

## 1. Introduction

Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* critiques the system of untouchability in Indian society. Velutha and Ammu's sexual relation with each other is implicitly an attempt to break the artificial and arbitrary walls constructed between the elite class and the so called subaltern group. However, the attempt was averted when the protesters (Velutha and Ammu) confront the mechanical society. The act of copulation exposed the subalternity of Ammu and untouchability of Velutha.

In this research study, Roy's *The God of Small Things* has been analyzed as a critique of untouchability. Sexual passion is also considered as a baser desire of human beings. It is not bound by laws, systems and social hierarchy. Ammu's sexual instinct exposes into physical intercourse with her own family carpenter, Velutha, an untouchable lower caste person in the society. She discovers that sexuality is a means of gratifying the instinctual desires where all forms of distinctions of class and caste are only social constructs, whereas Velutha realizes that it is a way of protesting and crumbling down the barriers of caste, color and discriminations. The different attempts with diverse objectives brought them together in fact uniting them into a primordial unity. However, the society does not tolerate this violation, consequently tragedy follows.

Ammu after such task is doubly subalternized. She is, on the one hand, dominated and segregated as she is a divorced woman living in her maternal house and on the other hand, due to her relationship with the lower caste carpenter Velutha, she is discriminated very bitterly in the society. Finally their relation and their task cannot be accepted and both of them lose their life. They both try to break the rules of the society but the society does not take it as normal. So, Velutha is badly beaten to death and Ammu herself cannot survive in such grief. The subalternity has been

exposed very clearly in the text. Ammu and Velutha both try to protest-the sexual relation is a main protest but such task brings them in a tragic end at last.

### **Background of the Novel**

*The God of Small Things* is Roy's first novel through which she became successful to get the prestigious Booker Prize. She was the first non-expatriate Indian author and the first Indian woman to earn such reputation. In her works, she picturizes the cultural aspects of Indian life in an artistic way.

The setting for *The God of Small Things* is the state of Kerala in India, where Arundhati Roy herself grew up. She was born in 1961 in Bengal and grew up in Kerala. Kerala is located on the southernmost tip of India and holds 3.5% of the country's population.

Malayalam is Kerala's state language and wears Mundu, the typical dress of Kerala people. Almost all people know and understand the English language and they also use English more than their own native language. *The God of Small Things* is originally written in English; however Roy does include a few Malayalese, as well as Hindi phrases in the novel such as Appoi and Ammai.

Kerala is the only place in the world where religions coincide, there Christianity, Hinduism, Marxism and Islam can be accounted for by its location on the Malabar Coast. It was highly accessible to traders from various other cultures. These traders brought a variety of religions to the region. Basically Syrian Christian is one who claims a religion whose ancestry supposedly dates back to St. Thomas. It is very similar in nature to the Roman Catholic Church.

Roy herself was born as a child of marriage between Christian woman from Kerala and a Bengali Hindu tea planter. It was not a happy marriage and she was unable to speak for her father. She said that she had only seen her father a couple of

times. Social prejudices have dissolved to a great extent through an affair between a low caste man and upper caste woman can still cause quite a flutter.

Set in the 1960, *The God of Small Things* is about two children; the two egg twins: Estha and Rahel, and the shocking consequences of pivotal events in their young lives, the accidental death by drowning of a visiting English cousin, Sophie Mol. The novel depicts vivid pictures of life in a town, the thoughts and feelings of the two small children and the complexity and hybridity of the adults in their world. It is also a poignant lesson in the destructive power of caste system and moral and political bigotry in general.

The novel tells us how life depends on small happenings in life. Pointing the importance of small things in life, Jason Cowley in *India Today* writes: “It is considerable never to forget about the small things in life. The insects and flowers, wind and water, the outcast and the despised” (28). It is these small happenings that have significant role in our life although they are considered small things. At the end of the first chapter she said that the little events and ordinary are reconstituted and imbedded with new meanings to become the bleached blame of the story. It is the story that examines the things very minutely and closely.

As the postcolonial writers explore the disrupted identity of formerly colonized people, Roy also depicts the distorted identity of the Kerala people. Chacko, one of the principal characters in this novel clearly mentions about how they are identity less. He further clarifies: “We are prisoners of war ...our dreams have been doctored. We belong nowhere. We sail unanchored on troubled seas. We may never be allowed ashore. Our sorrows will never be sad our joys never happy enough our dreams never big enough. Our lives never important enough to matter” (53).

Hybridity is another important aspect of postcolonial literary texts. *The God of Small*

Things also is a perfect example of study of hybrid culture. It is about cross identity that can be called cultural displacement. The narrator in the novel, talking about the hybridity explores:

Baby Kochamma dislikes the twins, for she considered them doomed, fatherless waifs. Worse still, they were Half-Hindu Hybrid whom no self respecting Syrian Christians would ever marry. She was keen for them to realize that they lived on sufferance in the Ayemenem house where they really had no right to be (45).

### **Roy and Subalternity**

Suzanna Arundhati Roy was born on the 24 November 1961, the child of a marriage between a Christian woman from Kerala and a Bengali Hindu tea planter. It was not a happy marriage and she was unable to spend her crucial childhood in Ayemenem. There, her mother Mary Roy ran an informal school named Corpus Christi where Arundhati Roy developed her literary and intellectual abilities unconstrained by the set of formal education. Ayemenem is no longer the old-fashioned village in the sixties where the novel is set. Paradise Pickles still exist there. Social prejudices have dissolved to a great extent, through an affair between a low caste man and an upper caste woman can still cause quite a flutter.

Roy spent her whole life fighting traditions. She didn't want to be a traditional Indian housewife. She raised the issues of caste and class discrimination. In her works, Roy seems to be obsessed with the poor people and their sufferings. She, on the one hand, raised the problems of women dominated in a patriarchal society, and on the other hand, talked about the social injustice done upon the lower caste people. Her political essays are sharp weapons to slap the so called superior group who always try to dominate the lower caste people.

Together with the political independence third world writers started to write freely, subaltern studies group emerged in writing and rewriting historiography of India. For this purpose they drew materials from Marxist historiography. But they did not follow as it is. They started research on various aspects of subaltern people in different parts of India.

