

I. Ethnic and Personal Experience in Roth's Works

This research is based on Philip Roth's *American Pastoral*, which analyzes the discourse about communism as terrorism is a perspective and truth about communism as terrorism is product of power. Merry bombs American cities and post offices, indulges in the murder of Dr. Fred Conlon. And finally gives up all these violent activities then confesses her guilt, but even after her confession her guilt narrator takes her as terrorist. The researcher argues that Merry's unsuccessful revolt is taken as the terrorist activities for narrator, which is only product of power and one way of interpretation. Rita Cohen takes these activities as a way to challenge the capitalistic norms, values and the way try to dominate minorities. Same event can be interpreted from different perspectives. The narrator's refusal to accept her as the political cadre, moreover than that even after the latter abandons violent activities narrator names her as exterrorist nor as general reinforces the theme of knowledge of terrorism as a perspective and truth as the product of power.

American Pastoral is a story of Jewish character called Swede Levov an outstanding man in every respect, whose only goal is to live a tranquil, pastoral life in rural Old Rimrock, New Jersey. But his rebellious sixteen year old daughter, Merry, gets caught up in the anti-Vietnam war movement and plants a bomb at the local post office, that kills one person. Even after her confession, she still suffers from her previous act of bombing. She becomes fugitive in the sight of law. And in the process of hiding she is dead and her cause of death is not discovered until the end of novel.

Roth deftly weaves social criticism into this compelling story for an entire generation blindsided by the great upheavals of the 1960s. Critic Charles Mcgrath believes: "Roth describes [. . .] postwar American life that have had the greatest

impact on my generation” (8). Political impact has been shown a kind of terrorism in young generation of sixties.

The general American characterization of the ethnic experience and the unique tension is the main characteristic of Roth’s so many works. His many of the subsequent works involved Jewish American dilemmas. Presenting a Jewish character in novels Mark Shechner points out that:

Roth has felt the need to establish his credentials by taking a stand on cultural myths to which he calls “ethical Jew hood”, the belief that the Jewish character is one that places a premium on generosity, abstinence, concern, responsibility, and civilization, a view for which Malamud’s early books spoke with gloomy confidence. (232)

Roth as psychological novelist brings psychoanalysis into the fictional medium, the relentlessness with which he has pursued his libidinal mysteries from *Portony’s Complaint* (1969), *The Breast* (1972), and *My Life as a Man* (1974). Through these books, the conception of narrator as patient is a way of employing flashbacks, digressions and epiphanies. The important effect of psycholoanalytic setting on Roth’s language is the freedom and energy of language to sluice out the material: the natural internal monologue of comedy and pain.

Roth’s development as a novelist is the development of past, of a growing cosmopolitanism along with a deepening interest in basic human concerns and predicaments. Chief among those predicaments is the struggle between the id and the superego or, in less Freudian terms, between the drive for sensual gratification and the drive for moral uprightness.

Roth's protagonists are usually self-conscious. They understand their predicaments with uncommon self perception. Character's awareness and frustration combine to make the reader laugh. Another distinct feature of Roth's character is that their experience mirrors the author's own life. The character who appears most frequently in Roth's novel is the writer Nathan Zuckerman, through whom Roth explores the problems of the writer as well as the tragicomic aspects of Jewish assimilation in the United States.

Roth's modernity distinguishes him as a writer lies in his strategies of fictional attack. The erotic yearnings and inhibitions of Malamud's fiction, Bellow's and Singers have been turned by Roth into very topics of his investigation. *Portnoy's Complaints* winning blend of cultural rebellion, raunchy humor, and boyish hijink, are sufficient to gain Roth a mass audience. Mark Shechner describes: "Roth's agitated equipoise spoke for a capacity to withdraw from his emotions at the point of greatest angst and to have fun with shame, sexual confusion, and a hopelessness bondage to childhood, even while performing a frantic exorcism" (235).

Philip Roth, born in the Weequatic section of New-York, New Jersey, on March 19, 1933. He was graduated from Weequatic High school in 1950 and worked for a while at the Newark public library and attended Newark College of Rutgers University. A year later, he transferred to Bucknell University, at Bucknell Roth began writing stories and edited the school's literary magazine. He received his B. A. in English, Margna Cum Laude in 1954, and he accepted a teaching fellowship at the University of Chicago for graduate work in English.

Roth's continuity in writing short stories in Chicago to pursue doctoral studies in English. These short stories had begun to get published as the fall of 1954 in small literary journals such as the Chicago Review and Epoch. Several of his stories were

anthologized in Martha Foley's *Best American Short Stories* and in the *O. Henry Prize Stories*. After his first full-length novel, *Letting Go* was published in 1962. He became writer in-residence at Princeton University. He later taught English literature at University of Pennsylvania. He got an experience of an academic provided much material for novels.

Roth won numerous prestigious awards for his work. In 1998 he won the Pulitzer Prize for *American Pastoral* and he received the national medal of arts at the White House. In 2002 he received the highest award of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, the gold medal in fiction, previously awarded to John Dos Passos, William Faulkner, and Saul Bellow among others. He has twice won the national Book Award, the PEN/Faulkner Award for *Operations Shylock* and the National Book Award for *Sabbath's Theater*.

Roth's early works clearly shows the influence of his literary idols-Henry James, Leo Tolstoy, Gustave Flaubert, Thomas Wolfe, and Theodor Dreiser. Philip Roth came into his own as novelist beginning with *Portony's Complaint*, which reveals a unique voice in American literature. His subsequent development parallels his growing interest in other continental writers such as Anton Chekhov, Franz Kafka, Fyodor Dostoevsky and particularly contemporary writers such as Milan Kundera whom Roth assisted in getting his works published in America.

Novels such as *Portony's Complaint* (1962), *The Counter Life* (1986), and *Operation Shylock* (1993) characters are struggling to reconcile their desires to be fully American triumphalism with their deeply ingrained sense of separateness. More than a touch of local color, his depiction of Jewish communities from a base from which to spin-and-unspin-national and personal narrative.

Political and historical issues are depicted in *The Human Stain* (2000) and *The Plot Against America* (2004). In *The Human Stain* an academic scandal reflects the political scandal that brought U. S. president Bill Clinton's impeachment in 1998. *The Human Stain* was made into a motion picture starring Anthony Hopkins and Nicole Kidman in 2003. Roth continued to reflect on U. S. politics and history in *The Plot Against America* (2004), which takes place in an imagined America where aviation hero Charles Lindbergh runs as republican candidate for president in 1940 on a peace-with-Hitler platform and defeats Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Dying Animal (2001) is the history of David Kepesh; an English professor sleeps with the student Consuela Castillo, who leaves him devastated and pinning for her before returning a decade later with breast cancer, which ravages his psyche as it does her body. Many critics to be discussed below attempt to resurrect Roth and hail him for his attempts in speaking out female body marks the whole fictional venture

The character Zukerman is focus of many Roth's novels. His fictional experience mirrors Roth's own life. And a number of critics have identified Zukerman as Roth's alter ego. Zukerman is the focus of *The Ghost Writer* (1979), in which Zukerman at the beginning of a promising career as a writer. Similarly Zukerman is leading character in *Zukerman Unbound* (1981), *The Anatomy Lesson* (1983), *The Prague Orgy* (1985) and in *The Counterlife* (1986). His sage continues in *The Counter* (1987) and appears in *The Facts* (1988), which is primarily about Roth's own life. Nathan Zukerman returns to narrate *American Pastoral* (1997) and *I Married a Communist* (1998).

