helped me to improve and complete this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank my family, friends, and the entire English Department for their kindness and support whenever I needed help. I truly appreciate everyone who has willingly helped me to make this thesis successful.

February 2025 Lekhak Baduwal

Narratives of Marginality and Resistance in Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*

Abstract

This thesis examines the subversive roles of oppressed characters in Arundhati Roy's The Ministry of Utmost Happiness. *It focuses on Anjum and how she resists systemic oppression. The study shows how Roy weaves stories of marginalized communities fighting against injustice within a socio-political framework. Using New Historicism, it explores how the novel connects personal stories, like the Kashmir conflict and injustices against minorities, to broader historical and cultural contexts. Anjum, a transgender woman, establishes a sanctuary for outcasts, symbolizing the voiceless reclaiming agency and appealing for justice and equality amid societal and political suppression. It also highlights how marginalized individuals are often controlled by political forces, while expressing dissatisfaction and frustration with the unstable Indian government due to power hegemony, the greed of politicians, and the exploitation of downtrodden people. Through the lens of Stephen Greenblatt's new historicist perspective, the narrative emerges as a discourse that intertwines individual personal journeys with a larger metaphor of societal subversion.*

Key Words: Discrimination, power, politics, resistance, existence

This thesis explores the narrative of marginality and examines the socio-political and cultural conflicts arising from systemic injustices as portrayed in Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*. The thesis examines how the novel devastating effects of oppression and sheds light on the emotions stifled by state mechanisms. Through the character of Anjum, Roy critiques the societal and political systems that marginalize vulnerable communities in India. Employing a new historicist approach, this paper investigates how Roy intricately intertwines individual

narratives with broader historical and cultural realities, emphasizing the themes of resistance and marginality. The novel shows how discrimination, power, and survival are connected, highlighting the strength of marginalized individuals as they face systemic oppression. It challenges dominant beliefs and gives a voice to silenced communities, offering a deep critique of social injustices. The story exposes how marginalization continues and calls for justice and change. Using New Historicism, the thesis focuses on how Roy connects the experiences of marginalized people with historical and political realities. The novel's political aspects, such as systemic injustices, state suppression, and resistance, serve as a backdrop to the personal struggles of marginalized characters.

This thesis examines how *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* connects the narrative of resistance and the lives of marginalized individuals with the socio-political context of contemporary India. Arundhati Roy blends literary narratives with historical and political realities, refusing to separate them. Her novel critiques systemic injustices and oppressive power structures. It acts as both a literary and political document, showing how marginalized identities and resistance are closely connected in challenging entrenched power. The origins of new historicism are often traced back to Stephen Greenblatt's Renaissance *Self-Fashioning* (1982), which is widely regarded as foundational to the approach. New historicism emerged in the late 1970s and early 1980s as a counterpoint to new criticism, old historicism, and critical deconstruction. Defining new historicism, Greenblatt states:

> A simple definition of new historicism is that it is a method based on the parallel reading of literary and non-literary texts, usually of the same historical period. This is to say that, new historicism refuses to privilege the literary text: instead of the literary foreground and historical background and practices as a

> mode of study in which literary and non-literary text are given equal weight and constantly inform or interrogate each other. (172)

This abstract shows that new historicism studies literary and non-literary texts from the same historical period together, treating them as equally important to show their mutual influence. This method highlights how literature reflects, critiques, and reshapes historical and social realities. Using this approach, Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* tells a powerful story of resistance and marginalization. It connects the lives of oppressed individuals to the socio-political realities of modern India.

The novel critiques power structures like gender, caste, and state violence, showing how they marginalize vulnerable communities. For example, Anjum's journey as a transgender woman reveals the impact of systemic oppression and her resilience against societal norms. Her sanctuary for outcasts symbolizes resistance and challenges dominant power structures. Using Stephen Greenblatt's idea that literature is a cultural artifact, this paper argues that Roy's novel exposes and challenges the deep inequalities created by political and cultural dominance. Anjum's personal story, combined with larger issues like the Kashmir conflict and communal violence, makes the novel a strong critique of systemic injustices. This approach shows how the novel reflects historical realities, promotes resistance, and amplifies the voices of marginalized communities. The novel's story of resistance and marginality connects personal and collective struggles. It exposes systemic oppression and challenges power structures. Through characters like Dr. Azad and Anjum, Roy shows grassroots activism and personal defiance against the overwhelming forces of political, economic, and social systems. Dr. Azad's hunger strike symbolizes resistance to global capitalism, advocating for local interests, cultural preservation, and systemic change. The protests at Jantar Mantar show people coming together to stand against

injustice, corruption, and environmental harm. These protests represent resistance against greed and authoritarianism. Roy shows how Anjum's sanctuary for outcasts turns personal grief into public activism, blending individual and collective resistance. By connecting these stories to events like the Gujarat riots and the Kashmir conflict, Roy criticizes the failures of the state and society. She highlights how marginalized voices are ignored in dominant histories.

Using a new historicist lens, this thesis explores how Roy presents literature as a cultural artifact that reflects and critiques its historical context. By weaving personal stories into broader socio-political struggles, Roy illuminates the tensions between grassroots resistance and systemic oppression, advocating for justice and sustainability. The convergence of Anjum's individual defiance with collective activism exemplifies the novel's central theme: resistance as a transformative force against marginalization and suppression. Roy captures the collective voice of resistance, demonstrating how personal grief often fuels public activism. Through a new historicist lens, the lives of Roy's characters serve as historical and cultural artifacts, revealing the failures of both state and society.

The phrase, "History is fiction written by the victors" (150), reflects the idea that history is often shaped by those in power to serve their agendas, marginalizing the experiences of the oppressed. erasing narratives of resistance and marginalization that challenge dominant power structures. "By constructing Anjum's story within the broader context of Indian history, including events such as the Gujarat riots and the Kashmir conflict, Roy critiques these dominant narratives. This approach aligns with Stephen Greenblatt's new historicist notion that history is a contested space shaped by power dynamics. It suggests that history is not an objective truth but rather a narrative manipulated by those in power, often silencing marginalized voices. Roy's *The*

Ministry of Utmost Happiness thus functions as a cultural artifact that reflects and critiques its historical context, advocating for solidarity and grassroots movements to counter authoritarian tendencies and promote systemic change.