In a patriarchal male dominated society female are subaltern, lower class people, untouchable are subaltern in caste practices, politically inferior groups who are underprivileged are subaltern in political system and practices. In *The God of Small Things*, Ammu, the principal character, is doubly subalternized. On the one hand due to her unsuccessful marriage, she is discriminated in male dominated society, and on the other hand, she is socially segregated due to her relationship with an untouchable family carpenter, Velutha. Velutha is well-capable of handling respected job; yet he is not respected due to his untouchable caste. He is paid less because he is untouchable. The narrator says; 'Mammachi often said that if only he hadn't been a paravan, he might have been an engineer' (75). Narrator further adds: "he is neglected; he is just a small thing for them. Mammachi paid Velutha less than she would a touchable carpenter but more than she would a paravan. Mammachi didn't encourage him to enter the house"(77).

There can be no gainsaying the fact that Arundhati Roy had read Rushdie and Morrison before she wrote the novel and the reading might have suggested the title. As for Urvashi Bharat, she has made her point well in her essay. But her emphasis is on the first part of the title, that is, 'god'; while there is much in the novel to show that Arundhati Roy's main concern is about the 'god of small things' which has been, in the novel, crushed by 'the god of big things' resulting in the tragedy.

In *The God of Small Things* we read: 'He was walking swiftly now, towards the Heart of Darkness. As lonely as a wolf: *The God of Loss. The God of Small Things*' (290). It is very clear here that Velutha, one of the central characters, is entitled as '*The God of Loss: The God of Small Things*'. It is Velutha who meets a very brutal, tragic and dark death in the police custody, because he was a Paravan (untouchable).

The novel really delves very deep in to human nature, nature of subaltern people. Although the nature of subaltern people is to rebel and speak against the elite group, they can't speak explicitly. In "Can the subaltern speak?" Spivak says, "If in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is more deeply in shadow" (83). Both Velutha and Ammu are victimized in the Kerala society.

Ammu being a member of touchable family is exploited and dominated in the society on two ways: on one hand she is victimized in a patriarchal society due to her identity as a divorcee. She is segregated because she is husbandless after marriage and living in maternal house. To live in parent's house permanently after marriage is not positively accepted in the society. On the other hand, she is supposed to be an outcaste when her sexual relationship with Velutha is known to all. Velutha being an untouchable is beaten to death due to his physical relation with Ammu, an upper class woman.

Spivak in her famous essay "Can the subaltern speak?" discussed the problems involved with representation. She argues that;

"The subaltern people cannot speak themselves. Instead, they have got to be represented. Their voices are in shadow of so-called superior's voice. It can easily be erased. Spivak posits women in the role of the

subaltern questioning the male constructed voice of women with the patriarchal society. Women are denied the position from which they can speak on their own; they are always turned into the objects of the male's desire. Spivak says there is no space from which the sexed subaltern subject can speak" (105).

In the novel both low caste people and women are subalternized. Velutha is subalternized being a paravan and developing sexual relationship with upper class woman and Ammu is subalternized as she is a divorcee and develops physical relationship with lower caste male. By drawing a parallel between the untouchables: Low caste people and women, Roy critique the mainstream Indian culture in order to give voice to the subaltern who are defined in terms of caste and class.

## 2. Subaltern Studies

Subaltern is a term first adopted by Antonio Gramsci to refer to those groups in society who are subject to the hegemony of the ruling classes. It includes peasants, workers and other groups ignored access to 'hegemonic' power. Although the history of elite class is realized by the state authority, Gramsci was interested in the historiography of the subaltern class. He opined that the history of subaltern groups is fragmented and episodic although the history of dominant class is usually accepted as 'official' history. They are always subject to the activity of ruling classes, even when they rebel. They have less power to the means by which they may control their own representation, and less access to cultural and social institutions. As quoted by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin in *Key Concepts in Post-colonial Studies*, Gramsci outlined six point plans for studying the history of the subaltern class in *Notes on Italian History* which included:

- (1) Their objective formation;
- (2) their active or passive affiliation to the dominant political formation;
- (3) the birth of new parties and dominant groups;
- (4) the formation that the subaltern groups produce to press their claims;
- (5) new formation within the old framework that assert the autonomy of the subaltern classes; and other points referring to trade unions and political parties (52).

Subaltern studies group is basically a school of colonial history and its main focus is to investigate and describe the contribution made by the people on their own, independently of the elite, and to establish a subaltern or peasant consciousness.

Subaltern studies group is based around Delhi University. Their main organ is the annual journal subaltern studies: *Writing on South Asian History and Society* first published in 1982. The group includes, amongst other, Ranjit Guha, Sahid Amin,



Gyanendra Pandey and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. The group has made an ineradicable impact on historical, political and critical studies of South Asia. In the work of subaltern studies group, they use the term to describe the ‘peasants’, the ‘insurgents’ who periodically rose up against the British colonialists, or more generally, ‘the people’.

Subaltern people are dominated and exploited in their society by elite groups. But subaltern is not homogenous term having a fixed identity. It does not have single criterion to identify as a subaltern. Sumit Sarkar also opines that the term is ambiguous because it doesn’t have stable identity. In *The Condition and Nature of Subaltern Militancy: Bengal from Swadeshi to Non-cooperation*, Sarkar writes:

...subaltern is no more free of ambiguities and problem than its rough equivalents (for example ‘popular mass’, ‘lower-class’); it does have the advantage however of emphasizing the fundamental relationship of power, of domination and subordination. Nor does the subaltern concepts exclude more rigorous class-analysis where the subjects or material permits it (273).

Subaltern can be defined as the people of lower class, untouchable, politically dominated and so-called inferior in social rank. Gramsci writes: “I first used subaltern as a collective description for a variety of different dominated and exploited groups who explicitly lack class-consciousness” (79).

Gramsci categorized ‘subaltern’ in place of ‘proleteriate’ who are by any way exploited and dominated by the elite group of the society, elite class rules the society by constructing the truth in their own favor. Seldon writes in his book *A Reader’s Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*: “it fits the descriptions of truth laid down by the intellectual, or political authorities of the day by the member of ruling elite, or by

the prevailing ideologies of knowledge” (100). This means that the intuitions that produce the discourses, fill it with certain set of standards and ‘logos’ that are imposed in the society, that in turn, raise the institutions in the level of power. Sumit Sarkar tried to clarify the term subaltern and its group by saying: “I am employing the term ‘subaltern’ as a convenient short-hand for three Social groups: tribal and low-caste agricultural laborers and share croppers; Landholding peasants, generally of intermediate-caste status in Bengal (together with their Muslim counterparts; and labor in plantation, mines and Industries along with Urban casual labor)” (273).