Sabbath's Theater (1995) a novel about an aging pornographic puppeteer obsesses with death and socially proscribed forms of sex. Mickey Sabbath's perverse confessions and the absurd situations Sabbath creates for himself may remind some of

Roth's early novel *Portnoy's Complaint*. Yet whereas Alexander Portnoy is tortured by his conflicting desire to be an American model. But there is not conflict to satisfy his sexual longings, in Sabbath. *Portnoy's Complaint* revolves around Portnoy's confessions; *Sabbath's Theater* revolves around Sabbath's unapologetic revealing in nastiness.

In *American Pastoral*, constructing an ideal home, Swede believes that he has replicated the ideals of America; the family becomes a source of the reproduction of ideology. But the ideal of America is challenged by Merry's protest. Jay L. Halio analyzes the novel as:

Merry's protests against the Vietnam war turn into ever more violent, clichéd complaints, against American imperialism-capitalism, bourgeois complacency and finally, her family's own success story. She bombs the town's post office, killing a well loved doctor and challenging her father's understanding of his life and his country. (291)

Merry's family strongly dedicated towards American capitalistic. Merry's protest against the American capitalistic ideology becomes revolution against her own family's success story. Another critic Louis Menand takes *American Pastoral* as a novel about a good man punished for his virtues. Swede becomes victim of 1960s revolution. Louis Menand elaborates it as:

Swede may be considered a job figure and that the novel ends with a question mark, as if Swede's fall is totally mysterious; [. . .] The novel is "about the corruption of American life by the culture of liberal permissiveness", as if Roth were taking back Portnoy's Complaint and perhaps even turning toward "the cultural right". (94)

Merry as the anarchic center of the novel and a postmodern horror, forces Swede to confront the falsity of his self. He perceives the postmodern as a threat to stable cultural identities rather than, as some have argued, an ethical challenge to master narratives. Timothy Parrish argues, “Roth, reconsidering his earlier affirmation of the postmodern self over a Jewish identity, gives the last word to Luo Levov, representing the “laws of the father” (96).

Leo Marx notes that there is a difference between the rustic who lives the simple life of a shepherd and the modern man or woman who adopts the trappings of a, “sentimentalized image of the simple, unworldly ‘common man’” (56). In contrast, Merry attacks the materialism of hegemonic American culture that ignores the poverty and powerlessness of the disenfranchised. Marx perceives:

Merry moves outside the system, attacking the basic of middle class values. After years of attempting to follow the speech patterns of normative society, she angrily renounces “the appearance and allegiances of the good little girl” and ridiculous significance she had given to that stutter to meet the Rimrock expectation. (101)

Swede never understands how his pastoral vision of America gave birth to Merry’s anger, self-styled revolutionary. Roth’s term counters pastoral in his novel itself involves pastoral yearnings. Frederick Karl notes:

The Swede desires to build his pastoral within the confines of a US consensus ideology that celebrates the American dream-epitomized by the individual embracing a puritan work ethic and climbing the ladder of capitalistic success . . . his daughter’s strategy of pastoral disengagement aims to destroy that consensus ideology , ejecting her

father out of his pastoral Eden[. . .] Roth investigates the way that

“benign national myth” helped to produce that demonic reality”. (78)

In this way, Roth’s *American Pastoral* has been analyzed from various perspectives.

But the issue of terrorism in the novel has not been explored yet. The research project

has been divided into four sections. The first section of the research is general

introduction of writer as an ethnic and personal experience expressed in his writings.

The second section deals with the discussion of methodology of terrorism. And third

section is the textual analysis of novel where the novel has been analyzed from the

perspectives of terrorism. The last section deals with the conclusion of the entire

research.

II. Discourse of Terrorism

Discourse refers to the web of language or social interaction that relatively binds the areas of social knowledge. It enables –writing, speaking and thinking within specific time period and place. So it is the representation of different form of beliefs or signs of the system of language. It helps power to produce knowledge and truth. Discourse is created through various act of representation by different people. Different discourses are produced in the society. And among them; power enables one discourse as a rule governed language, which includes a set of rules and convention that govern the way common people talk about the things. Discourses become passive, along with the changeability with power another discourse about the same thing comes in mainstream that becomes truth and the former notion becomes something else.

Objectives of representation within the discourse are attempted to prove the idea that representation really carries the reality. Representation is only medium to represent about some concept as it is the part of reality. Representation coordinates between the world and our consciousness in the form which creates a condition that representation becomes truth about certain things. About the relation between representation of discourse and reality, Alec Mchoul and Wendy Grace state as: “discourse do not merely represent ‘the real’ and in fact they are part of its production then which discourse is ‘best’ cannot be decided by comparing it with any real objects. The ‘real’ object simply isn’t available for comparison outside its discursive construction” (35). Representation is only the representation of reality, representation is only a condition of presenting reality. The condition within the discourse produces imagination, in that matter Alec Mchoul and Wendy Grace state as:

Both ‘the world’ and our consciousness of it are effects of the kinds of representations we can make of it. But, at the same time, discourse is not just a form of representation; it is a material condition (or set of conditions) which enables and constrains the socially productive ‘imagination’. These conditions can therefore be referred to as ‘discourse’ or discursive of possibility. (34)

Power establishes knowledge with the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse. Power is the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge. Discourse always circulates in dynamic circulation. Knowledge is the foundation for the circularity of discourse. It is also associated with power because power plays an important role to circulate discourse, which creates knowledge. Paul Rainbow believes, “Formulation of knowledge is the result of a certain form of the exercise of power” (199). Power enables to accept discourse as reality. Power operates within the system, that system establishes a truth. Truth is the result of the exercising of the power within that system which is neither true nor false. But it is only a perspective, which is a result of exercise of power.

Truth emerges within the system of knowledge. The system of knowledge’s linkage with different sectors of society gives a condition that produces the truth. Power’s essential link is always between power relations and their capacity to produce truth in the system of knowledge and its relation with different sectors. Alec and Wendy analyze Foucault’s notion as:

The system of knowledge Foucault scrutinizes imply immediate and solid connections to social relations; economics, medicine, and the human sciences; but unlike mathematics they can function as sciences only by relying on the densest and most complex field of positivity.

Thus the conditions required for the production of truth within these knowledge are muchness stable and far more difficult to control. (58)

Truth is result of practice of power, that power is exercised within a system, that system establish a norm which regulates and orderly circulates as truth within that system. Foucault argues that “truth is understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements” (1145). Truth is related to the system of power in circular form, Foucault says, “Truth is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produces and sustains it, and to effects of power” (1145).

Truth is neither outside the power nor it lacks power but it associates within the system. It induces regular effects of power. Power creates knowledge that helps to establish truth. Truth is produced under the discourse which is formulated by power. Paul Rainbow argues, “power produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production” (205). Power enables to accept any discourse as reality as Foucault believes, “It traverses and produces thing. It induces, pleasure, forms, knowledge, produces discourse” (1139).

We can take an example of the notion of terrorism in relation to the different perspectives; different discourses produce to justify their perspectives towards the definition of terrorism. In defining process terrorism is defined with relation of the violent action which evokes mass terror, more than that it causes physically harming of human being for political or social purpose. In the process of defining terrorism, basically two factors include within it. First it is concerned with the violent activities that is generally cruel and destroys the peaceful environment of people. At this point, the term defines with the features of violence and disorder of laws. Terrorism is

organized attack upon the innocence. The act of murdering innocence supports to authority to define revolutionary as terrorist. At this time the reason behind the origin of revolution cannot justify the deeds of revolutionary. C.A.J. Coady takes the Yasser Arafat's notion that gives importance to the killing of innocence as certainly the act of terrorism, "Yasser Arafat's condemnation of terrorism when he said:... no degree of oppression and no level of desperation can ever justify the killing of innocent civilians. I condemn terrorism. I condemn the killing of innocent civilians, whether they are Israeli, American or Palestinian" (39). The action causes the destruction of innocent people is the focus point to define the terrorism for Yasser Arafat. The definition does not mention the causes of violence, it highlights only act of killing. But the action of murder cannot be justified by showing the oppression because the act of killing is certainly unacceptable. Thus, the terrorism is defined with relation of destruction of human beings.