Ambedkar, as the principal architect of the Indian Constitution, envisioned it as a mechanism to dismantle societal hierarchies and provide equal opportunities. The phrase "progress of the people living in the society" underscores a commitment to uplift marginalized communities. This aligns with Ambedkar's resistance against caste oppression and his advocacy for social, economic, and political equality. According to the spirit of the constitution, "it contemplates the progress of the people living in the society"(3). Its phrase means that it reflects on the development or advancement of people within a society, with a focus on giving voice to marginalized individuals or groups whose experiences are often overlooked or suppressed. So, it emphasizes that a constitution, as a foundational legal and political document, is not just a static set of rules but is intended to evolve with the changing dynamics of the society it governs. The Constitution provides a framework for addressing these injustices, echoing Ambedkar's belief in the power of law and state mechanisms to rectify historical wrongs. Democracy, as a system of governance, is essential for true societal progress and inclusiveness, but Roy critiques how democracy is implemented in contemporary India, suggesting that it often fails to deliver on its promises and leaves many marginalized voices unheard in the political process.

Roy's notion of the political system critiques the gap between the idealized promises of democracy and the reality of its implementation. She highlights how, despite the democratic framework that guarantees inclusiveness, marginalized groups remain excluded from its benefits, revealing systemic failures. In her view, democracy in contemporary India often serves the interests of the powerful, leaving the

marginalized to contend with the illusions of progress and development. The narratives of resistance and marginalities, such as those in Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness,* reflect the lived experiences of communities grappling with systemic suppression. These narratives serve as a critique and reminder of the constitutional promise that remains unfulfilled for many.

Brannigan's framework aligns with the novel's themes by highlighting the interplay between resistance and marginalization. John Brannigan's interpretation of new historicism emphasizes that power dynamics shape the context of all texts, asserting that ideology and power are intricately woven into historical narratives. John Brannigan's concept of new historicism emphasizes that power relations shape the context of all texts, suggesting that ideology and power are inextricable from historical narratives (7). This framework is pivotal to understanding Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness,* which critiques the socio-political and historical power dynamics of contemporary India. The novel reveals how reality is constructed and manipulated by ideological and political forces, perpetuating marginalization and systemic oppression. Marginalized characters like Anjum embody this interplay between resistance and marginality. Anjum's journey illustrates how individual actions are deeply influenced and constrained by larger socio-political systems, exposing the lack of autonomy experienced by marginalized communities. However, Roy subverts this constraint by portraying Anjum's acts of defiance, such as creating a sanctuary for outcasts, as a form of resistance that challenges oppressive structures. The behind-the-scenes meaning of the narrative of resistance and marginality in the quote "How to tell a shattered story? By slowly becoming everybody. No, By slowly becoming everything" (22)—reflects the fragmented nature of marginalized identities and their resistance within systemic structures. his quote means that to tell a broken or

complex story, you need to deeply understand and connect with every person, place, and thing in it.

Instead of just looking at one side or perspective, you embrace everything, allowing the story to come together fully. It's about empathy, openness, and seeing the bigger picture. This line speaks to the complexity of giving voice to the silenced and representing their struggles in a way that transcends individual experiences. It highlights the power of stories as a way to resist oppression. The storyteller takes on "everything," breaking the divide between the center and the margins. It shows that being on the margins is not a passive state but a space to reclaim power and fight against injustice. In this way, the line shows how resistance and marginality come together to create voices that cannot be erased and demand attention within society. In *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*, Roy connects personal stories with collective histories, showing that the struggles of marginalized groups are part of a larger fight. To "become everything" means to take in and reflect the experiences of pain, oppression, and strength that shape the lives of marginalized people... It suggests that telling the story of the marginalized requires a deep, empathetic immersion into their realities, resisting singular narratives imposed by dominant power structures.

Society faced endless suppression, and historians have tried to expose this in their writings. Sanjay Gandhi and Anjum faced trouble when the police chased them. The tyranny of Indira Gandhi's rule ended, but bureaucrats continued to misuse their power. Greenblatt sees literature as a cultural artifact, blending fiction and reality to expose oppression. Roy uses this idea to resist dominant historical narratives. She highlights Anjum's strength and resilience in her storytelling. Anjum says "She was known to be the first hijra who had built her own guest house" (28). This means Anjum, a hijra, achieved independence and created a safe space for herself and others

by building her own guest house. This act of self-determination reflects Anjum's ability to redefine her identity beyond societal expectations, aligning with Greenblatt's concept of self-fashioning. Through her journey, Roy's novel negotiates contested meanings, echoing the dynamic interplay between individual agency and societal constraints. Anjum identity as a hijras and her life in the graveyard reflects gender marginalization and historical critique of exclusionary social norms. Anjum's history and Roy's narrative appeal are interwoven with reflections on dissent and nationalism. Roy writes, "I feel anger at intellectual deserters … for all our imperfection, we are a genuine democracy" (151), offering a critique of intellectual complacency and an exploration of the tensions between dissent and patriotism. This aligns with Greenblatt's view of texts as active participants in cultural and political dialogue.

The novel's depiction of the Kashmir conflict further echoes Greenblatt's idea of literature engaging with social and political struggles. Roy describes the relationship between India and Kashmir: "Partitions had made the two of them Kashmir and India eternal enemies. Blood brothers who could not be blood brothers and wouldn't be blood brothers" (125). Through Musa's narrative, Roy highlights the human cost of the conflict, referencing historical events such as the rise of insurgency and counterinsurgency measures by the Indian state. Additionally, Roy critiques authoritarianism, drawing parallels to events like the Emergency under Indira Gandhi. Her commentary on women's voices is particularly striking: "The most subversive thing a woman can do is talk about her life as if it really matters" (200). This statement highlights how women's experiences are often ignored in patriarchal societies. Roy shows that sharing one's story can be an act of rebellion. This idea aligns with Greenblatt's New Historicism, which views a woman's voice as a form of

resistance against forces that try to silence her. By telling her story, a woman takes control of her place in history and culture, challenges power, and reshapes historical narratives.

