

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Postcolonial Theory: Subalternity, Marginalized Voices, and Inclusive Representation in Selected Writings of Arundhati Roy, Neel Mukherjee, and Meena Kandasamy with Reference to Special Education

Prashanta Kumar Maharana¹, Dr. Bipin Bihari Dash², Dr. Suvashree Suvadarshinee³

¹Research Scholar, Silicon University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Email id-english.26degl06@silicon.ac.in, ORCID ID: 368-378-368-378

² Assistant Professor of English, Department of Humanities, Odisha University of Technology and Research (OUTR), Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Email Id: bbdashhum@outr.ac.in ORCID Id: 368-378-368-378

³ Sr. Assistant Professor of English, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences

Silicon University, Odisha, India

Email Id: suvashree.suvadarshinee@silicon.ac.in ORCID Id:368-378-368-378

HOW TO CITE: ABSTRACT:

Prashanta Kumar Maharana, Bipin Bihari Dash, Suvashree Suvadarshinee (2026). Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Postcolonial Theory: Subalternity, Marginalized Voices, and Inclusive Representation in Selected Writings of Arundhati Roy, Neel Mukherjee, and Meena Kandasamy with Reference to Special Education. International Journal of Special Education, 41(25s), 368-378

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, an influential postcolonial theorist, literary critic, and feminist thinker of Indian origin, occupies a distinctive position in the contemporary literary and cultural studies. She brought considerable critical attention through her English translation of the French philosopher- Jacques Derrida's *of Grammatology* (1967), accompanied by an intellectually conscientious and theoretically formidable introduction that produced deconstructive thought into dialogue with questions of language, representation, and subjectivity. Spivak's critical practice is informed by a complex commitment with Deconstruction, Marxism, Feminism, Psychoanalysis, and Postcolonial theory, through which she interrogates the structures of colonial power and the conceptual production of the marginalized subject. Her sustained concern with the voices of "Third World Women" further exposes the limitations of universalist feminist frameworks that overlook historical, cultural, economic, and geopolitical differences. Her seminal essay *Can the Subaltern Speak?* (1988) raises a fundamental question concerning the possibility of marginalized subjects attaining an independent and audible voice within dominant structures of knowledge and representation. The concept of the *subaltern* consequently becomes central to Spivak's critique of epistemic violence,

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:
 Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
 Open access publication under the
 terms and conditions
 of the Creative Commons Attribution
 (CC BY)
 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

ideological domination, and the politics of representation. Spivak's theory of subalternity provides a critical framework for understanding marginalized voices and promoting inclusive representation, participation, and dignity in special education. This paper explores Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak as a significant postcolonial theorist, focusing on her critical insights into subalternity, marginality voice, representation, and epistemic exclusion. Drawing upon her theoretical perspectives, the study examines the selected writings of Arundhati Roy, Neel Mukherjee, and Meena Kandasamy to illuminate how marginalized subjects negotiate structures of power, knowledge, identity, and social segregation. It investigates the ways in which dominant discourses shape, silence, or mediate marginalized voices and considers the implications of such representational practices for inclusive education. With particular reference to special education, the study extends Spivak's critique of subalternity and representation to questions of visibility, participation, recognition, and educational inclusion. It highlights the enduring relevance of Spivak's thought in fostering more equitable, sensitive, and inclusive forms of illustration for learners and communities positioned at the margins of dominant educational structures.

Keywords: Language, Marginalised Voice, Postcolonial Theory, Special Education, Subalternity, Inclusive Education.