To be powerful and to rule over the subject class or suppressed group, discourse will be created by elite class in the society. Michel Foucault, a German philosopher opines that ‘truth’ and ‘power’ are interrelated. Power creates the truth for the sake of power. Discourse is the embodiment of power, and it is the discourse through which speak the power of ruling culture-the power to govern and control.

In Foucauldian notion, discourses in all fields are produced with a real world of power, struggle, and used to gain real power. All institutions, either it is university or army, writing media or medical are involved in power foundation by means of discourses. There are very refined rules and regulations to support and continue the existing social systems. To elaborate the relation between ‘knowledge’, ‘power’, and ‘discourses’, Foucault in his book *History of Sexuality* says: “Indeed it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together”(100).

Although the marginal group in the society try to rebel against the domination, they cannot rebel easily because of the power network constructed to suppress them. Ranajit Guha in his essay *The Prose of Counter-Insurgency* says:

...for this Subalternity was materialized by the structure of property, institutionalized by law, sanctified by religion and made tolerable-and

even desirable-by tradition. To rebel was indeed to destroy many of those familiar signs which he had learned to read and manipulate in order to extract a meaning up of the harsh world around him and live with it. The risk in turning things upside down under these conditions was indeed so great that he could hardly afford to engage in such a project in a state of absent-mindedness (1).

There are two types of mentality of subaltern people by nature. On the one hand they try to free themselves from domination and exploitation. They want to rebel to secure the position in the society. But another characteristic of the behavior of subaltern class is their submissiveness. They consider that it is due to their fate they are victimized. They are destined to be suppressed. Gautam Bhadra in his essay "The Mentality of Subalternity": "It is well known that defiance is not characteristics of the behavior of subaltern classes. Submissiveness to authority in one context is as frequent as defiance in another. It is these two elements that together constitute the subaltern mentality" (63).

But Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak seems different in this matter. In *Can the Subaltern Speak?* Spivak presents the subaltern as speechless, unpicturable superfluity outside the labor relations, and revolving instead in a discursive orbit in which "the figure of the woman disappears... into violent shuttling which the displaced figuration of the 'third world woman' caught between tradition and modernization" (306). The violent shuttling makes here deduce that "there is no space from which the subaltern can speak" (307), and finally concludes that "the subaltern cannot speak" (308).

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak is one of the most outspoken proponents of a revision of post colonial literary theory. She is one of the leading figures of subaltern

studies group also. In her influential essay "*Can the Subaltern Speak?*" Published in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Spivak explores:

"Subaltern-members of the non-ruling class-express the oppression theory encounter. In attempting to speak for the subaltern, members of the intellectual elite can only present an interpretation of the subaltern voices filtered through an intellectual| elitist viewpoint. The subalterns are relegated to the position of subjects rather than participants in a two-ways dialogue. Spivak encourages academics to understand how their positions of intellectual and economic privilege limit their integrity in serving as a spokesperson for the subaltern women in the role of subaltern questioning the male-constructed voice of women within a patriarchal society (93).

Spivak resists the idea that one voice can represent a way of thinking, particularly when the way of thinking strives to recognize the significance of multiplicity and positionality in the creation of a text. In "*Can the Subaltern Speak?*" She explores the idea of how the subaltern, or non-elite finds ways to express its oppression, she argues that the wish of intellectuals to provide a space for this voice becomes problematic because of their respective positions. In the process of speaking about or for the subaltern the radical intellectual can not avoid reading a representation of the non-elite. This representation does not allow the subaltern to speak and represent itself; rather, the intellectual further colonizes the subaltern by positioning the non-elite as a subject. The subaltern merely becomes a subject of intellectual pursuit instead of a responsive participant in a dialogue. As the intellectual seeks to transform the insurgency of the subaltern into a text that documents its resistance, he/she must consider the politics of representation and how the writing

shapes this representation. In an attempt to address the issue, Spivak suggest that intellectual should acknowledge and understand how their privileged positions can inhibit the possibility of speaking for the subaltern.

The questioning of who speaks for whom is an integral aspect of Spivak's idea of feminism. She compares how the feminine has been treated in a similar way to the subaltern by pointing to deconstructive criticisms and certain types of feminist criticism as spaces where this treatment occurs. She contends that it is because of the colonial production of history and male dominance that women have been silenced through their absence in historiography, not because they have not participated. She points to subaltern historiography as a way to resist this type of representation.

### **Post-colonialism and Subaltern Studies**

Post-colonialism is the study of ideological and cultural impact of western colonialism particularly after decolonialism. It studies the process and the effects of cultural displacement and the way in which the displaced have culturally defended themselves. The term is sometimes used for the academic activities done in the third world academia. These third world intellectuals have tried to subvert the colonial subjectively-the west at the centre. The literary activities in these countries have more similarities in their attempts to spread lights on their national subjects that were marginalized in the writings of first world writers. Hans Bertens in the book *Literary Theory: the Basic* writes:

Postcolonial theory and criticism emphasis the tension between the (former) colonies, between what within the colonial framework were the metropolitan imperial centre and its consequences for personal and communal identities that inevitably followed colonial conquest and rule and it does so from a non-Eurocentric perspectives (200).

Post-colonialism is a type of discourse which resists the imperial power, and studies the history of colonized country, and studies the impacts left by the colonizers on the native lands. The colonial discourses are replaced by post-colonialism.

From the late 1970s, the postcolonialism has been used by literary critics to discuss the various cultural effects of colonization. Bill Ashcroft Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin write in *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*, “The term has subsequently been widely used to signify the political linguistics and cultural experience of societies that were former European colonies” (186).

Colonized people try to copy the colonizers’ culture to show themselves advanced and civilized but at the same time they cannot forget their own culture and they feel culturally displaced and identityless. The culture created at that time is called hybrid culture. Diaspora, cultural fragmentation and displacement, hybridity and mimicry are some of the important themes of postcolonial writings.