During political unrest in New Delhi, Sanjay Gandhi was chased by the police. He fled to a flyover and reportedly urinated in fear. This event is similar to Anjum's experience during the Delhi movement. Anjum, a transgender woman, was also chased by the police and cornered on a flyover. She faced the same fear of state power. This comparison connects history and fiction to show Arundhati Roy's critique of power and oppression. Sanjay Gandhi's fear shows that anyone can be vulnerable to authority. Anjum's story shows how people outside societal norms face even greater challenges. By linking these events, Roy reveals how fear affects everyone under oppressive regimes but impacts marginalized groups more deeply. She highlights resistance and survival, showing how the oppressed face both personal and collective struggles in an unfair society.

Everything is said here:

> Her top favorite was the Flyover Story- Anjum's account of how she and her friends walked home late night From Defence Colony in south Delhi all the way back to Turkman GateIn those days there was such thing as fresh air in the city, Anjum told Zainab. And what can anyone possibly do when it rains on a flyover? They have to walking,' Zainab would say, in a reasonable, adult tone....'So we so-ed in our ghagra!' Zainab would shout, because she was at the age when anything to do with shitting, pissing and farting was the high point, or perhaps the whole point, of all stories. (33)

Quotes shows the Flyover Story highlights the defiant resilience of marginalized individuals, finding humor and solidarity in the face of societal challenges, thus

embodying the narrative of resistance and marginality. It captures a moment of warmth and humor between Anjum and Zainab, while also subtly reflecting on the social and physical realities of urban life in Delhi. Here's an analysis of the passage's focus: Anjum and Sanjaya Gandhi who is caught by the police and trapped on a flyover during the Delhi movement.

It emphasizes the emotional and psychological toll of being hunted or pursued by oppressive forces. Both characters are depicted as being vulnerable, caught in a situation where they are overwhelmed by fear and danger. Its abstract provided can be linked to Greenblatt's mew historicism through its emphasis on micro-histories, marginalized voices, and the interplay between personal narratives and broader socio-political contexts. Greenblatt, one of the key figures in new historicism, suggests that literature should be seen not just as a reflection of historical contexts but also as an active participant in shaping and questioning those contexts. In simple terms, this passage highlights a lighthearted and humorous moment in the story where Anjum recalls a time when she and her friends walked through the streets of Delhi at night. They had to cross a flyover in the rain, and Zainab, a younger character, finds the situation funny and makes it into a playful story about needing to "so" (urinate) in their ghagras (traditional skirts). The scene captures the innocence and humor of childhood, where bodily functions become the focus of stories, and it contrasts with the more serious themes of the novel, adding a touch of levity to Anjum's narrative. It aligns with Greenblatt's view that literature interacts with and mirrors larger cultural and political dynamics.

Anjum's story, where she recalls a lighthearted moment of walking through the rain on a flyover, is significant because it highlights the everyday experiences of marginalized communities like the hijras. Through such personal, even whimsical,

moments, Roy gives voice to those who are typically excluded from mainstream narratives. This shows how personal stories connect to bigger political and social issues. Anjum's memory of walking in the rain, though lighthearted, becomes an act of resistance against the marginalization of hijra communities. By sharing such personal moments, Roy not only gives voice to those often excluded but also underscores how everyday experiences of marginalized individuals are intertwined with larger social and political forces. This narrative reflects the resilience of those on the margins, as their stories, even in their simplicity, become forms of resistance against their systemic erasure.

New Historicism helps us understand that literature, through such personal narratives, becomes a tool for both reflecting and resisting the socio-political contexts that shape them. New historicism helps us understand that literature does not just tell individual stories but also reflects the cultural, social, and political contexts of the time, showing how personal experiences are shaped by and reflect larger societal forces. The mention of Sanjay Gandhi and Anjum highlights the broader political context of the novel, particularly the impact of the Emergency (1975–77) in India. Anjum, as a hijra, represents the marginalized voices affected by such political events, much like Sanjay Gandhi's own troubled legacy. The fear and oppression experienced by both figures mirror each other, demonstrating the novel's critique of the government's authoritarianism. Anjum's statement, "I was looking like a mad person. All the cigarette burns were bubbles on my face, breast, nipples, and stomach. My whole bed was blood" (423), reflects her physical and emotional trauma. This moment, like the broader narrative, shows how personal suffering is intertwined with the historical and cultural forces shaping her identity. The violence Anjum faces—symbolized by the cigarette burns and blood—is not just her personal trauma but a

reflection of the systemic oppression and marginalization experienced by those living outside the dominant societal norms. It shows vividly captures the physical and emotional scars of a life shaped by both personal trauma and societal violence. This raw moment not only underscores her suffering but also symbolizes the broader cultural and political forces that perpetuate the marginalization and brutality faced by individuals like her. Anjum says, ‘'I was looking like a mad person. All the cigarette burns were bubbles on my face, breast, nipples, and stomach. My whole bed was blood" (423).

This moment reflects Anjum's physical and emotional trauma, which is a result of both her personal struggles and the brutal violence she has experienced, including societal and political oppression. This moment reflects Anjum's physical and emotional trauma, which is a result of both her personal struggles and the brutal violence she has experienced, including societal and political oppression. The novel, narrated through the lens of Roy’s perspective, exposes the brutal realities of Indian politics and its impact on marginalized individuals. The violence Anjum endures is not merely personal trauma but a powerful symbol of the larger cultural, historical, and political forces that dictate her existence. The cigarette burns and blood serve as external symbols of the oppression and marginalization that individuals like Anjum endure in a society bound by rigid gender norms and systemic violence, where personal suffering often mirrors the collective wounds inflicted by a repressive social order. The novel is written through the perspectives of novelist Roy who witness Indian politics during that time, the violence Anjum experiences is not just a personal trauma but a reflection of the larger cultural, historical, and political forces that shape her identity. The cigarette burns and blood are external symbols of the oppression and

marginalization that individuals like Anjum face in a society governed by rigid gender norms and systemic violence.