1. Introduction

The word 'postcolonial' is three dimensional. Historically, it means the end of colonial era and becomes synonymous with post-independence for the erstwhile colonies. Theoretically it makes use of some of the traits of post-structuralism and aligns with it. In the realms of literature, it used to be a synonym for 'Commonwealth Literature' but the nomenclature of this literature and the identity of the writers belonging to erstwhile British and French colonies opened up new possibilities. English language writers across the world, because of migration in the second half of the twentieth century defy exact classification. What does postcolonial theory mean? More importantly, when does postcolonialism begin? Britain was a colony of Rome and US too was a colony. But we never talk of postcolonial era in Britain and US. The word post-colonial first finds a mention in a British newspaper in 1959. However, the postcolonial theorist develops their notion regarding language after this time. Dennis

Walder trails the historical rise of the term "post-colonial", incorporating insights from writer Nayantara Sahgal regarding the enduring legacy of the empire in the following passage:

The OED records the first use of 'post-colonial' in a British newspaper article of 1959, referring to India, the jewel in the crown of Empire, which achieved independence in 1947; since when 'post-colonial' has referred mainly to the former colonized areas of Asia and Africa as they became self-governing states during the 1950s and 1960s - states as different yet related by their pasts as, say, Ghana and Singapore, or Pakistan and Sierra Leone. More recently, 'post-colonial' has come to be thought appropriate, because of the implication that the colonial experience persists despite the withdrawal of political control, as a result of the continuing strategic and economic power of the former colonizers, the new global dispositions which keep groups of poorer states in thrall; and because, as Sahgal admits, however minimal the impact of empire upon a particular people in the

long perspective, it has always left its imprint (Walder, 1998, p.3).

The writer explains how post-colonial has moved from a chronological marker to an impactful structural effect of an empire stretching beyond centuries. Within this expanding field of postcolonial inquiry, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's intervention becomes particularly significant because she shifts attention from the mere recovery of marginalized voices to the conditions under which such voices can be recognized, represented, and heard. Her theorization of the subaltern exposes the intricate relationship between language, power, knowledge, and representation, questioning the assumption that the marginalized subject can transparently speak for herself within dominant discursive structures. Spivak's distinction between representation as *Vertretung* (political representation or speaking for) and *Darstellung* (portrayal or depiction) demonstrates that the problem of the subaltern is not simply one of silence but also one of mediation and ideological construction (Maggio, 2007).

The scholarship on Spivak emphasizes that the politics of subalternity involves both the exclusion of marginalized subjects from established structures of representation and the ways in which intellectual and institutional discourses may themselves participate in producing the figure they claim to represent (Lloyd, 2014). More recently, Piu (2023) has highlighted the continuing sociological relevance of Spivak's concept of subalternity, particularly in relation to groups subordinated by colonialism and contemporary neoliberal globalization. Thus, Spivak's postcolonial project moves beyond a simple opposition between speech and silence; it interrogates the epistemic and political structures that determine whose speech becomes intelligible, whose experience enters history, and whose identity is constructed through the representations of others. Her work therefore provides a crucial theoretical framework for examining the voices from the margins and the complex politics through which subaltern subjects are

represented, mediated, and sometimes rendered inaudible.

Subalternity, meaning 'of inferior rank', is a term adopted by Antonio Gramsci to refer to those groups in society who are subject to the hegemony of the ruling classes. Subaltern classes may include peasants, workers and other groups denied access to 'hegemonic' power. The term has been adapted to postcolonial studies from the work of the Subaltern Studies group of historians, who aimed to promote a systematic discussion of subaltern themes in South Asian Studies. It is used in *Subaltern Studies* "as a name for the general attribute of subordination in South Asian society whether this is expressed in terms of class, caste, age, gender and office or in any other way" (Guha, 1982, p.vii). The group – formed by Ranjit Guha, and initially including Shahid Aimin, David Arnold, Partha Chatterjee, David Hardiman and Gyan Pande – has produced five volumes of *Subaltern Studies*: essays relating to the history, politics, economics, and sociology and subalternity "as well as the attitudes, ideologies, and brief systems – in short, the culture informing that condition" (Guha, 1984, p.vii). The notion of the subaltern became an issue in post-colonial theory when Gayatri Spivak critiqued the assumptions of the Subaltern Studies group in the essay *Can the Subaltern Speak?*

Marginality means to remain on the edge or border of a group, system, or power. The perception and description of experience as "marginal" is a consequence of the binaristic structure of the various discourses of power, such as patriarchy, imperialism and ethnocentrism, which imply that certain forms of experience are peripheral. Although the term carries a misleading geometric implication, marginal groups do not necessarily endorse the notion of a fixed centre. Structures of power that are described in terms of 'center' and 'margin' operate, in a complex, diffused and multifaceted way. The marginal therefore indicates a personality that is best defined in terms of the limitations of a subject's access to power.