Concepts of independence and nationalism have developed to subvert the imperialistic notions of writings. Postcolonial writers became more conscious about local culture, history and their own traditions. African writers started to write about the social discrimination and cultural domination done over Negro by the European white people. They tried to prove that they are not savage and they do have their own culture and own history. The postcolonial discourse emphasizes the identity of the natives.

After 1970s, Indian scholars especially in and around Delhi University started to publish journals about local culture, local socio economic activities and local people’s identity; that is named as Subaltern Studies Group. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, a famous feminist and post colonial critic tried to depict the condition of female in such a tough religious society, Ranajit Guha, Sumit Sarkar and Shahid

Amin made an ineradicable impact on historical, political and critical studies of South Asia.

Subaltern studies are also an outcome of cultural studies which is concerned about the study of mass/popular culture, local history and local people's activities, subaltern art and ideology. The interplay between race, ethnicity and culture has also emerged as a central concern of contemporary cultural theory and subaltern studies. Spivak in her essay "Post Coloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for Indian Posts" writes: "Indian history itself is a position of subalternity; one can only articulate subaltern subject position in the name of the history" (24). Local and native past became the central focus for the subaltern studies groups that was marginalized in the colonial period.

*The God of Small Things* is a perfect postcolonial novel having much more subaltern elements. The study of Indian history is one of the important aspects in *The God of Small Things*. The local Kerala culture i.e. the mixture of Hindu and Christian is the main aspect of the background of the plot. The story is totally based on the colonial experiences and its impact after decolonization. Although it was written and published at the end of 1990s the story is of 1960s.

Arundhati Roy, in *The God of Small Things*, symbolically questions the 'real' history of India. Chacko, one of the principal character in the novel, is the spokesperson on behalf of Indian history. The question of Indian history is discussed symbolically through the image of History House. It is the abandoned estate of British colonial officer in the India-'Kari Saipu', the Englishman who had 'gone native; who spoke Malayalam and wore Mundus. Ayemenem's own Kurtz. Ayemenem his private Heart of Darkness" (52). Kari Saipu, in the novel, is described as an archetype of Kurtz. He spoke Malayalam, the local language of Indian natives and wore Mundu,

the traditional dress of the natives. He was native but 'gone native' just to exploit and corrupt the mind of the local people. Roy attacks the British mission who learned native language and system and exploit the real culture and history by imposing their own culture. The colonized people were supposed to read the history that was composed by the British colonial power. Chacko tries to make the children Estha and Rahel, conscious of their own history. He explains 'History was like an old house at night. With all lamps lit. And ancestor whispering inside' (52). It shows how the power holders manipulate the original story and replace with their own imagination to fulfill their aim.

### **Subalternity in *The God of Small Things***

Subaltern Studies group basically focus on the study of those social groups who are deviated from mainstream groups. Such groups in the society are separated and even segregated from the authentic groups and their culture that is what Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak called 'elite'. Subaltern studies recover the obliterated voice of the marginalized community and their way of living.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak is one of the propounder of subaltern studies who talks about women's subalternity in Indian society where they are doubly subalternized/ marginalized as she said in *Can the Subaltern Speak?* "If in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is even more deeply in shadow"(83).

In Indian society, subaltern people have to bear injustice done upon them by so-called superior groups. They are not allowed to celebrate the social culture and festivals together with the higher class people. As the narrator says, "...they were made to stand separately not with the rest of the family .Nobody would look at them" (5), Ammu and her children are excluded in Sophie Mol's funeral ceremony.



Study of decolonized Indian culture itself is the study of subaltern in a sense. Its ruptured identity, cultural fragmentation and hybridity can be considered the identity of subaltern people. Subaltern in India are colonized not only politically but the colonizers have ruptured their identity. Pappachi's mind has been "*brought into a state* which made him like the English" (52). Chacko told that they all were 'Anglophiles'. He further explains: "they were a family of Anglophiles pointed in the wrong direction, trapped outside their own history, and unable to retrace their steps because their footprints had been swept away" (52). Their house is a symbolic representation of whole India once colonized by the Britain. They established their own culture, religion, language, education system in India that made the people anglophile as Chacko called to Pappachi.

What Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak talked in her essay "*Can the Subaltern Speak?*" is that subaltern people do not have their own history. They are also deviated from the mainstream culture. Their history is also ruptured by the colonizers. She further says: "...in the context of the colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak"(83). Female are doubly subaltern in the sense that they are, on the one hand, dominated by the patriarchal monopoly in the society and on the other, being colonized, they don't have their own history and identity of their own. Chacko, a principal character of the novel says: "our dreams have been doctored. We belong nowhere"(53). The subaltern people are living without identity due to cultural displacement.

Almost all characters in the novel become useless in their life. Ammu, with her twin son and daughter is left by her Bengali drunkard husband and compelled to sustain her life in maternal house where she is extremely hated not by the family but also by the society. Chacko, after having divorce, lives without any job at last. Sophie

Mol, an English cousin of Rahel and Estha died by drowning. Rahel's love relation also turns into desert at last and returns back after divorce. Ammu dies having no company. The narrator commenting about her death says: "She died alone, with a noisy ceiling fan for company and no Estha to lie at the back of her and talk to her" (161). This incident also shows that the common people in the society are dying like animals-just a simple death, what else! There will be nobody to care and mourn for those who died.

### 3. Critique of Untouchability

*The God of Small Things* is a tragic story of a Syrian Christian Indian family from Ayemennem in Kerala. In the novel, the laws of the Indian caste system are broken by the activities of Ammu and Velutha, an untouchable or Paravan. Velutha works at the paradise pickles and preserves factory owned by Ammu's family. Yet because he is an untouchable, the other workers resent him and he is paid less money for his work. Velutha's presence is unsettling to many who believe and act above his station. "An unwarranted assurance. In the way he walked. The way he held his head. The quiet way he offers suggestions without being asked. Or the quite way in which he disregarded suggestions without appearing to rebel" (76).

According to religious belief, being an untouchable is punishment for having been bad in a former life. By being good and obedient, an untouchable can obtain a higher rebirth. Velutha's lack of complacency causes him many problems throughout the novel. It was not entirely his fault that he lived in a society where a man's death could be more profitable than his life had ever been. Although he is a dedicated member of the Maoist party, his untouchable status makes other party members dislike him, and so, local party leader comrade K.N.M.Pillai would be more politically successful without Velutha.