Terrorism is viewed from the perspective of the destruction of innocent people. It brings the chaos and disorder in the society. Terrorism becomes as adjectives to the viewer of the violence. Revolutionary never want label them as terrorist. But they become terrorist from the other corner of the society who creates a discourse that relates revolution with the action of terrorism. C.A.J. Coady takes that events and highlights from the action of revolutionary as terrorist, "the fact is of course that most observers, and especially the press, describe any revolutionary as a terrorist and virtually any revolutionary use of violence as terrorism, including even the killing of soldier" (63). Encounter with soldier and murder of that event also describes as an action of terrorism. Sometime the violence becomes as an action of terrorism through the murder of innocence and it also becomes as an action of

terrorism when an armed person dies in the encounter of revolutionary force. Thus it is a perspective from which it describes the action.

Revolution becomes an act of terrorism for the authority who never wants to lose their power to control over the minority. Violence becomes disorder of society because of its nature to challenge the authority. The way revolutionary forces want to change the system that certainly brings the environment of chaos in society. The chaos is compared with the destruction of the social relation with individual. C.A.J. Coady defines that situation as, “the distinctive point of terrorism as a tactic it will be said, is to terrorize to spread fear and so destabilize social relation” (53). The terrorism is defined through its impact upon the tradition which is now going to modernize, but it is compared with only the future that the way now some challenges the system. If terrorism continuously goes on, that establishes the tradition of terrorism. Lawrence C. Hamilton and James D. Hamilton takes the terrorism as, “each terrorist act actually reduces the probability of future terrorism” (44). The situation is compared with the future’s activities as the same way because its impact upon the upcoming generation. They again takes the terrorism as a failure movement to bring any changes as, “terrorism is usually unsuccessful in bringing about the social changes sought by the terrorism” (41).

Terrorism is a situation for authority where many people are guided by the false ideology. The ideology becomes false for authority because it challenges the authority in form of violence against repression. The violence is the result of misinformed by the rebels for the authority. C.A.J. Coady argues that the growing causes of terrorism as:

If moral responsibility requires the satisfaction of both knowledge and freedom condition with respect to the action performed , then many

wrong doing combatants don't realize that they are doing wrong because they have been misinformed or "brain-washed" by patriotic or ideological conditioning. (144)

The definition highlights that the group of rebels shows the violent action only because they cannot judge the situation by using logic. So they take the wrong doing as their pride.

Discourse supports authority to compare the activities of revolutionary groups with terrorism. On other hand authority also uses the method to secure the power forever. C.A.J. Coady brings the example as, "the idea that governments and authorized governmental instrumentalized do or can use terrorist methods for their political purpose" (54). The violence used by the authority defines in such a way that it is compulsory to establish social norm and necessity to fight against them to establish peace, law and order. In the history of war the authority adopts cruel method to remain powerful and the purpose is defined in such a way that relates with the political purpose rather than the killing of innocent people. In the history of war, there are lots of examples where the government directly involved destroying the general people. The attack on German cities by Britain, C. A. J. Coady argues, "The British strategic bombing of German population centers was condemned at the time as immoral because it was a direct attack upon non-combatants" (57).

Federal Bureau of Investigation defines terrorism as, "terrorism is the unlawful use of force, or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment therefore in furtherance of political or social objectives" (38). Within this definition the act which is violence against the civilian, that act is terroristic. But state never takes it as like that because of its control over power. Jenny Teichman brings Walter Liqueur as, "in defense

against a tyrant responsible for imposing a reign of terror on his people. As examples he mentions the anti-communist rebels in Afghanistan, and the man who plotted against Hitler. Implicit in his thinking is the idea that terrorism is justified when its aim are good” (514). Cause may be the government itself because government also practices state terrorism. Jenny Teichman brings some government’s decision as terrorism as, “the wide definition if applied to the state would force us to categorize all punishment, including justified punishment, as terrorism” (512). Destruction of human beings is always from the side of terrorist group. States always tend to destroy the terrorists at this process by killing the innocence people. Jenny Teichman further argues, “An aim will hit at mass targets, which of course include soft targets e.g. schools, hospitals, women and children and old people. Atrocities on this scale are normally carried out by states not by rebels” (516).

Terrorism is not only the concerned with the revolutionary groups. Terrorism is also defined as the results of the government’s activities to secure its political power forever. That act also causes mass terror or harming of human bodies. Jenny Teichman quoted Noam Chomsky and Walter Laquer’s notion about terrorism as:

Some contemporary philosopher, such as Chomsky, insists that government is capable of terrorism. And the historian Walter Laquer holds that Hitler and Stalin both practiced state terrorism, which he says is made up of acts of terrorism carried out by governments against their own people. (58)

Authority adopts the terrorist method to remain powerful. That act causes the atmosphere of terroristic environment for general people. That act is state terrorism, where people are physically destroyed by government itself. Hitler misuses power

towards general innocent people on the name of nationalism Stalin also practiced terroristic method on the name of empowering minority.

Terrorism is activities that cause the physical destruction of innocent people who are not involved in war. Within this definition a lots of examples are in history of World War. It justifies that the state is also the main root of the terrorism but the cause of that act is defined another way that is necessary to maintain peace, law and order in the world. Rebel's action is compared as an act of terrorism and authority's action are justified through another perspective. C. A. J. Coady brings the example as:

The Allied area bombing of German cities in world war and the US nuclear attacks upon Hiroshima and Nagasaki are just two outstanding examples where enterprise was to slaughter non-combatants and hence was plainly immoral on the internal perspective and yet was 'justified' in utilitarian terms. (56)

The physical destruction of human beings by the state becomes only a way to defend terrorism. But in reality that destruction of human beings is not the way to defend it. It is a way to threaten the general people to revolt against the authority. It is the exercising of military force to remain powerful forever. Authority never mentions the fact behind the mass destruction. They only produce a discourse that they encounter the forces that are against the law of country. Thus authority firstly defines the group of revolutionary forces as terrorists. And authority tries to control over the group, in that process authority gives the psychological punishment to the relatives of the family members. Innocent people, who are not involved in violence, are being terrified by the act of government, then the government justifies that they are involved in the conspiracy against the law. That example is what C. A. Coady uses:

Other legal systems have sometimes though it efficient to punish family members very severely for crimes committed by their relatives. Even where the family members knew nothing of the behavior and would have deplored it. This is what is normally meant by “vicarious punishment” and even those who accept strict liability in some cases have generally opposed this. (50)

In society different people create different discourses to define the same term from the different perspectives because they carry different ideologies. So Jenny Teichman brings different definition of terrorism as:

Haighatchadourian holds that there are no exceptions to the (non definitional) rule that terrorism is necessarily evil. Noam Chomsky believes that the state is the main perpetrator of terrorism today; whereas Anothony Kenny and several others argue that terrorism must be defined as a type of unjust rebellion. (506)

Discourse and power relation help to formulate the knowledge that establishes truth. After the certain time period, the power changes and within this changeability the discourse of certain ideas also changes. This difference can be also viewed in the definition of terrorism. Jenny Teichman brings the definition of the *Oxford English Dictionary* as, “terrorism as; government by intimidation as carried out by the party in power in France between (1789-1794). Generally a policy intended to cause terror in those against whom it is adopted” (507). Two hundred years ago, terrorism meant an action carried out by the government. Jenny Teichman compares it in terms of past and present, “then, terrorism was thought of as a type of behavior perpetrated by governments; now it is regarded, usually though not always, as a type of behavior

directed against government” (508). After then Jenny finds out the definition of terrorism in second half of the nineteenth century as:

Targeted at Archdukes and tsars and chiefs of police. Terrorist deeds were intended to bring about political change, but were also thought of as acts of punishment, or vengeance. In short, terrorism came to mean political assignation. In Europe in those days terrorism had nothing to do with mass terror, and its exponents were proud of the label “terrorist”. (508)

Terrorism does not carry the same meaning after a long time. Because it is defined not in the term of its meaning, it is defined in favor of the authority, who do not remain in the same during the long term. With the changeability of power holder the discourse about the terrorism also changes.