However, marginality as a noun is related to the verb “to marginalize” and in the sense provides a trap for those involved in resistance by its assumption that power is a function of centrality. This means that such resistance can become a process of replacing the centre rather than deconstructing the binary structure of centre and margin, which is a primary feature of postcolonial discourse. Marginality unintentionally reifies centrality because it is the centre that creates the condition of marginality. According to Ashcroft et.al (2013) in simple terms “We could ask ‘Who are the marginal?’ ‘Marginal to what?’. We might be tempted to reply spontaneously, “imperialism marginalizes the colonized people. It reiterates that absence that lies at the point of interface between the two cultures.” (p.137,138).

In subaltern studies, marginality does not only mean living on the fringes; it also represents the systematic exclusion and silencing of the oppressed by those dominant power structures. Inclusive representation refers to the ethical and meaningful inclusion of disregarded, excluded, or underrepresented individuals and communities in cultural, literary, social, and educational discourses, ensuring that their experiences, identities, perspectives, and agency are neither silenced nor reduced to stereotypes. From a postcolonial perspective, representation becomes inclusive when marginalized subjects are enabled to participate in producing and articulating their own identities rather than being merely spoken for by dominant groups (Spivak, 1988).

2. Objectives of the Study

- Examine how Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s theory of subalternity illuminates the experiences and voices of marginalized subjects in the selected writings of Arundhati Roy, Neel Mukherjee, and Meena Kandasamy.
- Analyse how the selected writers represent the silencing, exclusion, and

negotiation of marginalized identities through Spivak’s critique of representation, epistemic power, and dominant discourse.

- Explore the relevance of Spivak’s theoretical insights to inclusive representation, participation, and recognition of marginalized learners in the context of special education.
- Investigate the relevance of Jacques Derrida’s concept of deconstruction and Edward Said’s theory of Orientalism in analysing the construction, exclusion, and representation of marginalized identities in the selected writings.
- Evaluate the role of language, communication, and linguistic representation, with reference to Roman Jakobson’s theoretical perspectives, in shaping the articulation, mediation, and reception of marginalized voices and their implications for inclusive representation in special education.

3. Methodology of the Study

The research establishes a qualitative, interpretive approach, with in-depth textual analysis, to study Spivak’s seminal writings and its core theories applying them to Arundhati Roy, Neel Mukherjee and Meena Kandasamy’s texts on subalternity, representation, epistemic violence, and marginality. Selected secondary readings from postcolonial and cultural studies are critically examined to contextualise her theoretical interventions and analyse the politics of voice, agency, exclusion, and representation.

4. Results of the Study

The study identifies key themes of subalternity, silenced voices, marginalization, inclusive representation and special education in Spivak’s theoretical framework. The findings indicate the relevance of these concepts to understanding the educational experiences of marginalized learners.

Table 1. Key Theoretical Dimensions Emerging from Spivak's Thought

Theme	Key Finding / Theoretical Insight
1. Subalternity	Marginalized individuals and communities may remain uncared when dominant social systems oppose their voices from entering mainstream discourse.
2. Genuine Representation	Genuine representation needs more than speaking for marginalized groups; it should create open space for their own experiences, perspectives, and involvement.
3. Voice and Agency	Uncared in society should be given meaningful chances to express their experiences, emotions, identities, and aspirations in social, cultural, and educational contexts.
4. Epistemic Violence	Dominant systems of knowledge and skill can remain silence or misrepresent marginalized sources/learners by defining their real identities and experiences through predetermined classifications.
5. Marginalization	Social, cultural, economic, caste, gender, and educational systems may strengthen exclusion and restrict equal contribution.
6. Gender and Intersectionality	Marginalization can become more intricate when gender intersects with caste, class, poverty, disability, and other forms of social deprivation.
7. Silence and Elimination	Silence should not systematically be explained as the absence of thought or agency; it may show structural obstacles that control expression.
8. Inclusive Representation	Inclusive education should recognize various voices, identities, experiences, and learning needs rather than forcing a one dominant model of participation.
9. Postcolonial Power	Colonial and postcolonial frameworks of power impact whose knowledge, language, culture, and experiences are recognized as authentic and genuine.
10. Empowerment through association	Inclusive educational exercise should move beyond speaking for marginalized learners toward creating situations in which they can involve, enunciate experiences, and exercise agency.

5. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of the present study is mainly based on Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's postcolonial-feminist theory, which helps to understand the experiences of people who are socially, politically, and culturally marginalised. Spivak's concept of subalternity refers to those whose voices are often ignored or suppressed by overriding social and political structures. Jazeel (2014) explains that Spivak's work is important for understanding how dominant systems of knowledge shape and control the identities of marginalised people. Her distinction between 'Vertretung', meaning speaking or acting for

others, and 'Darstellung', meaning portraying or representing others, is useful for examining how writers give voice to marginalised characters. Spivak also draws attention to the subaltern woman, whose oppression may result from the combined effects of gender, patriarchy, class, caste, and colonial power (Mohanraj, 2018; Bhattacharjee, 2019). Her concept of epistemic violence further explains how dominant forms of knowledge can silence or exclude alternative voices. Leonhardt (2025) shows the continuing relevance of Spivak's ideas in understanding contemporary processes of inclusion, exclusion, and recognition. Therefore, this study uses

Spivak's theoretical perspective to examine how Meena Kandasamy, Neel Mukherjee, and Arundhati Roy portray marginalised characters, represent their experiences, give them agency and voice, or show how their voices are silenced by dominant social structures.

6. Discussion and Analysis

In Indian English fiction, subalternity, marginalized voices, and inclusive representation provide an important framework for examining how socially excluded individuals negotiate voice, identity, agency, and recognition within structures of power (Spivak, 1988; Singh, 2020). Spivak conceptualizes subalternity in relation to the ideological limitations that prevent marginalized subjects from achieving meaningful representation within dominant systems of knowledge and discourse. The question of representation therefore extends beyond simply giving marginalized subjects a voice to examine who represents whom, under what conditions, and with what consequences.

In Indian English fiction, disability interconnects with caste, gender, and class as literary depictions of disabled characters inevitably reflect wider social hierarchies and cultural norms blurring normality and difference. Such an intersectional perspective is significant because disability is not experienced independently of other forms of social marginalization, and literary representations can either reinforce or challenge stereotypical constructions of disabled identities (Singh, 2020). The relationship between marginality and education is equally important because children with disabilities have historically encountered exclusionary educational structures, making access, participation, recognition, and agency central concerns of inclusive education (Singal, 2006). Singal (2005) argues that inclusive education in India should not be understood merely as the inclusion of particular categories of children within existing institutions but as a broader transformation of the educational system addressing who is included, what inclusion means, and why inclusion is necessary.

Singal (2006) further emphasizes that India's movement from special schooling towards integration and inclusion requires a contextual understanding of the educational needs of marginalized children with disabilities. Johansson (2014) similarly demonstrates that the meaning of inclusion in India remains contested, with different understandings of the *includable child*, inclusive schooling, and institutional responsibility for learners with disabilities. D'Souza (2019) argues that exclusion can be embedded within ordinary schooling practices themselves and that ableism must therefore be understood as a structural rather than merely individual problem. Singal (2019) consequently conceptualizes inclusive education through the interconnected principles of redistribution, recognition, and representation, while emphasizing that increased enrolment does not necessarily guarantee meaningful participation or quality learning for children with disabilities. Taneja-Johansson and Singal (2025) further emphasize the importance of developing equitable and context-sensitive pathways towards quality education for persons with disabilities across different educational settings. From this perspective, Indian English fiction can serve as a critical cultural space for questioning the silence of marginalized subjects and examining how disability, caste, gender, class, and educational exclusion shape experiences of identity and belonging (Singh, 2020).