When Velutha has an affair with Ammu, he breaks an ancient taboo and incurs the wrath of Ammu's family and the Kerala police. He breaks the rigid social rules of the caste system and therefore the authorities punish him. Roy describes the policemen's violent actions as being done out of fear, "civilizations fear of nature, men's fear of the women, power's fear of powerlessness" (308).

The division between touchable and untouchable is so ingrained in the Kerala society that Velutha is seen as a nonhuman. If they trust Velutha more than they

intended to, it was only because any kinship and connection between themselves and him, and implication that if nothing else, at least biologically he was a fellow creature had been served long ago.

Set in a small town in Kerala, *The God of Small Things* is about a family, seen from the perspective of seven years old Rahel. She and her twin brother live with their mother, Ammu, who was married to a Bengali, the children's Baba, but from whom she is divorced. They live in sufferance in the Ayemenem house with their grandmother (Mammachi), Uncle (Chacko) and grandaunt (Baby Kochamma). Ammu, a touchable and a member of a high class family in social status, develops physical relationship with Velutha, an untouchable family carpenter, which is beyond imagination in such a tough religious society and is supposed to be a great crime against the God.

Velutha is accused of kidnapping Sophie Mol, Rahel and Estha's cousin and killing her and, therefore, killed by policeman together with other people. Ammu also dies in grief. The church denies burying her, the worst transgressor who broke the love laws by having sexual relationship with Velutha. Ammu dies alone, and there is nobody to support her. "She died alone with a noisy ceiling fan for company and no Estha to lie at the back and talk to her. She was thirty-one. Not old not young, but a viable, dieable age" (161).

Velutha is paid less because he is an untouchable. But he can do many things that the touchable are not able to do. The narrator says, "Mammachi often said that if he hadn't been a paravan, he might have become an engineer" (75). Yet he is neglected, he is just a small things for them. "Mammachi paid Velutha less than she would a Touchable carpenter but more than she would a paravan. Mammachi didn't encourage him to enter the house"(77).

Since Ammu has developed a sexual relationship with Velutha, Ammu is outcaste. She was not allowed to take part in her niece's funeral ceremony with her family members "Though Ammu, Estha and Rahel were allowed to attend the funeral; they were made to stand separately, not with the rest of the family. Nobody would look them" (5).

Ammu is punished in the society for not following the traditional rules, and expelled from her paternal home. Such concept of caste system was deep rooted in Kerala society. The communist leader of Kerala, comrade K.N.M Pillai, an advocate of equality and socialization, doesn't allow Velutha to enter his house because he is a paravan; or an untouchable. Talking with Chacko, "a self-proclaimed Marxist" (65), comrade Pillai confesses, "He may be very okay as a person. But other workers are not happy with him. Already they are coming to me with complaints... You see, Comrade, from local standpoint, the caste issue very deep-rooted" (278). Thus, through the issue of caste system, the narrator in the novel shows how the power twists the law to corrupt the mind of suppressed class. The postcolonial scholars want to create a society where the voice of the subject class can be heard.

Ammu (subaltern as women) tries to break the hierarchy of gender in the society. Inter-caste marriage is not allowed; to make love with the person from different caste is supposed to be an extreme crime in the society in which any emotional contact with a person lower to one's caste is supposed to be a great sin. One, who has an affair, with the lower caste male would be expelled from her caste. Velutha (subaltern as untouchable) breaks the social rules and crosses the forbidden territory. The Narrator says, "Perhaps Ammu, Estha and she were the worst transgressors but it wasn't just them. It was the other too"(31). Almost all characters try to resist the existing rules of the society.

A divorced woman often returns to her parent's home, but she is not welcomed wholeheartedly. She is supposed to be lowered down having a divorcee amongst them. There is even the risk that the presence of divorced woman would affect possible marriage for other daughters within the household. *The God of Small Things* is based on the same type of Indian social and family structure. The narrator, through the example of Baby Kochamma, an archetype of conservative Indian woman, vividly describes the attitude of the family towards a divorced woman. The narrator says:

As for a divorced daughter-according to Baby Kochamma, she had no position anywhere at all. And as for a divorced daughter from a love marriage, well words could not describe Baby Kochamma's outrage. As for a divorced daughter from the intercommunity love marriage, Baby Kochamma chooses to remain quivering silent on the subject.

(45-46)

Love, family relationship, and death are most significant themes in the novel. But above all, it is a rebellion against love laws, "the laws that lay down who should be loved, and how much. And how much" (177). Everyone in the family crosses the love laws. Mammachi, who has one sided oedipal connection with her son, supply with young girls for his 'men's need' from the backdoor. Baby Kochamma is tortured by her unflourished love, who later satisfies herself by pressing Ammu.

Although the nature of subaltern people is to rebel and speak against the elite group, they can't speak explicitly. In "*Can the Subaltern Speak?*" Spivak says, "If in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is more deeply in shadow" (83). Both Velutha and Ammu are victimized in the Kerala society.

The novel really delves very deep in to human nature, nature of subaltern people. Roy handles the sex scene between Ammu and Velutha with artistry. Nevertheless, Ammu's affair with the untouchable is wholly implausible. It is the story of forbidden cross-caste love affair and sex, and what a community will do to protect the old ways. Arundhati Roy herself says that because of the caste system, because of the fact that there is no social link between those who make the decision and those who suffer the decision; it just goes ahead and does what it wants. The people also assume that this is their lot, their Karma what was predetermined.

Velutha, an untouchable family carpenter is socially hated because of his lower rank and status. Although he did have capability and skills, he was not regarded and accepted as a useful skilled member of the society. Mammachi used to say about him," if only he hadn't been a paravan, he might have been an engineer" (75). Lower class people are segregated from holding good profession although they might have skills. They are supposed to do the dirty works like cleaning the toilet, serving the rich people etc. They are not allowed to establish any types of relationship with higher class women. Velutha is beaten badly and killed due to his relation with Ammu, an upper caste widow. The narrator in the novel commenting about Velutha's position says;" Mammachi didn't encourage him to enter the house (except when she needed something mended or installed)" (77). The society is so prejudiced that it accepts the works done by untouchables and consumes the skills and does not accept them as useful members of the society.