Revolutionary’s goal is seize the power. And using this power revolutionary deconstructs the old system to establish new system. Franco Ferracuti takes the action as political struggle, “a terrorist act is any action carried out as part of a method of political struggle, aimed at influencing, or conquering or defending the state power, implying the use of extreme violence against innocent, non-combatant persons” (130). The action is necessary to get the state power, the violence is defined in term of political struggle.

Terrorism is not only concerned with the violent activities. It is also the result of the consciousness upon the crime which is committed in the name of law.

Oppression and injustice are the seeds of resistance. Violence becomes the way to resist against the equality. Minority groups do not have power to circulate their discourse. Their discourse becomes passive thus they adopt the violence as a political

weapon. Lawrence C. Hamilton and James D. Hamilton quoted take different authors' notion about terrorism as:

Although these authors disagree on the consequences of terrorism, they are in general agreement that its origin lies in the oppression and inequities of the system. Rebellion is then most likely (or at least, most justified- a distinction not always clearly made) where oppression and inequity are greatest. Other authors (Moss, 1972; Lutterbuck, 1975; laquer, 1977) have disputed the claim that terrorism is primarily a weapon of the miserable and oppressed and they point out that it is often the work of idle elites, particularly students and intelligentsia.

(40)

Terrorism becomes the weapon for minority to show the power towards the authority. Rebellion is against the repression and that results in the form of terrorism. So it is a way to achieve political power for revolutionary force.

Terrorism becomes protest against the inequality for the minority. Leftist takes terrorism as a weapon to challenge the capitalistic society. The terrorism is the result of repression and it reconstructs a society where terrorism will not need for inequality. Lawrence C. Hamilton and James D. Hamilton brings Hym's notion as, "he argues that terrorism improves the climate for reform, and thereby works to bring about amore just society in which terrorism is no longer necessary. On this view, terrorism is self-reducing 'and productive of peaceful, non-revolutionary change'" (40). Terrorism becomes a way to empower the minority. More than that it stops the futures violence and roots for the future peace.

Terrorism is a way to achieve political power that consist violent activities. That is adopted by the politically active groups. Violence becomes normal at the time

of revolution for social change. Violence is changed into terrorism then the cause of its reason is viewed from the political perspective. Violence's aim is to weaken the established society which is based on the unequal system and bring a modern equal society. Austine T. Turk takes the terrorism as, "Terrorism and terror are associated with the breakdown of traditional authority structures and with efforts to create modern ones. Terrorism is improbable in traditional stricter because the ideological and logistical requisites for political violence are usually lacking" (127).

Terrorism is defined on the basis of different ideologies. Communist ideology believes on the revolution, without revolution minority groups never get their rights, to get right, it is necessary to establish socialism through revolution, it is the assumption of communism. But those who do not believe on the communism, they takes socialism as the totalitarian ruling system rather than an equal society. They define revolution as an act of terrorism. This causes the mass terror and victim of the innocence. In that defining process, two different ideologies contradict each other; but those accuse becomes truth which is in power. During the time of struggle, innocent people become victims of that struggle. Because the struggle is within the society, where general, innocent people live, they become the victim of that struggle. At that time authority brings the example of victims to justify the definition of terrorism. It is injustice towards revolutionary to attach the cause of death of innocent because only revolutionary are not responsible for that act.

Truth is neither a false nor it is a truth rather it is only a perspective. Discourse creates truth by practicing power in local form. As like that westerners always create discourse about revolution of communism as an act of terrorism. In reality that terrorism is only a perspective, which is defined to protect the power where its purpose is to show the powerful in ruling for other. Same person's different

identity proves that it is only a production of different discourse about same idea. But which discourse is able to suppress other that becomes the real identity about certain thing. This is the presentation of terrorism is only the disagreement towards the different ideologies.

Terrorism as a discourse is only a perspective of description. West always tries to be superior in all sectors likes in government ruling system. So, the western hegemonic concept towards ideology of communism is terrorism because it is based on “democratic form” which is the only right system for it. But that is the only a discourse, that reinforces that in really the act of revolution is almost similar to the terrorism. In fact, neither the revolution is so much glorious grief of red fighter nor as described by western as terrorism, it is only a perspective through which one ideology is adopted and comes to create different discourses which are changed in course of change of the time, place and historical progress.

III. Definition of Communism as Terrorism in Roth's *American Pastoral*

American Pastoral constructs an ideology about the communist movement in sixties as horror and destructive. The ideology creates a discourse about the communist movement as an act of terrorism. In novel, the representation connects revolution with individual's destruction of happiness. And revolution is compared with the act of terrorist forces that the act is certainly terrorism. The character Merry becomes fugitive. And revolution fails to bring any social reform. But it causes the destruction of human beings. The ideology supports that revolutionary notion of communist is only an illusion. This discourse takes the revolution as an act of terrorism. Communist cadre Merry in the novel believes in struggle to get rights. But the character Merry gives all the violent activities. And she strongly dedicates herself in Jainism. That ideology supports the communist revolution as a crime and destructs the innocent human beings.

Communism and religion are the two different poles which never come together within one poles. But in the novel, revolutionary character Merry adopts Jain to confess her guilt. She promises never to harm human being and all living creatures. The situation helps to create a discourse that the ideology of communism as a terrorism. The ideological contradiction is the result of the different perspectives to describe the communist movement. The character as a failure revolutionary cadre changes into the religious person is only the different perspective to interpret the communist ideology.

The novel begins with Swede Levov's continuous happy life as like a capitalist thinks that his life is perfect life. He celebrates American dream, within that he finds his pastoral vision of his perfect life. Merry, her daughter rejects the father's

ideology, she takes it as a bourgeois life and starts to revolt for Vietnam. For her it becomes the counter with full of patriotic feelings:

A brand –how merry had begun, one who'd found in North Vietnam she called the democratic republic of Vietnam a country she spoke of with such patriotic feeling that, according to Dawn, one who would have thought she'd been born not at the Newark Beth Israel but at the Beth Israel in Hanoi "the Democratic Republic of Vietnam '-if I hear one more time, Seymour, I swear, I'll go out of my mind", he tried to convince her that perhaps it wasn't as bad as it sounded. (102)

Merry takes Vietnam as the democratic republic. America is known as the most "democratic nation" in the world. America is Merry's motherland but she takes Vietnam with full of patriotic feelings. Her mother Dawn is shocked when she gets experience, and shows her surprise to Swede. The cause behind why she takes the country such a way Dawn never explores that. It helps Merry to revolt against her family. That ideological contradiction is manifested through that remark. Her refusal to accept the American narrative of a liberal democracy attempts to reveal a story of American empire, colonization and greedy capitalism.