Roy uses Anjum's story to critique systemic oppression while emphasizing survival, adaptation, and the reclamation of spaces by the marginalized. In the writer's words, "She lived in the graveyard like a tree" (7). The "graveyard" is not just a physical space; it symbolizes the repression and silencing of non-conforming identities throughout history. The tree, in contrast, stands for resistance, regeneration, and the continuous existence of marginalized voices, much like the subversive energies Roy employs to offer alternative histories and voices in her novel. This metaphor speaks to real-world struggles where individuals and communities who exist outside the dominant norms, such as transgender people, refugees, or racial minorities, often find themselves relegated to the metaphorical 'graveyard'—spaces where their voices and identities are ignored or suppressed. Yet, like the tree, they persist, grow, and continue to challenge the systems that marginalize them. Anjum's existence in the graveyard becomes a powerful symbol of resilience in the face of societal erasure, offering a stark reminder that the marginalized, though often pushed to the edges, can create new, life-affirming spaces of belonging and resistance.

The "graveyard" is not just a physical space but a symbol of the repression and silencing of non-conforming identities throughout history. The tree, in contrast, stands for resistance, regeneration, and the continuous existence of marginalized voices, much like the subversive energies Roy employs to offer alternative histories and voices in her novel. In this case, the metaphor of the graveyard and the comparison of Anjum to a tree reflect her marginalized position within society. The graveyard, often seen as a place of death and neglect, symbolizes the marginalization of those who exist outside mainstream societal norms. Anjum, as a transgender

woman, is an outsider, living in a space that society deems "dead" or "invisible." Yet, the comparison to a tree suggests life, growth, and resilience despite her circumstances. Anjum's residence in the graveyard symbolizes her existence on the fringes of society. Her uniqueness as a person was emphasized by the Writer: Anjum says:

> It doesn't matter. I'm all of them. I'm Romi and Juli, I'm Laila and Majnu. And Mujna, why not? Who says my name is Anjum? I'm not Anjum, I'm Anjuman. I'm a mehfil, I'm a gathering. of everybody and nobody, of everything and nothing. Is there anyone else you would like to invite? Everyone's invited. (4)

This quote, through Anjum's rejection of fixed identities and her embrace of multiplicity, reflects new historicism by showcasing how individual identities are shaped, contested, and reconstructed within the broader socio-political and cultural power dynamics of history. It emphasizes the fluidity of identity and the interplay between individual agency and collective social constructs, highlighting how personal identities are shaped by both internal desires and external cultural forces. She is representative characters of a society and courageous woman and very dedicated to her goals. It represents the totality of all the activities of a given this certain place of society. She can be replaced as a tool for everyone's use when needed. So, she doesn't want to be known by name, she identifies herself according to the situation. Hijras belong to lower classes and poorer castes that experience marginalized economic structure. This statement is not just an assertion of identity, but an invitation to embrace the multiplicity of existence. In a society that attempts to define and confine individuals, Anjum's declaration resists those limitations by embracing all identities, acknowledging her fluidity and complexity. It's a call to celebrate the vast spectrum

of human experience, where boundaries dissolve, and the marginalized, once silenced, can reclaim space and voice.

Anjum's insistence on being a 'gathering' of 'everybody and nobody' reflects the novel's critique of identity as a rigid construct, highlighting the importance of inclusivity and the rejection of societal norms that seek to define people by narrow terms. It is clear that "hijras are human beings, and they have the right to live with dignity. Anjum's desire to "bear too much but not to bear injustice" and her efforts to give voice to the silenced represent a larger struggle for self-identity and empowerment. Roy presents the hijras' journey as a form of resistance, aligning with new historicist theory, which critiques the socio-political context of its time. Anjum's actions demonstrate her deep awareness of the political and cultural landscape, and her refusal to accept injustice reflects a broader theme of resistance against oppressive systems. As contemporary women confront identity crises, they, like Anjum, strive for self-willed empowerment and to assert their humanity.

The novel engages deeply with India's history, addressing events such as the narrators speaks, "Partition had made the two of them—Kashmir and India—eternal enemies. Blood brothers, who could not be blood brothers and would not be blood brothers" (125). It quotes speaks to the enduring and painful legacy of Partition, which continues to shape the relationship between Kashmir and India. From a New Historicist perspective, this conflict can be understood as a manifestation of the power dynamics, historical narratives, and cultural divisions that persist long after the event itself. The portrayal of Kashmir and India as "blood brothers, who could not be blood brothers" reflects how historical trauma and political narratives are constructed and reinforced through literature, affecting how people understand and relate to their past, often with lasting, unresolved tensions. Roy's depiction of marginalized groups

reflects the historical, political, and cultural realities of her time. It shows how the novel not only offers a critique of the present but also engages with the forces that shape societal norms and identities. This reflects the unresolved trauma of Partition and its enduring impact on contemporary politics, aligning with Greenblatt's idea that texts critique dominant historical narratives. The narrator states, "'In the khwabgh, Holy souls trapped in the wrong bodies were liberated'" (57). This line portrays the 'House of Dreams' as a sanctuary where marginalized individuals, like hijras, find refuge and community. It symbolizes a space of liberation, where they can embrace their true selves despite societal rejection. The Khwabgah challenges traditional gender binaries, offering a haven for transgender individuals and reflecting the novel's broader themes of identity, marginalization, and post-colonial history. It underscores the tension between societal constraints and personal liberation, highlighting how the Khwabgah serves as a critique of the cultural and historical treatment of gender identity in India.

Linking the novel's events with India's history since 1917, Roy portrays the deeply ingrained conflicts that shape both personal and collective existence in a divided society. As Anjum says, 'But for us, the price rise and school admissions and beating-husbands and a cheating wife are all inside us. The riots are inside us. The war inside us. Indo-Pak is inside us. It will never settle down. It can't' (27). This quote illustrates how personal, societal, and political struggles, such as economic inequality, domestic violence, and Indo-Pakistani tensions, become internalized, affecting individuals on a psychological level. It shows the intersection of personal identities and political struggles, emphasizing how systemic issues infiltrate personal lives. Roy's novel, deeply historicized, uses historical events to critique India's political and social transformation, particularly post-1917, during colonial and post-colonial shifts.