The novel is full with tension. Velutha's untouchable social position has turned into tragic consequences due to the physical relationship with Ammu. Sexual passion leads them to cross the forbidden territory. They were able to break the social barrier. People cannot even imagine the bodily contact and sexual relationship

between an untouchable family carpenter and touchable upper caste woman. Not only the sexual intercourse but it also leads their lives together, and finally, results in tragic death of both Velutha and Ammu.

Sexual passion is considered as a baser desire and instinct of human beings. It is not bound by laws, system and social hierarchy. It is also a bare identity of women that shows the reality. Although Ammu is a member of touchable caste in the society and owner of the carpenter also, she cannot control the passion, and it is due to the passion that causes tragic death of them. Womanhood and untouchability are the main issues dealt in the novel; it starts and ends within the periphery of these two. The whole plot of the novel is based on subaltern activities and their experiences.

The characters in the novel break the social system and transgress the social values and norms. It's a rebellion against love laws, "the laws they lay down who should be loved and how much. And how much" (177). Sexual relationship with touchable member is a type of resistance against social rules. Commenting on the act of characters, the narrator says: "Perhaps, Ammu, Estha and she were the worst transgressors. But it wasn't just them. It was the other too. They all broke the rules. They all crossed into forbidden territory. They all tempered with the laws that lay down who should be loved and how. And how much"(31).

The husband treats women as the property. To save the job at MR. Hollicks estate, Ammu's alcoholic husband does not hesitate to offer her offer her to Mr Hollicks. Ammu cannot beat his offer, and fights to save to herself from downgrading. In this rage, her husband begins to beat the twins also. Ammu not being able to hold the situation, gets divorced, and "left her husband and returned, unwelcomed, to her parents in Ayemenem" (42). In such a situation, she develops a love affair with Velutha, to heal her wounds. The affair ends with the sexual relationship, which could



not be accepted by the family at any cost. She is expelled from her parental home, because her need was just a small thing "they stuck to the small things "(338). But, the big things happened after the incident. Ammu was outcast. Estha, her son, was returned to her ex-husband breaking the unbreakable friendship of the twins, And Rahel, her daughter, was left to Ayenemem house to be heated and neglected. Velutha, who she herself and her children loved, was beaten to death by the police.

Arundadhi Roy, thus, presenting the story of an Indians Family, provides the glimpse to the structure of Indian culture. The subjectivity of her novel is purely Indian that was marginalized in the writings of the Europeans. The novel presents that the Indians have their 'own' culture, which has its own norms and standards. Presenting the savages nature of Mr. Hollicks, Mr. K. N. M. Pillai, the policeman and the members of Ammus' family, the writers proves that irrationality is the parts of the human unconscious. They are much more savage than they advocate themselves of beings rational, or civilized.

### **Gender Discrimination in *The God of Small Things***

Women are highly discriminated in Indian society. They are not given equal opportunity of education, social participation and property right. Patriarchal society generally thinks that the higher education was unnecessary expense for them. They are considered as second sex or of lower class. As the narrator says: "Pappachi insisted that a college education was an unnecessary expense for girls, so, Ammu had no choice but leave Delhi and move with them. There was very little in a young girl to do in Ayemenen at her than to wait for marriage proposals while she helped her mother with the housework" (38).

It is generally thought in Indian society that the women should remain inside house and their works also are bound to the periphery of the household. On the one

hand, they have to remain and work inside the house without crossing the threshold. On the other hand, they are deprived of making decision inside the house. So the women are doubly subaltern. They are dominated by their husband inside and by the society outside.

Subaltern women generally are effaced in the literary texts. In the text of subaltern studies they are incidental to the events of history rather than contributors to the struggle. In "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Spivak presents the women as speechless, unpicturable, superfluous outside the labor relations and revolving instead in a discursive orbit in which "the figure of women disappears...into a violent shuttling which the displaced figure of 'the third world women' caught between tradition and modernization" (306). The violent shuttling makes her deduce that "there is no space from which the subaltern can speak" (307), and finally concludes that "the subaltern cannot speak (308).

Ammu, the central character of the novel, lives in her maternal home with her two children after having divorce from a Bengali husband. They live in sufferance in the Ayemenem house with Mammachi, children's grandmother, uncle Chacko and grandaunt, Baby Kochamma. When she develops the physical relationship with Velutha, an untouchable family carpenter; that is beyond imagination in such a tough religious society and it is supposed to be a great crime against the God.

Being a divorcee, she was not allowed to take part in her niece's funeral ceremony with her other family members." Though Ammu, Estha and Rahel were allowed to attend the funeral, they were made to stand separately, not with the rest of the family. Nobody would look at them" (5).

Ammu, a divorcee returns her parent's house, but she is not welcomed wholeheartedly. She is supposed to be lowered down having a divorce amongst them.

There is even the risk that the presence of divorced woman would affect possible marriage for other daughter within the household. The narrator, through the example of Baby Kochamma, an archetype of conservative Indian women, vividly describes the attitude of the family towards a divorcee. The narrator says: “As for a divorced daughter-according to Baby Kochamma, she had no position anywhere at all. And as divorced daughter from a love marriage, well words could not describe Baby Kochamma’s outrage. As for divorced daughter from a inter community love marriage-Baby Kochamma choose to remain quivering silent on the subject” (45-46).

So Ammu is exploited and dominated in the society on two ways: on the one hand she is victimized in a patriarchal society due to her identity as a divorcee. She is socially segregated because she is husbandless after marriage and living in maternal house. To live in parent’s house permanently after marriage is not positively accepted in the society. On the other hand, she is supposed to be an outcaste when her sexual relationship with Velutha is known to all.

From 1982, subaltern studies emerged with the study of caste, gender, color and ethnicity. It did not talk about the female issues up to the first three volumes. It had not been dealt until the publication of subaltern studies IV. Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak raised the issues of feminism in subaltern studies IV. She made it clear that subaltern studies as a discourse to speak on behalf of marginalized groups has not paid as much attention to women as it should have.