Merry's ideological contradiction with her family is clearly manifested in the novel. She starts to learn from the communist pamphlets. Influenced from that ideology, Merry takes everything as political, communist ideology takes every event in society in terms of politics. Social struggle, repression, injustice and poverty all become the study for the communist. She learns all about the war, injustice and poverty from communism. In these terms, communists have their own assumption like without the revolution poor cannot live secured and perfect life. Bourgeois always try to dominate the working class. The necessity of war is inevitable factor for

communists. They take society as important in comparison with individual. Merry takes communism as whole part:

You came with the communist material, you came home with all those books and pamphlets and magazines. “I’m trying to learn, you taught me to learn, didn’t you? Not just to study. But to learn. You taught me to learn C-c-c-communists. . .” “It is communist. It says on the page that it is communist”. “C-c-c-communists have ideas that aren’t always about c-communism”. For instance “About poverty. About war. About injustice. They have all kinds of ideas. Just b-b-because you’re Jewish does not mean you just have ideas about Judaism. Well, the same holds for c-c-communism. (105)

Merry verbally revolts that shows her ideological contradiction with her family. She revolts against her family because of ideological contradiction. She claims that she starts to learn from the circle of her family, in process of learning she learns about communism. And agrees that it is impossible to learn without house.

Ideological conflict begins within the sphere of Merry's family. The struggle begins with the responsibility in another way; she brings the responsibility from family to the people of Vietnam who are suffering because of America. She tries to show the responsibility towards the Vietnamese babies who are suffered from the war. Swede ignores her proposal because he stands for the capitalistic beliefs and values. Thus he limits his responsibility only in the sphere of family he can't think about the ordinary people as like Vietnam's children. Merry is influenced by the communist ideology. So she takes interest about the people who are suffering from the American war in Vietnam. She shows sympathy towards the victim people but that proposal is rejected by her father. That rejection is the struggle between the different ideologies.

America blows the Vietnam village indicates the cruelty towards the poor Vietnamese. The ignorance from her parents towards the condition shows the capitalistic notion toward the minority:

My responsibility is to you and not to the war oh, I know your responsibility is not to the war –that’s why I have to go to New York. B-b-b-because people there feel responsible. They feel when America b-blow up Vietnamese villages. They feel responsible when America b-blowing little babies to b-b-b-b-bites. B-but you don’t and neither does mother. You don’t care enough to let it upset a single day of yours. (107)

Merry tries to participate in the movement. That supports the Vietnamese people. She tries to convince her family to support the Vietnamese. Merry’s request rejects by her father because of the capitalistic tradition. She tries to persuade her father that his responsibilities also are focused towards the Vietnam people because America is blowing them. But its refusal encourages Merry to go outside the family to revolt.

Merry goes out from the home to revolt against the capitalism. She revolts against the American idealism for the sake of the Vietnam people who suffer from the great nation. Revolution becomes necessary to support the Vietnamese people. But family accepts the tradition of capitalism. Within it, she can’t get happiness as her family feels. She starts to revolt within the family. She leaves the house and also bombs the American cities. And she strongly dedicates herself within the communism. On the other hand, capitalists define the revolution and violence that evokes the terror and physical harming of human body. That enables them to define them as terrorists. Government's inability to bring equality among all the citizen results the injustice. Injustice comes out in the form of violence. And at the time of

violence the government is unable to secure the life of ordinary people. That unsuccess of government gives the power to the revolutionary groups. It is impossible to gain power for revolution within the family. So she goes outside from the system of family:

She went out one day and blew up the post office, destroying night along with it dr. Fred Conlon and the village's general store, a small wooden building with a community bulletin board out front and a single old Sunoco pump and the metal pole on which Russ Hamlin—who, with his wife, owed the store and ran the post office—had raised the American flag every morning since Warren Gamalrel Harding was president of the United States. (113)

Merry bombs the OldRimrock Post office is the transports the Swede out of the longed-for *American Pastoral*. That event is antithesis for Swede. And its enemy into the fury, the violence and the desperation of the counter pastoral into the indigenous American berserk. Swede's desire to build his pastoral within the confines of a U. S. consensus ideology celebrates the American dream-epitomized by the individual embracing a puritan work ethic and climbing the ladder of capitalistic success. His daughter's strategy of pastoral disengagement aims to destroy that consensus ideology, rejecting her father out of his pastoral Eden into the "American berserk".

Swede creates his "self" by imagining a single narrative future of Edenic bliss, Merry extends and multiplies her father's logic of self-identification and fulfillment. Merry projects herself into the bombs she explodes as she explores the furthersest boundaries of her own self. She identifies herself with the victims of the American imperlist war or with the Vietnamese. The war is thousands of miles away from Swede but that war erupt his business and his home.

After Merry's disappearance Rita Cohen, claims to be Merry's representative. Rita Cohen meets with the Swede and forces him to listen to her attacks on the capitalistic basis of his business. Rita Cohen is reverse image as Merry's self who speaks Merry's rage without stuttering. Acting as Merry's emissary while Merry is in hiding, Rita Cohen comes to Swede and makes a telling remark: "you have a shiksa wife, Swede, but you did not get a shiksa daughter" (138). Rita's remark is made in the context of critiquing the emptiness-WASPish emptiness-of Merry's mother. According to Rita Cohen, "lady dawn of the manor" is at the heart of Merry's identity crisis" (135). Cohen argues that this, "is a mother who colonized her daughter's self-image' through her obsession for the blandishments of a conventionally idealized American womanhood" (137). To Rita, Dawn represent the empty promise to which Swede surrenders his life. This view is reinforced if one follows Rita's hint that Merry is no Shiksa but a Jew, conflicted by her inability to reconcile her Jewish identity with her Catholic heritage. "Don't you know what's made Merry, she taunts Swede, "sixteen years of learning in a household where she was hated by that mother" (137). Or, more to the point, Merry has become revolutionary Merry by virtue of Swede's indifference to the sort of cultural identity.

Rita attacks on the capitalistic values. She explores that the working class are dominated by the bourgeois all over the world. Same situation seems in Swede's factory. She compares this with other factories. Payment for women is more in a least amount in comparison to men which is an injustice imposed on them:

What do you pay the workers in your factory in Ponce, Puerto Rico?

What do you pay the workers who stitch gloves for you in Hong Kong and Taiwan? What do you pay the woman going blind in the

Philippines hand –stitching designs to satisfy the ladies shopping at

Bonwit's? You're nothing but a shifty little capitalistic who exploits the brown and yellow people of the world and lives in luxury behind the nigger-proof security gates of his mansion. (133)

Rita Cohen's support continues to Merry's attempt to bring socialism in America. Rita takes the factory as exploitation for the workers. With this, she analyzes the factory representing an indictment of capitalistic injustice and exploitive labour practices that serve to profit the Levovs. The capitalists believe that the success of one is the result of hard work. But communist ideology holders assume that their luxurious life is the result of exploitation of labour.

Rita Cohen attacks on the capitalistic basis of Swede's business. Swede defends his business as a vehicle for good. After all, he employs individuals whom Merry and Rita regard as exploitation in the name of employee. Rita quickly returns, "I know what a plantation is, Mr. Legree- I mean Mr. Levov. I know what it means to run a plantation. You take good care of your nigger, of course you do. It's called paternal capitalism" (135). She relevantly attacks him, "you know what I've come to realize about you kindly rich liberals who own the world? Nothing is further from your understanding than the nature of reality" (139).

Attack on the American city Pentagon, which is the center of American military command. That attack is against the military attack upon the Vietnam. And attack is the result of the military repression in Vietnam. The group reacts against the war. They leave a note that the attack is protecting the democratic republic of Vietnam from the America. The group involves in the violence which is the result of extreme repression towards the minority by the capitalistic American military:

A bomb goes off on the queen Elizabeth. A bomb goes off in the pentagon- in a women's rest-room on the fourth floor of an air force

area of the pentagon! The bomber leaves the note. “Today we attacked the Pentagon, the center of the American military command. We are reacting at time when growing US air and naval shelling are being carried out against the Vietnamese; while U.S. mines and warships are used to block the harbors of the democratic republic of Vietnam; while planned for even more escalation are being made in Washington”. The Democratic Republic of Vietnam –if I hears that from her once again, Seymour, I swear, I’ll go out of my mind. It’s their daughter! Merry has bombed the Pentagon. (148)

Violence becomes the weapon for the oppressed group. The violence is political weapon to react against military repression upon the Vietnamese people. But the “violence” is the resistance from the oppressed group.