By highlighting figures like Sarmad, a mystic and poet who resisted societal norms, Roy critiques dominant historical narratives and connects personal resistance to broader political issues, illustrating the subjective nature of history. As Michiko Kakutani points out, *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* explores social, political, religious, and cultural issues, including the Kashmiri separatist movement, blending history and fiction to highlight themes of marginalization, historical trauma, and resistance. She says:

> 'No doubt Roy, who has spent much of the last two decades immersed in politics (she became a vocal supporter of the Kashmir separatist movement, and an 8 critic of Hindu nationalism) means for the many fragments and digression to open out her story into a panoramic mosaic of modern India, and the countless, social, political, religious and cultural issues rolling just below the surface of everyday life. There are to national tragedies in the unending "supermarket of sorrow," like the Bhopal toxic gas disaster of 1984 and the Gujarat riots of 2002 and multiplication of alarming anecdotes involving murder, rape, torture and mutilation as well as more mundane episodes of loss and grief. (4)

The mention of Arundhati Roy's support for the Kashmir separatist movement, her critique of Hindu nationalism, and her references to national tragedies like the Bhopal disaster and the Gujarat riots, underscore the novel's deep engagement with India’s socio-political realities. Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* highlights the stark contrast between the growing wealth of a few billionaires and the widespread poverty, the systemic violence against women, and religious intolerance—issues that continue to plague the nation. The novel reflects a world where the elites thrive at the expense of the majority, whose daily struggles for survival go largely unnoticed. This critique

aligns with New Historicism by embedding individual narratives within the broader socio-political and historical context of modern India. By integrating national tragedies like the Bhopal disaster and Gujarat riots with personal stories of loss and grief, Roy critiques the systemic power structures and explores the complex relationship between history, culture, and literature. The novel demonstrates how historical events, such as the Partition and the ongoing political struggles, intertwine with the lived experiences of marginalized voices, exposing the dynamics of power and resistance. Roy also reflects on how colonization persists even after the British Raj has ended, as contemporary political leaders continue to impose control over marginalized communities. Anjum's decision to live in a graveyard after the riots symbolizes her alienation but also her resistance against societal erasure. This act highlights how power operates through institutions like the state to control and discipline marginalized groups.

The novel further critiques the impact of political oppression through poignant statements like Saddam Hussain's words about Kashmir: 'In Kashmir, when we wake up and say 'Good morning,' what we really mean is 'Good morning" (35-40). This expression reflects the perpetual grief experienced in conflict-ridden Kashmir. From a New Historicist perspective, Roy's use of such expressions critiques the political oppression that shapes daily life in regions like Kashmir. The line 'Kashmir, the unfinished business of Partition, had turned into a graveyard of poets' (150) encapsulates the devastating impact of unresolved political conflicts, drawing attention to the historical tensions that continue to shape the region. "This revised version clearly links the novel's events and themes to the socio-political realities of India, and uses New historicism to highlight how Roy intertwines history with personal narratives to critique power structures and societal issues.

Roy's portrayal of Kashmir as "the unfinished business of Partition" situates the conflict within the broader historical narrative of Partition (1947) and its enduring legacy. This reflects how historical events continue to shape the present, creating a discourse of power and exclusion. Roy amplifies the voices of Kashmir's silenced victims, challenge the state-sanctioned version of history. Greenblatt explores the rediscovery of Lucretius's on the nature of things and things and its impact or shaping modernity, emphasizing the transformative power of rediscover of narratives. Roy's novel act as a rediscover of marginalized voice, like Dalit, Muslims asserting their important in shaping India cultural and historical narratives. Roy intertwines personal narratives with historical events, such as the caste violence, partition, showcasing their impact on individual. The novel also reflects contemporary political realities, as seen in the reference to protests at Jantar Mantar: 'A short walk away, in Jantar Mantar, protestors protested at injustice, corruption, and fascism' (200). This quote serves as a prime example of how Roy embeds real-life historical and cultural contexts to critique the suppression of marginalized voices. Jantar Mantar, a well-known site of political demonstrations, becomes a symbol of resistance, where individuals and groups challenge systemic oppression and confront dominant power structures. By tying these protests to broader issues of authoritarianism, inequality, and state-sponsored violence, Roy's novel critiques the current socio-political landscape of India, showing the continued relevance of resistance in the face of injustice.

Jantar Mantar serves as a symbolic backdrop for activism and resistance, where marginalized voices confront the dominant power structures. The mention of protests against injustice, corruption, and fascism ties directly to Roy's broader critique of contemporary India's sociopolitical landscape, including issues like

authoritarianism, inequality, and state-sponsored violence. Roy's portrayal of Kashmir as 'the unfinished business of Partition' situates the ongoing conflict within the larger historical narrative of the 1947 Partition and its enduring legacy, illustrating how historical events continue to shape contemporary power dynamics and exclusionary practices. By amplifying the voices of Kashmir's silenced victims, Roy challenges the state-sanctioned version of history, echoing Greenblatt's exploration of how the rediscovery of suppressed narratives can transform our understanding of the present.

The protests in *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* highlight Roy's engagement with the socio-political realities of modern India, resonating with Greenblatt's concept of historical contingency, where literature is shaped by the socio-political forces of its time. The novel critiques contemporary power dynamics, using characters like Anjum to explore themes of resistance, identity, and societal control. For example, the narrative voice mentions, 'New master wanted to hide her knobby, varicose veins cramming her withered limbs into saucy bras' (160), a line that juxtaposes Anjum's resilience against a figure preoccupied with appearance and youth. This imagery can be interpreted as a reflection of power dynamics, where societal authorities—embodied by the 'new master'—attempt to control or hide physical imperfections, much like they try to suppress non-conforming identities such as Anjum's. The 'new master' symbolizes the power structures that enforce ideals of beauty, gender, and conformity, reflecting the broader theme of societal pressure to conform to rigid standards. This resonates with a critique of urban capitalism, which often erases cultural heritage and identities in favor of superficial, market-driven ideals.

Through new historicism, Roy uses the character of Anjum to comment on how marginalized identities, particularly those that challenge gender and social norms, are subjugated by a capitalist society that values conformity over authenticity.

Anjum's character, as a transgender woman, becomes a symbol of resistance against these power structures, reflecting the ongoing struggle for identity and acceptance in modern India. This thematic exploration connects to the political landscape of India, where power structures continue to marginalize non-conforming identities, especially in the context of rapid urbanization and the erosion of traditional values. Roy's novel, by embedding personal stories within this larger historical and political framework, critiques the socio-political dynamics that continue to shape India's present, drawing attention to the interplay between historical contingency and the ongoing struggles of marginalized communities. This analysis ties the novel's exploration of personal identity to broader political and historical contexts, showing how Roy critiques contemporary Indian society's power dynamics through new historicism, which emphasizes the influence of historical and political forces on literature.