Both Subaltern voices and their works are ignored in the patriarchal society despite their contribution and active participation in the anti-imperialist insurgencies. Spivak thinks that “Woman is the neglected syntagm of semiosis of subalternity as female subject...” (359).

Spivak wrote a commentary on Mahasweta Devi's *Standayani, A Literary Representation of the Subaltern: Mahasweta Devi's Standayani*, where she argued how the female are deprived of their subjectivity, their voice. Women are looked and thought to be the object of the male's desire. Spivak says that "India is too deeply informed by the goddess-infested reverse sexism of the Hindu majority. As long as there is the hegemonic cultural self-representation of India as goddess-mother, she will collapse under the burden of the immense expectations that such a self-representation permits"(96).

After the publication of Spivak's famous essay "*Can the Subaltern Speak?*" the history of feminism took an important turning point. She has discussed on the problems involved with representation. She argues that the subaltern people cannot speak themselves. Instead, they have got to be represented. Their voices are in shadow of so-called superior's voice. It can easily be erased. Spivak posits women in role of the subaltern questioning the male constructed voice of women within the patriarchal society. Women are denied the position from which they can speak on their own; they are always turned into the objects of the male's desire. Spivak says "there is no space from which the sexed subaltern subject can speak" (105). She comes up with an interesting conclusion that "both as an object of colonialist historiography and as a subject of insurgency, the ideological construction of gender keep the male dominant" (82). Such ideological construction of power, in Spivak's opinions created because "in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is even more deeply in shadow" (83).

Spivak especially focuses on the issues of women although she talks on various subaltern classes. She claims that the women are doubly subalternized in the

colonial patriarchal spaces. They will remain as mute as ever. She, in the end of her essay concludes that “the subaltern cannot speak” (104).

Kamala Visweswarans's opinion is different when she opinion in her essay gender and subalternity, gendered subalternity that it is not only the determination of male in the society that makes women subaltern but it is inn relation to the other women. She further writes:

...for women become women not only in relation to men, but also in opposition to other women. Thus the subject position of the middle-class or elite nationalist 'women' must be counter posed to that of subaltern women. The gender relation of subalternity means that with regard to the nominal male subject of nationalist ideology, the figure of women is subaltern; with regards to subaltern women, the recuperated middle-class women as nationalist subject certainly is not. (87)

She believes that the idea that gender is a separate category is equivalent to caste and class, rater than a structuring principle of naturalism and its historiography. Talking about subaltern women, she writes: " the questions of subaltern women must be formed first by the recovery of a non-original or 'dependent' subject in the understanding of subaltern autonomy as relational" (88).

In *The God of Small Things* Roy presents a principal female character, Ammu dominated in different fields. She is considered as a real subaltern woman. Trying to clarify the subalternity of Ammu the narrator talks:” though Ammu, Estha, and Rahel were allowed to attend the funeral, they were made to stand separately, not with the rest of the family. Nobody would look at them.” (5).

She was a married woman but she had been living in her maternal house after divorce. She was not allowed to be included in socio-cultural rituals and ceremonies.

Talking about her position in the society the narrator further writes:

...a married daughter had no position in her parent's home. As for a divorced daughter-according to Baby Kochamma, she had no position anywhere at all. And as for a divorced daughter from a love marriage, well, words could not describe Baby Kochamma's outrage. As for a divorced daughter from an intercommunity love marriage-Baby Kochamma chose to remain quivering silent on the subject. (45-46).

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, while talking about subalternity of woman opines that there is no space from which the subaltern can speak. It seems that Ammu doesn't have any space where she can sustain her life happily. She is considered as burden in her maternal house.

The patriarchal society is biased and prejudiced which never accepts the female empowerment wholeheartedly. Women are not supposed to get education and opportunity. Talking about female education the narrator writes; "Pappachi insisted that a college education was an unnecessary expense for a girl, so Ammu had no choice but to leave Delhi and move with them". Every marriage is common to be free from the burden of education for girls; 'there was very little for a young girl to do in Ayemenem other than to wait for proposals while she helped her mother with the housework' (38).

For woman there is no right to be equal in social ceremonies and functions, no rights to get the opportunities as the males do have, no rights to get education, and no rights to get social prestige-what can they do then? Are the women only the property of male or what? Many philosophers raise the questions against the injustice done

upon female in the society. Many postcolonial writers try to show the real scenario of such discrimination in the society. Arundhati Roy also visualizes the picture of Indian society where women are considered in the lower rank although they can do as male can.

### **Untouchability in *The God of Small Things***

Caste system is the recurring theme in the postcolonial literature. The postcolonial attempt is to subvert such dominating hierarchies. The practice of caste system is very important in Hindu society in India. Many Indians use the term jati to refer to the caste. There are many caste and sub-castes in India, each related to especial occupation. All the castes are grouped into four main Varnas- Brahim, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shaudra. Brahmins are the superior caste and they perform religious ceremony in their allocated occupations. Kshatriyas are the warriors and are less superior then Brahmins in social rank. Vaishyas are of third Varna and they are mainly traders. The last varna is of Shudras, and they are labourer. Caste not only indicates occupations but habits and social interactions with members of other caste as well. Brahmins are prohibited to drink alcohol, even to touch it. Members of high caste enjoy more opportunities but dirty habits and social interactions with members of other caste perform menial jobs. Untouchable people are supposed to do very difficult and dirty jobs like that of cleaning the toilets, collecting and removing the garbage which requires them to contact with bodily flits. They are therefore, considered polluted and not allowed to enter the house of touchable, and they are supposed to drink from separate wells. Upward mobility is very rare in the caste system. Inter caste marriages and sexual relations are not allowed, and supposed to be crime against the God.

Though such an extreme form of caste system does not exist in present India, Roy in *The God of Small Things* vividly narrates the situation of caste-system that was in existence during the seventies. As most of the Indian writer's dream of caste-less society, Roy also makes her main character, Ammu and Velutha-an untouchable or a paravan, breaks the laws of Indian caste system. Roy repeatedly reminds the lines "the laws that lay down who should be loved and how much. And how much". As mention earlier, inter-caste marriage is not allowed, to make love with the person from different caste is supposed to be an extreme crime in the society in which any emotional contact with the person lower to one's caste is supposed to be a great sin.