The attack is a weapon for oppressed groups thus the bomb is the symbol of resistance against the oppression from the government. Merry moves outside the system, attacking the basic middle class values. Merry articulates her pastoral yearnings- to disengage herself from that social and economic world –by creating an adversarial enclave within the dominant social and economic system, attacking the materialism of a hegemonic culture that ignores the poverty and powerlessness of the disenfranchised. Desire to contain communism took many forms, including the Vietnam War. Unable to keep the war “thousands and thousands of miles away”, Swede finds that the combat, erupting in his business, in his home, is not containable. He cannot control her objectionable body. Swede associates Merry’s obsess body with political insurgency, suggesting that both push beyond the normative boundaries of social control and social containment.

Merry rips away at the American narratives of a liberal democracy, attempts to reveal to her bewildered father a story of American empire, colonization and capitalism. Swede is appalled by Rita's "childish clichés" (135). Rita Cohen, claims to be Merry's representative, meets with Swede and forces him to listen to her attacks on the capitalistic basis of his business. Swede defends his business as a vehicle for good. For Swede, she carelessly conflates liberal values with greed and criminality rather than with the programs that helped to usher in the great society and other social transformations of the sixties. Swede embraces this liberal ideology without recognizing that it does not necessarily provide liberty and justice for all. The liberalism is the glorification of the autonomous individual, ideologically justifies capitalism's pursuit of profit in the marketplace. In such a society, built on competitive systems of self-interest, may in fact undermine communal obligation and values.

Swede imagines himself having heart-to-heart talks with black revolutionary Angela Davies. At that time Swede feels Davies could offer him an explanation for his daughter's actions. And she serves as a means for discovering where Merry is. In the midst of one imaginary conversation, he tells Davies about his black employee Vicky, who stays with him to defend his business during the Newark Riots of 1967:

He tells Angela how, after the riots, after living under siege with Vicky at his side, he was determined to stand alone and not leave Newark and abandon his black employees. He does not, of course, tell her that he wouldn't have hesitated—and wouldn't still—to pick up and move were it not for his fear that, if he should join exodus of business not yet burned down, Merry would at last have her airtight case against him.

Victimizing black people and the working class and the poor solely for self-grain out of filthy greed! (162-163)

Swede is unable to relinquish his own pastoral vision. Swede acknowledges that he was relieved when the governor sent in the National Guard to put down the riot and protect his investment, his property. He rejects Davis's "idealistic slogans" in which "there was no reality, not a drop of it" (163). He determines that his daughter is not a brave revolutionary and rejects her counter pastoral vision which has nothing to do with his ideals. Narrator takes Merry's nature towards Swede as, "but with dishonesty, criminality, megalomania and insanity. Blind antagonism and an infantile desire to menace-*those* were her ideals. In search always of something to hate. Yes, it went way, way beyond her stuttering. That violent hatred of America was disease unto itself. And he loved being an America" (206). Swede equates the idea of America with a capitalistic based liberal democracy, imagining that America is an arena that freely allows him to enact his individual desire, without recognizing how the state already "contains" him and others in its own regulatory at times violet/violating-practice.

The revolution is necessary to empower the minority. Revolution is necessity of time, without revolution empowerment of minority is impossible. In that revolution against the military attack upon the minority, Merry is not only involved in opposition of the war. In investigation on Rimrock bomber event another daughter's father answers as that the struggle is not against the family. The struggle is against the bourgeois system. That class has controlled over the political power, being only ten percent. But they are rolling ninety percent. More than that they have controlled over the economic power of ninety percent people:

The father of the Rimrock bomber answering a similar question, “as parents, we’d to say no, not in recent years”. His daughter is quoted by him as fighting for what Merry’s too- in her dinner –table outbursts decrying her selfish mother and father and their bourgeois life- proclaimed as the motive for her own struggle : “to change the system and give the power to 90 percent of the people who have no economic or political control now”. (151)

Merry revolts against that system, which snatches the ninety percent people's economic and political power by the ten percent. Struggle is directed against the bourgeois life. Merry projects herself into the bombs she explodes as she explores the furthest boundaries of the self. She identifies herself with those whom she perceives to be the victims of the American imperialist war with Vietnam. Her journey starts with as a revolutionary person. Her revolution is not directly against the boundaries of system within her family stands. So her revolution causes father’s success into the American berserk. Throwing a bomb to American cities symbolically refers to her family. Merry’s critique of her family’s unwitting complicity with imperialist and postcolonial American practice is a critique offered from within the family about the family.

Merry represents alterities that the system finds difficult to contain. After her disappearance in the five years, Swede finds her. She has renounced the life of a violent revolutionary and embraced Jainism, an atheistically Indian philosophy advocating the ethical principal of non- violence. The follower of communist cadre is changed into the religious person reinforces the revolution is certainly as an act of terrorism. The shifting towards the religious person from cadre creates the discourse of terrorism about the communist because of her remorse for her revolution to bring

the justice for the minority. Shifting in ideology not only present her as a peace lover person, but it also helps to analyze that she cannot bring the justice for minority through revolution. It shows that the communist revolution is only illusion for minority. More than that it creates a discourse about revolution is certainly an act of terrorism. The changeability in ideology is remorse from the earlier deeds for Merry. She tries to be perfect from the soul. Her attention towards the purifying soul from her earlier deeds read like:

She wore the veil to do no harm to the microscopic organisms that dwell in the air we breathe. She did not bathe because she revered all life, including the Vermin. She did not wash, she said, so as “to do no harm to the water”. She did not walk about after dark, even in her own room, for fear of crushing some living object beneath her feet. (232)

Transit from the revolutionary to the follower of the Ashimsa creates a discourse that the act of bombing, certainly towards the destruction of human body is certainly a work of terrorism. Revolution for the social changes and protect the poor from the injustice is the destination of revolutionary character Merry in the novel. She revolts against the bourgeois system. But change in her ideology shows the failure of revolution.

After that, Merry becomes fugitive at the time she cannot secure herself from the evils of that system. She cannot protect herself from being a commodity of male. She was raped, “she was raped on the night she arrived. He’d captive and raped and robbed. Just seventeenth” (257). While she was in revolution, she becomes victims of evils of patriarchy. She becomes a commodity for man to consume as like goods. At the time of revolution, she is dominated by male Merry cannot create the environment for strong revolution that could challenge domination. At that period she cannot

protect herself from the evils of patriarchal society. So she returns from the revolution in spite to struggle against the male capitalist domination. That condition brings negative attitude towards the communism. She becomes the follower of the peaceful movement. As like, other sixties revolutionary changed into the capitalist and merging within society. Merry not only merges within that system, she strongly confesses herself. So she punishes herself physically she adopts the eternally confession to free herself from earlier crime.

Confession of revolutionary and merging within the capitalistic system is the success of capitalistic ideology. It supports capitalist to punish the revolutionary forces. And their return in the mainstream in capitalistic society represents the picture of communist revolution as a crime committed to against the peaceful environment. Merry returns in capitalistic society and adopts the Jainism that creates negative picture of communist revolution.

Merry returns from the revolution but she does not bind within the circle of her family. In this context, Merry becomes confessing character, far from hurting anyone. Her extremism ultimately subverts the centrism optimism of her father's ideology. Merry for her father as, "she is unprotect able . . . it's all unendurable. The awfulness of her terrible autonomy" (272). Merry's material body is tied to her autonomy a will separate from his paternal will. Merry has no place in her father's pastoral vision of the world, so he takes her as uncontroable person. Merry has shaken the very foundation of his belief system; and that, Jerry argues, is precisely her purpose; "that's what she's been blasting away at- that façade. All your fucking norms. Take a good look at what she did to your norms" (275).