Ania Loomba redefines Gramscian Notion of 'Hegemony' by saying that "Hegemony is power achieved through a combination of coercion and consent" (29). Loomba highlights that power is not solely enforced through force, but is often achieved through a mixture of coercion (direct control or violence) and consent (acceptance by the people). This means that those in power not only rely on physical force but also use ideological means, such as education, media, and religion, to shape people's beliefs and make them more accepting of the dominant power structures. The quote "Hegemony is power achieved through a combination of coercion and consent" refers to the idea that power is not solely imposed through force, but is also achieved when people willingly accept or consent to the power structure. it suggests that those in power often use both force (coercion) and ideological means (consent) to maintain control over a society. This passage connects to the narrative of resistance by highlighting how hegemonic power structures not only rely on coercion but also shape

consent through ideological means, such as media, education, and religion, to control and subjugate marginalized groups. The post-Partition treatment of Muslims in India, unfairly labeled as enemies or terrorists, exemplifies how these power dynamics force individuals into resistance, as they challenge the dominant narratives and seek to reclaim their identities and agency in the face of both coercion and consent. In *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*, Arundhati Roy critiques the ideological manipulation of jihad in Kashmir, showing how it fuels violence and exposes the state's complicity in the conflict.

The quote, “The inbuilt idiocy of jihad has seeped into Kashmir…” (173), reveals the irrationality of using religion for political purposes, leading to destruction. Greenblatt's new historicism would analyze how these political and ideological forces shape the identities of those involved in resistance movements. Anjum’s creation of a sanctuary for marginalized people, described as "a Jannat for those whom history had cast aside" (45), symbolizes resistance against societal rejection. The doomed love between Tilottama and Nimmi, “a battle against the world, one they knew they were destined to lose” (175), represents the tension between personal agency and societal control, turning their love into an act of defiance. This personal resistance mirrors larger political conflicts, reflecting the struggle of Kashmir’s resistance to state oppression. Greenblatt’s idea that “the private and the public, the personal and the political, are inextricably linked” is evident throughout Roy’s narrative, where personal stories intertwine with historical events, prompting readers to reconsider notions of belonging and exclusion in the context of modern India. Roy also critiques the normalization of violence in Kashmir, seen in the quote, “There were massacres, rapes, and injustices that no one even pretended to forget. They just became part of the landscape” (90). This line emphasizes how historical repression and

desensitization to violence have made traumatic events part of the region's entrenched history, reflecting the broader impact of global economic structures, exploitation, and political extremism on marginalized communities. The novel critiques the failure of revolutionary movements, as exemplified by Shalini's reflection on the internal conflict between personal identity and political allegiance: "My party is my mother and father; many times, it does many wrong things" (425). This reveals the moral complexities of revolutionary movements, where idealism clashes with the human cost of violence. In *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*, Roy's narrative of resistance amplifies the voices of the marginalized, using characters like Anjum and Tilottama to challenge societal and political structures, illustrating how the oppressed fight to reclaim their agency and resist the forces that seek to silence them. Through a new historicist lens, these personal and political struggles reflect how historical forces shape identity and societal norms. The graveyard where Tilo finds a sense of belonging symbolizes a counter-narrative to state ideologies, providing marginalized individuals with space to reclaim agency.

Similarly, Revathy's rape exposes the intersection of political conflict and ongoing gender oppression, demonstrating how even revolutionary movements can perpetuate systemic inequalities. Roy's work critiques these cultural ideologies, revealing the limitations of resistance movements in addressing the full spectrum of oppression. It highlights the complexities of political resistance and the persistence of systemic oppression, showing how revolutionary movements often fail to confront the intersectional struggles faced by marginalized communities.

> It is precisely the idea of society as a system, a set of institutions that must give way to something. The power system is to abolish both real and scientific categories. Man is a free human subject is a subject of a certain sort, naturally

> good, warmly sociable, kind, and loving. Men and women are social creations, the products of codes and disciplines. (61)

It is suggesting that societal power structures shape individuals through ideological and institutional forces, and resistance arises when these constructed identities challenge the systems that seek to define and control them. One affects another and is itself affected. Musa is portrayed as a resistance figure deeply embedded in the Kashmiri struggle for autonomy and freedom. This means that Musa's role as a resistance figure is deeply intertwined with the broader political context of the Kashmiri struggle for autonomy and freedom. His actions and identity are shaped by and, in turn, influence the ongoing conflict, illustrating the interconnectedness of individual resistance and larger political movements. The speaker of this powerful statement is Musa, who asserts that...

> Musa Kashmiri characters who show clear picture of their circumstance: one day Kashmiri will make India self-distrust in the same way. You may have blinded all of us every one of us with your pellet's guns by then. But you will still have eyes to see what you have done to us; you are hot destroying us. You are constructing us. It is yourselves that you are destroying. Khuda Hafiz, Garson bhai, with that he left I never saw him again. (433)

Its statement reflects the resilience and defiance of the Kashmiri people, asserting that despite the violence and oppression they face, India will ultimately destroy itself through its This statement emphasizes that individuals are shaped by the cultural and historical systems around them, suggesting that identity and behavior are not innate but are products of societal codes, power structures, and disciplines. Essentially, men and women are products of society, with their identities molded by its institutions and power dynamics. New historicism critiques how power systems shape behavior and

identity, arguing that individuals are not free agents but are influenced by ideologies constructed culturally and historically. The concept of the "free human subject" underscores that freedom is a societal construct, shaped by ideology and power relations.

Roy's narrative intertwines real historical events with the lives of her characters, making the novel both a historical critique and anti-factual commentary. New historicism asserts that literature is crucial for understanding and critiquing these power structures, which affect society in both positive and negative ways. The clash of cultures in the narrative highlights the cross-cultural impact of these historical and societal forces. From a New Historicist perspective, Musa Kashmiri's quote critiques the political oppression in Kashmir, highlighting the tension between personal agency and larger historical forces. It underscores how the violence inflicted on the Kashmiri people is not only destructive to individuals but also self-destructive for the oppressors. Musa's defiance becomes part of a broader historical narrative of resistance and self-determination. The extract also reflects the psychological disintegration caused by cultural domination. Linking this to Greenblatt's New Historicism, we see how Musa's story in *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* reveals the historical, cultural, and political power dynamics in Kashmir. It shows oppression of one group by another can sometimes be seen as a way for both groups to survive, possibly by maintaining power dynamics that, in a twisted way, sustain the system. It implies that the oppressed group may endure through resistance or adaptation, while the oppressors maintain control, creating a survival mechanism for both within a harmful system.