The fiction of Meena Kandasamy, Neel Mukherjee, and Arundhati Roy provides a significant literary terrain for examining subalternity, marginalized voices, and inclusive representation through the intersecting structures of caste, gender, class, poverty, violence, displacement, and social exclusion. In Kandasamy's *The Gypsy Goddess* (2014) and *When I Hit You*; and *A Portrait of the Writer as a Young Wife* (2017), marginalized female and Dalit experiences are articulated through narratives of caste oppression, patriarchy, domestic violence, and resistance, thereby transforming silenced experiences into forms of testimonial agency (Kandasamy, 2014, 2017; Mandal, 2023;

Sangeetha et al., 2022). Mukherjee's *The Lives of Others* (2014) and *A State of Freedom* (2017) similarly foreground characters positioned at the margins of family, class, caste, labour, and economic power, exposing how structural inequality restricts individual dignity and agency (Mukherjee, 2014, 2017). Mukherjee's *A State of Freedom*, in particular, brings together fragmented narratives of marginalized subjects whose experiences reveal the intersection of caste, class, gender, labour, and neoliberal inequalities (Barbhuiya, 2025). Roy's *The God of Small Things* (1997) and *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* (2017) extend this inquiry by placing Dalits, women, children, Muslims, transgender persons, political dissenters, and other socially excluded communities at the centre of the narrative, challenging the structures that render such lives invisible or expendable (Roy, 1997, 2017; Lau & Mendes, 2019). In *The God of Small Things*, Velutha's caste position, Ammu's gendered marginalization, and the traumatic experiences of Estha and Rahel reveal how caste, patriarchy, family, and institutional authority combine to produce exclusion and suffering (Roy, 1997; Kaur, 2020). The novel *The God of Small Things* is in itself significant because it celebrates the life that is filled with "small things", "small lives", "small people" and "small events". In themselves "small" but leading to great consequences. Roy has written literature "that dares to dare", touching on a variety of ideas and ideologies and in her own words, tries to "explain complicated things in simple language," (Ram, 2001, p. 14).

Thematically it centers round Ammu, her two children Raphael and Estha, her parents, brother, Chacko and his wife, Margaret and daughter, Sophie Mol and above all, Ammu's low caste lover, Velutha, the paravan. The novel opens with Raphael's coming back to Ayemenem after a failed marriage, to see Estha, her twin brother ('they were two-egg twins,' dizygotic) who was sent to his father after Sophie Mol's funeral and now returned to their native place after twenty-three years. The whole family has been personalized in retrospection. The twins (Estha and Raphael) lived with their divorced

mother, Ammu and their blind maternal grandmother, Mammachy and their maternal uncle Chacko, once a Rhodes scholar at Oxford and lecturer in Madras Christian College, who helped his mother to run their paradise pickle business, and their maternal grandfather's youngest sister, Baby Kochamma. Chacko was married to an English Woman, Margaret (who divorced him and married Joe) and had a daughter, Sophie Mol who died later by drowning. Ammu's love for Velutha forms the core of the novel and makes the novelist's preference crystal clear. The traditional society was not only conservative but authoritarian for it laid down who should love whom. It happened long ago and it is against this concept that the novelist protests vehemently. The right to love a man of her choice, is a woman's birth right and it should not be scuttled in the name of religion, caste, colour and class. It is in this sense that the novel should be read as a feminist novel or a post-colonial novel for both feminism and post-colonialism aim at destroying the old power structure. The novel further foregrounds subalternity and marginality by portraying caste oppression, gender discrimination, social exclusion, and the silencing of marginalized voices within dominant social and cultural structures.

In *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*, Roy expands this politics of representation through figures such as Anjum and other socially displaced communities, creating alternative spaces in which marginalized subjects resist normative identities and construct forms of belonging and collective agency (Roy, 2017; Lau & Mendes, 2019). A read through Spivak's (1988) concept of subalternity, demonstrates that marginalization concerns not merely the absence of speech but the unequal structures that determine whose speech is heard, legitimized, and represented. Consequently, the selected fiction can be connected meaningfully with special and inclusive education, since learners with disabilities may likewise experience institutional silencing when they are represented primarily through deficit, dependency, or exclusion rather than agency and participation

(Singal, 2005, 2019; Johansson, 2014). The literary movement from silence to voice, exclusion to participation, and representation to agency therefore provides a productive bridge between Spivakian Postcolonial theory, Indian English fiction, Disability studies, and Inclusive education, suggesting that genuine inclusion requires not merely speaking *for* marginalized subjects but creating conditions in which their identities, experiences, knowledge, and voices can be meaningfully recognized (Spivak, 1988; Singal, 2019).

Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness* presents a fragmented narrative that brings together individuals and communities positioned at the margins of Indian society. At the center of the novel is Anjum, a transgender woman who moves from a life of social exclusion to the creation of a community at Jannat Guest House, where people rejected by mainstream society find companionship and dignity. The novel also portrays Tilo, Kashmiris, Dalits, Muslims, political activists, and other vulnerable subjects whose lives are shaped by violence, discrimination, and displacement. Through these intersecting narratives, Roy challenges dominant systems that determine whose lives are valued and whose voices are heard. In relation to special and inclusive education, Anjum's experience can be read as a powerful metaphor for the exclusion of learners whose identities or abilities do not conform to dominant norms. The Jannat Guest House, therefore, symbolically represents an inclusive space where difference is accommodated rather than suppressed, encouraging ideas of belonging, dignity, participation, recognition, and acceptance of diversity.

Neel Mukherjee's *The Lives of Others* is set in 1960s Bengal and centers on the wealthy Ghosh family, whose apparently prosperous household is marked by internal conflict, inequality, exploitation, and social divisions. Alongside the family narrative, the novel depicts the impoverished lives of peasants and the growing influence of the Naxalite movement. The contrast between the privileged Ghosh family and marginalized peasants exposes the unequal

distribution of wealth, power, education, and social recognition. Particularly significant from a Spivakian perspective is the question of who receives narrative visibility and who remains unheard. In relation to inclusive education, the novel can be read as illustrating how social class and structural inequality can restrict access to opportunities and participation. Its representation of marginalized peasants invites reflection on educational systems in which disadvantaged learners may be physically present but remain socially, academically, or institutionally unheard. Thus, the novel facilitates a discussion of educational inequality, voice, participation, social exclusion, and the need to recognize marginalized learners as active subjects.

Meena Kandasamy's *The Gypsy Goddess* revisits the 1968 Kilvenmani massacre in Tamil Nadu, in which Dalit agricultural labourers were violently attacked amid conflicts involving land, labour, caste, and class. Rather than presenting the event simply as historical tragedy, Kandasamy reconstructs the experiences of marginalized agricultural workers and foregrounds questions of caste oppression, collective resistance, memory, and historical erasure. The novel challenges dominant versions of history by drawing attention to lives that have frequently remained outside mainstream historical and literary representation. From the perspective of inclusive and special education, the novel is significant because it demonstrates how caste, poverty, social status, and institutional exclusion can determine whose experiences become visible and whose knowledge is valued. Its emphasis on recovering suppressed voices can therefore be connected with the need to ensure that learners from marginalized communities—including learners with disabilities—are not merely represented by others but are given meaningful opportunities to express their experiences, participate in decision-making, and exercise agency.

Special education can be meaningfully connected with the marginalized characters of Arundhati Roy, Neel Mukherjee, and Meena Kandasamy because their fiction foregrounds

voices affected by caste, gender, trauma, social exclusion, and unequal access to participation. In Roy's *The God of Small Things*, Velutha, Ammu, Estha, and Rahel experience different forms of caste, gender, and psychological marginalization, making the novel relevant to questions of voice, exclusion, and agency (Mittapalli, 2017). Kandasamy's *The Gypsy Goddess* represents Dalit agricultural workers through caste and class oppression, while *When I Hit You* foregrounds female subjectivity, trauma, and resistance to patriarchal domination (Dhande & Islam, 2025; Das, 2022). Such representations can be read alongside inclusive education, which emphasizes dignity, participation, agency, and recognition of marginalized voices.