Merry from the beginning is always against her father's ideology. Father always wants to regularize the life; she tries to give the different sight to look the

world. She attempts to give the different perspective to regularize the life but Swede rejects the way on which she tries to force for walk. As like Swede wants to regularize life that never happens. He always believes that individual ideology is American ideology:

Seeing so fast. And how stocial he had always been in his ability not to see, how prodigious had been his power to regularize. But in the three extra killings he had been confronted by something impossible to regularize, even for him . . . And the instrument of this unbinding is Merry. The daughter has made her father see. And perhaps this was all she had ever wanted to do. She has given him sight the sight to see clear through to that which will never be regularized, to see what you can't see and can't see and won't see until there is added to one to get four. (418)

Merry murders because she wants to come out from American dream. But Swede is always happy in the success of the glove factory. Symbolically he practices the values of American Dream. Thus the factory stands for the success of a family as success of American Dream. It is the result of the exploitation of labour not the success of American Dream. Factory's success is the result of the exploitation of the labour, so Merry tries to teach this point. Swede's major faults are that he easily accepts the injustice of capitalism. So Merry attacks on its bourgeois foundation. Merry transgresses the body politics by bombing the Old Rimrock post office- a signifier for the both the Swede's pastoral home and an intelligent system of communication and by killing other human beings. She sets herself radically argues that the state should not intrude in private lives and private desire unless to protect others from harm. Swede believes that he has replicated the ideals of America. She becomes a source not

only of biological reproduction but also of the production of the ideology that equates with the mainstream of American ideology. On that basis a true believer, Swede promotes the tenets of American liberalism based on universal acceptance. He tries to create the individual which equates American liberalism. But he cannot establish his relation to the mainstream of American idealism and democracy. Because of Merry's violent repudiation of her father's economic and social version of pastoral vision.

Swede's pastoral vision gets destroyed because of Merry's refusal to accept her father's ideology. Her motives for struggle is praised by her father's dream character Angela Davis as he takes as, "a soldier of freedom, a pioneer in the great struggle against repression"(160). Revolution is result of suppression, Merry becomes the leader to react against the repression to support her along with a lot of youths. She takes it as, "Merry is not alone, she is part of an army of eighty thousands radical young people who have gone underground the better to fight the social wrongs fostered by an oppressive politico-economic order" (161). Angela takes Merry as a member of revolutionary force to fight for the social betterment. She takes the revolution as the result of oppressed in political and economic power. As a communist ideology holder always tries to control over the political power, and economic power for minority. The revolution, for them, is a weapon for the betterment of society; it ignores the individual's betterment. So revolution is only the betterment of society. Thus revolution is taken as, "socialist revolution in America" (166) in the novel.

Merry revolts against the capitalistic tradition but gives up all the violent activities for revolution. Despite of that situation, she does not return in mainstream. She is fugitive in sight of the law. This time she is unable to protect from being as a commodity of the capitalistic male. She has been raped again and again. That situation cannot bring the storm of revolt but she adopts the Jainism, and proves her as

a criminal. To relieve from crime she lives in dark that symbolizes she had committed crime because of her innocence. To free from that crime she becomes a true follower of religious person. "In the tiny room . . . she lived without light" (251). Merry becomes victim of bad purpose in novel rather than revolutionary, "Merry had been used for somebody else's evil purposes-that was the story to which it was crucial for them all to remain anchored" (365). Revolution becomes evil because it lacks control over the power. Power holder creates a discourse about revolution as an evil and terroristic.

Revolution does not get any political objectives is a discourse created by the novelist in the novel. It fails to bring social reformation so as instead revolution becomes the cause of punishment of revolutionary forces in capitalist system. Revolution fails to control over the power rather it is renamed as terrorist. In this new identity Merry's life starts and moves ahead. Changing form of revolution is as:

She had concluded by this time that there could never be a revolution in America to uproot the forces of racism and reaction and greed. Urban guerrilla warfare was futile against a thermonuclear superstate that would stop at nothing to defend the profit principle. Since she could not help to bring about a revolution in America, her only hope was to give herself to the revolution that was. That would mark the end of her exile and the true beginning of her life. (260)

Revolution fails to secure political goal, certainly brings grief for the revolutionary. The authority defines the revolution as terrorism. Revolutionaries are put in exile to practise the power and threaten for upcoming revolution against the authority. Revolution cannot bring socialism in America because of its political cadre change their ideology; changing in ideology supports the capitalistic ideology to create a

discourse establishment of socialism is impossible. Because it always suppresses individual's happiness. The failure in revolution reinforces authority to create a discourse that revolutionary Merry causes only the destruction of her family's happiness. The revolution fails to bring socialism or get its political objectives. The revolutionary cadre becomes the terrorist not a freedom fighter. The story develops in a pattern that the character's suffering is the result of refusal of the capitalist ideology. The ideology becomes the success of Swede's family. But Merry goes against that ideology and fails to control over the power. The situation creates a discourse to support the ideology of American capitalist. The American mainstream always tries to define the leftist movement as a form of terrorism. As a result, that discourse helps to exploit so many workers in the factory.

Failure in revolution defines Merry as criminal in capitalistic society. She violates the rules and norms of capitalist system but she returns within the system. Her returning in the system adopting the philosophy of Jainism does not erase her previous act as a terrorist. She adopts the Jainism but that cannot become her identity. Her revolt is based on the political ideology but she never gives political excuse, "I'm not trying to give a political excuse for her, because there is no political excuse-there is any justificant, none . . . she was wrong, of course- she made a tragic, terrible, ghastly mistake. There's no defense of her to be made" (416). She never excuses because her revolution is against the foundation of that bourgeois life. She becomes wrong because tries to destroy the control over the economic power and snatches that power and formulates the socialism in the place of capitalism.

Merry once becomes the communist cadre after then she adopts the Jainism. But the narrator names her as the ex-terrorist. The objective of naming her as terrorist is only to stop the upcoming revolt against capitalist system. Her introduction may be

Jainism but that does not support to the negative tag given to her by capitalistic system. The importance thing is Jainism easily accepts the capitalistic system. But the communist ideology terrorizes the foundation of bourgeois life system in comparison to Jainism. So the narrator introduces her as a terrorist. Relating present with past is only to threat those who attempts to bring the socialism in America:

Through a landscape that for so long now has been bound up with the idea of solace, of beauty and sweetness and pleasure and peace, the ex-terrorist had came, quite on her own, back from Newark to all that she hated and did not want to a coherent, harmonious world that she despised and that she, with her embattled youthful mischief, the strangest and most unlikely attacker, had turned upside down. (421)

Merry becomes ex-terrorist even after the confession of her guilt. The confession does not become significant for the capitalistic tradition. Authority takes her as the ex-terrorist than religious person. The term “ex” is related with the previous work. Her today’s identity is shaped by her previous act of “terrorism” that originates from the military repression rather than that kills human beings. She confesses and tries to be away from that remorse. But authority presents the negative description about the revolution. The negative picture of the revolution is the result of lack in the control over power. The revolution becomes the act of terrorism for them who accept the capitalistic tradition. The communist movement becomes weak because of its follower who could not totally bring the storm of revolution that can change the social injustice. So the cadre becomes the terrorist in the sight of the capitalistic follower.