According to the fictional writer Sir Walter Scott in *Old Morality*, "Fiction is a literary genre where the story takes place in the past, and through fiction, the past is

interpreted" (55). The statement suggests that fiction, particularly historical fiction, allows the past to be reinterpreted and examined through the lens of contemporary perspectives. In the context of the narrative of resistance and contemporary politics, this means that fictional narratives can illuminate the struggles and resistances of marginalized groups in the past, shedding light on the ongoing political issues in the present. By exploring past injustices—such as colonialism, caste oppression, or religious conflict—through fiction, writers like Arundhati Roy can critique current political systems, highlighting the persistence of these issues and the need for resistance. Fiction becomes a tool to revisit history, challenge dominant ideologies, and explore how the past continues to shape present-day political struggles.

New historicism is a literary criticism that makes the blend between reality and fiction. Through fiction, the bitter reality is revealed. New historicism is a blend of fact and fiction of the past. There for, by showing her skills, the writer has spoken the voice of the oppressed group in the society. Rather, it is the voice of the author through his art of presentation, and this is reality. Through the lens of new historicism, fiction serves as a powerful tool for blending the past with the present, revealing the complexities of historical realities. As Sir Walter Scott suggests, fiction interprets the past, and through this artistic medium, Arundhati Roy gives voice to the oppressed, highlighting societal struggles and offering a critique of historical and political forces. By intertwining fact and fiction, the writer not only presents the voice of the marginalized but also reflects the broader dynamics of power, resistance, and cultural identity. Madhav observes that the people involved in the conflict are not confused but rather have a kind of intense, "terrible clarity" about their positions—though this clarity is outside the frameworks of modern geopolitics. Madhav says:

Their problem is not confusion, not really. It’s more like a terrible clarity that

> exists outside the language of modern geopolitics. All the protagonists on all sides of the conflict, especially us, exploited this fault line mercilessly. It made for a perfect war – a war that can never be won or lost, a war without an end. The chant that I heard on the phone that morning was condensed, distilled passion – and it was as blind and as futile as passion usually is. During those (fortunately short-lived) occasions when it was full cry, it had the power to cut through history and geography, of reason and politics. (181)

The quote shows how the endless and unwinnable conflict, fueled by blind passion and ideological fervor, challenges traditional geopolitical frameworks, revealing how individuals and groups, through their intense emotions, resist being defined or constrained by historical or political systems.

It is illustrating how the conflict described is driven by a distorted clarity, where intense, blind passion fuels an endless, unresolvable war, transcending reason, history, and politics. This quote describes a conflict driven by blind, intense passion that transcends reason and politics, creating an endless and unwinnable war. It highlights how all parties exploit these divisions, resulting in a "perfect war"—one that is futile and without resolution. The "chant" and the emotional nature of the conflict emphasize how powerful emotions, rather than reason or politics, fuel the violence in the region. Madhav's reflection in the novel underscores the deep emotional, ideological, and historical dimensions of the Kashmir conflict, showing how personal experiences are inseparable from the larger historical context. This passage critiques the political and geopolitical structures that perpetuate such conflicts, illustrating how intense emotions, rather than rational or diplomatic solutions, drive the violence. It also highlights how the war exists outside modern geopolitical frameworks, where historical and geographical factors are overshadowed

by a blind passion, leading to an ongoing, intractable struggle. It addresses the dangers of ideological and emotional fervor in politics, where reason and reconciliation are often overshadowed.

Through the lens of New Historicism, this reflects how historical and political forces shape individual lives, highlighting the personal struggles of marginalized people in the midst of broader social and political upheaval. The relationship between Ziauddin and the character symbolizes an attempt to reclaim agency and find peace in a politically charged environment, showcasing how individuals resist and navigate historical forces that seek to erase or oppress them. Similarly, the next critic, Archana Thapa, in her article *Redemption and Beyond*, examines how the themes of suffering and survival in Arundhati Roy's work reflect:

> Larger socio-political dynamics of Kashmir, offering a critical perspective on the ways in which individuals are shaped by historical and political forces. Shah's fiction successfully syntheses the national and personal traumas Of an affluent family that experiences a socio-economic fall because of The conflict. It also recounts how their sufferings deepen as the country Moves forward towards an uncertain future. (6)

It explores how the socio-political situation in Kashmir shapes individuals, focusing on the trauma experienced by an affluent family that faces a socio-economic downfall due to the conflict, while also depicting the worsening of their suffering as the country moves toward an uncertain future. The idea of a "fall" illustrates how personal fortunes are vulnerable to larger historical forces.

Regardless of a family’s wealth or privilege, national crises such as wars or partitions can lead to their financial and social decline, reflecting the experiences of individuals or families once prosperous but devastated by national conflicts. In Shah’s

fiction, personal and national traumas are connected. An affluent family experiences deep suffering. This happens as the country faces an uncertain future. Similarly, Anjum's life in *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* shows personal trauma. She struggles with her gender identity. Her life also reflects national trauma. This is symbolized by political unrest and violence in India. This parallel emphasizes how Shah's and Roy's works intertwine personal and national narratives. Archana Thapa's article, "Redemption and Beyond," explores Shah's portrayal of these connected traumas, linking them to the Maoist conflict in India. This framework of combining personal and national experiences of conflict can also be applied to Roy's novel through the lens of new historicism, where historical and political events shape individual lives.