In the grand tapestry of Indian English literature, the contributions of postcolonial, marginality, identity, and resistance narratives novelists' shimmer like threads of gold, enriching the narrative with their unique sensibilities, nuanced perspectives and bold literary voices. These novelists have not only added a feminine touch to the canon but also have broken new grounds, challenged conventions, voiced silences and peeled back the layers of identity and social constraint. Their work reflects the realities of womanhood in a complex society while illuminating the path towards empowerment and introspection. As literary torchbearers, these writers have not only carved a niche for themselves but have opened floodgates for generations of voices yet to be heard. Their legacy, thus, is not a mere footnote in literary history, but a cornerstone one that continues to shape, inspire and redefine the evolving landscape of Indian English fiction.

7. Conclusion

The 21st century has ushered in a dynamic and transformative phase for Indian English fiction. Writers have moved beyond traditional themes of colonialism, nationalism and identity to embrace more diverse, global and deeply social constraints. Contemporary authors are boldly exploring subjects such as marginality, gender fluidity, subalternity, class distinction, patriarchy,

racial discrimination, Dalit feelings, reflecting the complex realities of a rapidly evolving India. The language is more experimental, blending Indian idioms with global aesthetics. New voices are constantly emerging, enriching the literary tapestry. Indian English fiction today is a powerful lens through which contemporary socio-political anxieties, cultural shifts and individual aspirations are being expressed, making it a vibrant and resonant force in global literature. As a theorist Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak laid the foundational frameworks like Marxism and feminism to show how dominant power structures silence marginalized groups. Through concepts like subalternity and epistemic violence, she argues that truly oppressed voices are excluded from systems of knowledge and representation. Alongside Edward Said and Homi K. Bhabha, her work cements representation as a critical ethical and political issue. This led other writers to experiment freely.

Arundhati Roy, Neel Mukherjee, and Meena Kandasamy are contemporary Indian English novelists who write about social inequality and marginalised communities. Roy explores caste, gender, nationalism, displacement, and social injustice. Her narratives, delicately wrought with emotional depth and introspective subtlety, transcend cultural boundaries and linguistic confines, offering a universal resonance that elevates Indian English fiction to global stature. With her two novels, she does not merely tell a story - she excavates the human soul, giving voice to silences and shaping the invisible contours of inner life. Mukherjee focuses on class, caste, poverty, migration, and inequality. Kandasamy, particularly through a Dalit and feminist perspective, examines caste oppression, patriarchy, violence, resistance, and the voices of marginalised people. Their works therefore provide important perspectives on caste, gender, identity, marginality, and resistance in contemporary Indian society.

To sum up, these three novelists stand as a towering figure in the realm of Indian English literature, carving a niche for themselves as a harbinger in the domain of marginalized and

subaltern novels. Popularly known as the visionary of this genre, their narrative artistry is deeply rooted in their lived experience within a polyglot milieu and their mastery over multiple languages which endowed them with a rare perceptiveness and intellectual prowess. Their dynamic and introspective worldview is deftly channeled through their nuanced characters and innovative narrative techniques.

8. Acknowledgements

The first author expresses his sincere gratitude to his Research Supervisors, Dr Suvashree

Suvadarshinee, and Dr Bipin Bihari Dash for their valuable guidance, constructive suggestions, and continuous academic support throughout the course of this research.

9. Authors Declaration

We hereby declare that this work is original, has not been published elsewhere, and is not under consideration for publication in any other journal.