Different discourses are created through different structures of the society. Western male ideology towards women is always in a dominate pattern. Men want to regularize women. She must be bound within the circle of that ideology. Otherwise

men take her as monster, if they cross the limit. If she limits herself in the boundaries man renames her as goddess. These discourses about women are the result of the hegemony rule towards the women in capitalistic patriarchy society. Same discourse is created by Jerry to Merry in the novel, “He had a big, generous nature and with that they really raked him over the class, all the impassible ones. Unsatisfiable father, unsatisfiable wives, and the little murderer herself, the monster daughter. The monster Merry” (67). Monster is a way to prove that Merry’s revolution is not in the form of political objectives. The discourse about Merry that is produced by the authority is the result of revolution that is fails to get power. That discourse is practiced in local form by the individual to establish as a truth for the general people. The daughter is compared with monster because she does not follow the patriarchal norms and the ideology of American capitalistic system. She revolts against it but fails to get the power thus she gets the name of monster. Her renaming as monster supports to create a discourse about communist cadre as a terrorist. And authority never wants to empower the minority so authority renames her as a monster to relegate revolution for empower to minority. Her own family member adopts the ideology of American capitalistic values. So she becomes the monster and terrorist for her own family. This is the exercise of power in local form that creates a situation to establish a discourse as truth.

Merry moves towards the force of communism. That distances her from her family, the ideological contradiction with family mainly shatters the dream of perfect family of her father. He never mentions about it directly but neither accepts Merry’s ideology. More than that, Jerry takes her as monster because she does not fit within the system. Merry becomes monster because of her refusal to bind within the male hegemony for women in capitalist patriarchal society. Person is same but her identity

is different because of different discourses are created to define same concept in the same time. But that discourse becomes as truth which is produced by the authority. Merry becomes freedom fighter for communist, she becomes monster for patriarchal society. Merry becomes terrorist for capitalists because of different perspective to identify the same person. Thus the definition of terrorism is only a perspective to define communism by the capitalist American society.

IV. Conclusion

The discussion of communism as terrorism is constructed by the first world's writers like Philip Roth creates a discourse of terrorism about the communism. The discourse of terrorism legitimizes that the binary opposition between communism ideology and the first world's ideology. The word "terrorism" is also used to legitimize the first world ideology is civilized rather than the communist ideology. The discourse also helps to establish the ideology of communism is terrorism. And their revolution is compared with the act of criminal act. The behavior of revolutionary cadre is compared with monstrous activities. Such discourse about communism is the only a perspective to describe communism on the basis of different ideology. First world like American society always tries to dominate the communist ideology. The discourse that legitimizes the American ideology always seeks the civilized society in comparison to communist ideology. The communist ideology is barbaric and criminal act that is only one way to define from the different perspectives.

Definition of terrorism towards the communism is only a discourse. The discourse is the imposition of the American ideology about the communist cadre as terrorist. A critical reading of Roth's novel *American Pastoral* deconstructs the first worlds discourse which hegemonically imposes the communist are terrorist. The novel focuses that the communist revolution snatches the happiness of the family. The revolution cannot get its destination but becomes unsuccessful revolution and Merry's regret for her previous activities helps to create a discourse that the revolution is as an act of terrorism. It supports the capitalistic discourse about the communism. Power also helps to circulate the discourse. The circulation of discourse establishes the revolution as an act of terrorism. It is the result of failure to get its political power thus

they rename it as terrorist. The act does not become glorious revolution because of failure to get political power. The critical reading focuses that the definition of terrorism is only a discourse that is produced by the authority because they are in power by exercising the military power in the society.

Merry attempts to bring socialism in America so she involves in the revolution and hides from the justice to challenge the American authority. Her revolution ends without getting political objectives. She herself tries to justify that her earlier act as a terrorist so she adopts the Jainism because of repressive nature of the society. The representation of the communism in novel through the character supports that the American ideology is more civilized than the communist ideology. The representation about revolution creates the binary opposition between communism and American ideology. The binary opposition succeeds to circulate the discourse about communism as terrorism in the novel.

The ideology of communism as a terrorism is biased interpretation which ignores its political objectives by the American ideology. It is a first world's discourse that is based on different ideology to justify that the notion of communism is only an act of terrorism. It is only a perspective to describe the communism. Representation of failure revolution creates a discourse that the revolution is guided by the act of terrorism. The critical reading of the novel exposes failure in getting political power renaming political cadre as terrorist. More than that, it is only a discourse that is produced by the authority to define rebel as terrorist only to use the military force over revolutionary to hold power forever. Power helps to establish the discourse of terrorism towards the communist cadre as terrorist. But it is not truth; it is only a way to understand the revolution through the different perspective.

Philip Roth follows the first world's fixed and stereotypical construction about the communism and its revolution. He represents revolution as an act of terrorism. In the other words, the communist cadres in the novel are represented as terrorist, criminal, monstrous. The discourse of terrorism shows the first world's will to govern them by exercising institutionalized power over communist cadres. The first world's writer always supports the meaning produced by imposing and maintaining their codes of domination over the communist and rest of the worlds.

Thus this research counters the American discourse about the communist revolution as an act of terrorist and tries to dismantle the American ideology's representation about communism. It deconstructs the representation of the communist cadre which is based on the American ideology's mentality. American writers like Roth manifests the discourse and vision that are deposited in his mentality. His attempts to prove that the communist movement as an act of terrorism is guided by his own consciousness and desire. Domination and repression is at the heart of the novel *American Pastoral*. The binary between communism and first world's ideology are shown dominantly in the novel. The discourse of terrorism is seen as a political economy designed to ensure one-way flow of thought about the communist cadre as terrorist and criminal. The discourse of terrorism suppresses the fact that the first world exploits the communist people through the discourse of terrorism. Communist cadres are shown as irrational monstrous but the first world's are shown as they have the rational thought and civilized ideology within society.

Works Cited

- Coady, C. A. J. "Terrorism and Innocence". *The Journal of Ethics* 8.1 (2004): 37-58.
- . "The Morality of Terrorism". *Philosophy* 60. 231 (1985): 47-69.
- Ferracuti, Franco. "A Sociopsychiatric Interpretation of Terrorism". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences International Terrorism* 463 (1982): 129-140.
- Foucault, Michel. "Truth and Power." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York: Harcourt, 1992. 1135-45.
- Halio, Jay L. *Critical Survey of Long Fiction*. Salem press, 2000.
- Karl, Frederick R. *American Fictions (1940-1980): A Comprehensive History and Critical evaluation*. New York:Harper, 1983.
- Lawrence, C. Hamilton and James D. Hamilton. "Dynamics of Terrorism." *Internaional Studies of Quarterly* 27.1, (March 1983): 39-54.
- Louis, Menand. "The Irony and The Ecstasy: Philip Roth and the Jewish Atlantics," *Rev. of American Pastoral. The New Yorker* (19 May 1997) 90-94.
- Marx, Leo. *The Machine and the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral ideal in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- McGrath, Charles. "Zukerman's Alter Brain". *New York Times* (7 May 2000):8-10.
- McHoul, Alec and Wendy Grace. *A Foucault Primer Discourse, Power and the Subject*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1993.
- Parrish, Timothy. "The End of Identity: Philip Roth's American Pastoral". *Shofar* 19.1 (fall2000):84-99.
- Rainbow, Paul ed. *Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books, 984.
- Shechner, Mark. "Jewish Writer". *Harvard Guide to Contemporary American Writing*. Ed. Daniel Hoffman. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Teichman, Jenny. "How to Define Terrorism". *Philosophy* 64.250 (Oct. 1989): 505-507.

Turk T. Austin. "Social Dynamics of Terrorism". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science International Terrorism* 463 (1982): 119-128.

Victoroff, Jeff. "The Mind of Terrorist: A Review and Critique of Psychological Approaches." *The journal of conflict Resolution*. 49 (Feb 2005): 3-42.