As Foucault states, "to maintain dominance of power, it must circulate in numerous discourses, namely religion" (301). It shows, to maintain dominance, power must flow through various discourses, such as religion, to influence and control society. For Foucault asserts that power circulates through various discourses, including religion. Religion becomes a critical tool for social and political control. In *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*, the narrative of resistance shows how dominant ideologies in cultural and religious discourses marginalize voiceless communities. These ideologies also reinforce systemic oppression. Through New Historicism, Roy's work explores the relationship between literature, historical realities, and power structures. It shows how religion reflects culture while also shaping and sustaining societal control. Foucault's idea of power techniques and Greenblatt's New Historicism both highlight the complexity of power and resistance. In literature, power is challenged not only at a broad social level but also within specific systems and techniques that sustain it. Foucault's concept of the "multiplicity of force

relations" suggests that power operates through a web of interconnected social, political, and cultural dynamics, rather than as a monolithic force. Roy's work exemplifies how resistance is directed at these techniques—such as legal, political, and cultural norms—not just at power in its broadest sense. In *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*, Arundhati Roy critiques state and social systems by exposing the mechanisms of power that marginalize and oppress various groups. This aligns with Foucault's idea that effective resistance targets the specific techniques that sustain power.

Foucault's theory of power, discourse, and truth argues that only those who hold power have the ability to define and control truth. As he suggests, the historical conditions for the emergence of truth are shaped by those in power, which is often reflected in the control of discourse. This idea is echoed in Perry Anderson's *The Indian Ideology*, where he states, "the elite believe what they want to believe, as always everybody believed, what they wanted to believe" (61). Roy critiques how elites—whether political, economic, or cultural leaders—manipulate narratives to maintain their control. They create and promote ideologies that serve their needs, reinforcing the status quo at the expense of marginalized or oppressed communities. In Roy's novel, this manipulation is challenged as she gives voice to the "have-nots" and critiques the exploitation of lower classes by capitalist systems. Parul Sehgal, in her review *"Arundhati Roy's Fascinating Mess: Being an Activist and an Artist Tricker than it Sounds,"* reveals how Roy intertwines her activism and artistry to highlight these power structures, making her resistance both personal and political. Parul Sehgal, in her review of Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*, titled *"Arundhati Roy's Fascinating Mess: being an Activist and an Artist Tricker than it Sounds."* In this review, Sehgal discusses how Roy's novel portrays various

marginalized characters who embody different resistance movements in India, such as queer individuals, addicts, Muslims, orphans, and others who are casualties of India's political and social struggles. Parul Sehgal's review shows:

> It tours India's fault lines, as Roy has from the brutal suppression of tribal population to Gujarat. Just about every resistance movement is embodied in a character, and the lines and struggles of these characters intersect. The queer, addicts, Muslims, orphan, and other casualties of the national project of making India great again find one another and form a raucous community of sorts. (5)

It is representing various oppressed groups, unite to challenge the national project of exclusion and oppression in India. It suggests that the novel doesn't just tell individual stories, but rather shows how the struggles of various groups (the queer, the addicts, Muslims, orphans, etc.) There was suppression inside people. The review underscores how Roy's novel engages with India's "fault lines," referencing the various social, political, and religious divides that shape the nation's history.

In new historicism, literature is viewed as a product of its historical and cultural context, and texts are seen as reflective of the power dynamics, ideologies, and social tensions of the time. Stephen Greenblatt, a leading proponent of this approach, emphasizes the interplay between literature and history, focusing on how literary works critique or reinforce dominant historical narratives. People have forgotten the value of humanity. They formed the religious traits by which led to the bloodshed environment. The community was so much conservative there was the slogan " Musalmano ka ek hi sthan! Qabristhan ya Pakistan! (Only one place for the Musalman! The graveyard or Pakistan!") (62). the slogan is a clear example of hegemonic discourse that seeks to silence and exclude the Muslim community in

India, reinforcing Greenblatt's concept of power dynamics in culture. It also highlights the plight of the subaltern, who, in this case, is forced into a binary existence and silenced by dominant nationalistic forces. This directly reflects how the subaltern is denied a voice within dominant political narratives. The slogan is a reflection of the hegemonic discourse of a majoritarian, exclusionary nationalism. Writer argues that literature and culture are not just products of their historical moment but also key sites where power struggles are fought. In this case, the slogan represents an expression of a dominant political ideology that seeks to exert control over the Muslim community through violence and exclusion.

In conclusion, Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* embodies Greenblatt's new historicist principles by intertwining personal stories with historical contexts, critiquing power structures, and giving voice to the marginalized. Through characters like Anjum, whose journey defies societal norms and exposes systemic inequalities, the novel challenges dominant ideologies while highlighting the ongoing quest for justice in an unequal society. Roy's narrative exemplifies the dynamics of repression, resistance, and societal transformation, serving as both a critique of India's socio-political evolution and a broader commentary on the marginalization of vulnerable communities. This critique resonates strongly with contemporary political realities, where issues of systemic oppression, the marginalization of minorities, and the fight for inclusivity remain pressing. The struggles faced by Roy's characters mirror the global rise of social justice movements, such as those advocating for transgender rights, refugee support, and environmental justice. Similarly, the novel's depiction of state failures and societal divisions reflects ongoing political crises, where governments often neglect the needs of marginalized groups while prioritizing dominant narratives of power. Using a new historicist lens, this research underscores

the importance of subversion as a response to suppression, portraying the dissatisfaction and resistance of the downtrodden against socio-political injustices. By highlighting the parallels between the fictional struggles in *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* and real-world resistance movements, Roy's work becomes a powerful call to action, urging readers to confront and challenge systems of oppression and to envision a more inclusive and equitable society.

Works Cited

Anderson, Perry. *The Indian Ideology*. Verso, 2012, p. 61.

Brannigan, John. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. Macmillan, 1998, p. 7.

Brannigan, John. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. Palgrave Macmillan, 1998.

Foucault, Michael. *The History of Sexuality*. Vintage Press, 1979.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*. University of California Press, 1988.

Greenblatt, Stephen, and Catherine Gallagher. *Practicing New Historicism*. University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Guha, Ramchandra. *India After Gandhi: The History of the World's Largest Democracy*. Harper Collins Press, 2007, pp. 29-81.

Kakutani, Michiko. "Arundhati Roy's Long-Awaited Novel Is an Ambitious Look at Turmoil in India." *The New York Times*, 5 June 2017.

Mukharjee, Pranab. *The Dramatic Decades: The Indira Gandhi Years*. Rupa Press, 2015.

Roy, Arundhati. *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*. Penguin, 2017.