10. Conflict of Interests: None

References

- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2004). *Key concepts in post-colonial studies*. Routledge.
- Barbhuiya, M. K. (2025). Exploring subaltern narratives in Neel Mukherjee's novel *A State of Freedom*. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 10(4), 447–453. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.104.65>
- Bhattacharjee, A. (2019). The ethics of representation and the figure of the woman: The question of agency in Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's "Can the Subaltern Speak?". *South Asian Review*, 39(3–4), 311–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02759527.2018.1540123>
- D'Souza, R. (2019). Exploring ableism in Indian schooling through the social model of disability. *Disability & Society*, 35(7), 1177–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1668635>
- Das, J. (2022). Reclaiming the body: Marital rape and self-sustainability in Meena Kandasamy's *When I Hit You*. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2455328X221122516>
- Dhande, S., & Islam, M. (2025). Eco-caste nexus: The intersection of ecocriticism and caste discrimination in Meena Kandasamy's *The Gypsy Goddess*. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 17(1), 85–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2455328X251319937>
- Guha, R. (Ed.). (1982). *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian history and society*. Oxford University Press.
- Guha, R. (Ed.). (1984). *Subaltern Studies III: Writings on South Asian history and society*. Oxford University Press.
- Jazeel, T. (2014). Subaltern geographies: Geographical knowledge and postcolonial strategy. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 35(1), 88–103. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjtg.12053>
- Johansson, S. T. (2014). A critical and contextual approach to inclusive education: Perspectives from an Indian context. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18(12), 1219–1236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2014.885594>
- Kandasamy, M. (2014). *The Gypsy Goddess*. Atlantic Books.
- Kandasamy, M. (2017). *When I Hit You: Or, A portrait of the writer as a young wife*. Atlantic Books.
- Kaur, L. (2014). The rights of girl child in Indian society as foregrounded by Arundhati Roy in *The God of Small Things*. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*, 2(2), 1424–1434. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijels.55.14>
- Lau, L., & Mendes, A. C. (2019). Romancing the other: Arundhati Roy's *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*. *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, 57(1), 45–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021989418820701>
- Leonhardt, N., Björnsdóttir, K., Goldbach, A., Smára, R., Martick, S., & Schlothauer, B. (2025). The diversity of voices in universities: A critical reflection on representation based on two university projects in Iceland and Germany. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 53, 124–133. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bld.12623>

- Lloyd, D. (2014). Representation's coup. *Interventions*, 16(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369801X.2012.726444>
- Maggio, J. (2007). "Can the subaltern be heard?": Political theory, translation, representation, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 32(4), 419–443. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030437540703200403>
- Mandal, M. (2023). Dismantling caste and gender hierarchy: Female-Dalit alliance in Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* and Meena Kandasamy's *The Gypsy Goddess*. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2455328X221149302>
- Mittapalli, R. (2017). Caste and outcast: Dalit masculinity in Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. *IUP Journal of English Studies*, 12(2), 54–67.
- Mohanraj, R. (2018). "It's not just a matter of speaking...": The vicissitudes of cross-cultural interviewing. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 18(2), 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-D-368-3780>
- Mukherjee, N. (2014). *The Lives of Others*. Chatto & Windus.
- Mukherjee, N. (2017). *A State of Freedom*. Chatto & Windus.
- Piu, P. (2023). The journey of subalternity in Gayatri Spivak's work: Its sociological relevance. *The Sociological Review*, 71(6), 1258–1278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00380261231194495>
- Ram, N. (2001, January 6). Scimitars in the sun: N. Ram interviews Arundhati Roy on a writer's space. *Frontline*, 18(1), 4–14. <https://frontline.thehindu.com/cover-story/scimitars-in-the-sun/article64755917.ece>
- Roy, A. (1997). *The God of Small Things*. Flamingo.
- Roy, A. (2017). *The Ministry of Utmost Happiness*. Hamish Hamilton.
- Sangeetha, J., Mohan, S., Hariharasudan, A., & Kannan, R. (2022). An analysis of linguistic discourses and literary techniques in Meena Kandasamy's select works. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(2), 342–347. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1202.16>
- Singal, N. (2005). Mapping the field of inclusive education: A review of the Indian literature. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 9(4), 331–350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110500138277>
- Singal, N. (2006). Inclusive education in India: International concept, national interpretation. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 53(3), 351–369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10349120600847797>
- Singal, N. (2019). Challenges and opportunities in efforts towards inclusive education: Reflections from India. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(7–8), 827–840. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1624845>
- Singh, K. (2020). Writing disability in contemporary Indian English fiction: A posthumanism perspective. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Multidisciplinary Sciences*, 3(1), 245–253.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
- Taneja-Johansson, S., & Singal, N. (2025). Pathways to inclusive and equitable quality education for people with disabilities: Cross-context conversations and mutual learning. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 29(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1965799>
- Walder, D. (1998). *Post-colonial literatures in English: History, language, theory*. Blackwell Publishers.