Ammu, a "Touchable" and a member of high class family in social status, develops a physical relationship with Velutha, an untouchable that is beyond imagination in such a tough religious society, and is supposed to be a great crime against God. Because the priest and the interpreters of religious holy books to be the works of sovereign God. That is the cause why, the church denied burying Ammu, the worst transgressor who broke the love laws by having sexual relationship with Velutha. She died alone, and there was nobody to support her.

...Ammu died in a grimy room in the Bharat Lodge...She died alone.

With a noisy ceiling fan for her company and no Estha and Rahel to lie at the back of her and talk to her. She was thirty-one. Not old, not young, but a viable, dia-able age (161).

Caste discrimination is so much deep-rooted in India that even his fellow workers resent Velutha. The Communist leader of Kerala, Comrade K.N.M. Pillai," Ayemenem's egg-breaker and professional omletter,"(236) takes the full advantage of the situation, because Velutha is the only card-holder member of the party, and, Comrade Pillai would be more successful without him. Baby Kochamma files false



FIR against Velutha, and he is beaten to death. He is supposed to have broken the rigid boundaries of caste system, and therefore, the authorities must punish him. The narrator throws a bitter satire on the hypocrisy by presenting the attitude of Comrade Pillai towards Velutha. Comrade Pillai, the advocate of equality and socialization, does not allow Velutha to enter onto his house, because he is a paravan, or an untouchable. Talking with Chacko, “a self-proclaimed Marxist” (65), Comrade Pillai confesses, “he may be very well okay as a person. But other workers are not happy with him. Already they are coming to me with complaints... You see, Comrade, from local stand point, the caste issues are very deep-rooted” (278).

Velutha is charged with kidnapping Sophie Mol, the daughter of Chacko, and is killed in police ‘Encounter’ (303). The twins were forbidden to go to the house of Velutha whom they liked most, which their parents do not like. They don’t to make a public comment that their children have known an untouchable. The social hypocrisy is further exemplified through Chacko. The narrator comments, “He would call pretty woman who worked in the factory to his room, and on the pretext of lecturing them on labor rights and trade union law, flirt with them outrageously” (65). Thus, through the issue of caste system, the narrator in the novel shows how the power twists the law to corrupt the mind of suppressed class. The post-colonial scholars want to erase such social discrimination, and create a society where the voice of the subject class also can be heard.

In *The God of Small Things* the laws of Indian caste system are broken by the characters of Ammu and Velutha, an untouchable or paravan. Velutha works at the Paradise Pickles and Preserves Factory, owned by Ammu’s family yet, because he is an untouchable, the other workers resent him and he is paid less for his work. Velutha’s presence is unsettling to many who believe he acts above his station. His

own father notes this problem: “Perhaps it was just a lack of hesitation and unwarranted assurance. In the way he walked. The way he hold his head. The quite way he offers suggestion without being asked. Or the quite way he disregarded suggestions without appearing to rebel” (76).

Hindus believe that being an untouchable is punishment for having been bad in a former life. By being good and obedient, an untouchable can obtain a higher rebirth. Velutha’s lack of complacency causes him many problems throughout the novel. “It was not entirely his fault that he lived in a society where a man’s death could be more profitable than his life had ever been” (267). Although he is dedicated member of the Marxist party, his untouchable status makes other party members dislike him and so, local party leader comrade K.N.M Pillai would be more politically successful without him. It shows that the caste discrimination is deeply rooted in the society.

When Velutha has an affair with Ammu, he breaks an ancient taboo and incurs the wrath of Ammu’s family and the Kerala police. He breaks the rigid social rules of the caste system and therefore, the authority punishes him. Roy describes the policemen’s violent actions as being done out of fear, “...civilization fear of nature, men’s fear of women, power’s fear of powerlessness”(308). The division between the touchable and untouchable is so ingrained in the Kerala society that Velutha is seen as a non human. “If they hurt Velutha more than they intended to, it was only because any kinship, any connection between themselves and him, any implication that if nothing else at least biologically he was a fellow creature had been served long ago”(309).

Traditionally, a woman who has sex with a man from a lower caste would be expelled from her caste. The reason such scandal is caused by the affairs of an untouchable man and a touchable woman. Ammu is hated because of her sexual relationship with Velutha, an outcaste.

## 4. Conclusion

Roy depicts the miserable life of the people of the Indian city Kerala. The colonizer had left their cultural impacts on the society which cannot be changed. Colonized people try to copy the colonizer's culture to show themselves advanced and civilized but at the same time they cannot forget their own culture and they feel culturally displaced and identityless. Cultural freedom cannot be easily achieved. Roy presents the picture of cultural system of an Indian city Kerala to clarify how subaltern people are suppressed. On the one hand the mission of cultural colonialism dominates indigenous people, and on the other hand, in their own society lower cast people don't have the rights to do something as the so called higher class people do

Untouchables are affected in the society because they cannot revolt and uplift their status. Their voices are under shadow. Their history is fragmented and episodic. They are subject to the ruling class. If the untouchables try to get freedom they will be victimized because it will be against the rules and system of the elite group that creates the truth and discourse to suppress the so-called inferior. Spivak says that the subaltern can't revolt; they are speechless and unpicturable in the patriarchal society.

The idea of untouchability is explored at two levels in the novel. Firstly, we have social untouchables, or paravan, who were never allowed basic human rights. Secondly, we have metaphoric untouchables in high castes. Here discrimination expresses itself in marginalizing the women in their personal and public life. The author has presented both the miserable plight of untouchables and also the struggle of a woman trying to have fulfillment in life in a patriarchal society.

Sexual relationship between Ammu and Velutha in *The God of Small Things* is a resisting tool against the elite group. The relationship between touchable and untouchable proves that it is due to sexual intercourse the untouchables have been

exposed. Ammu discovers that it is sexuality which is a means of gratifying the baser desires where all the forms of distinctions are just nothing. Velutha's subalternity has also been exposed as he is finally beaten to death due to his contact with Ammu. They both crossed the social boundary. Marriage system and the love laws both have been transgressed upon. Kerala was the first state where the communist party first won the election and ruled the city but there was class, caste and gender discrimination prevailing in the society. The cultural aspects of Kerala have been clearly presented in the novel.

Women are silenced and erased not because they are not represented but it is due to the male dominance and patriarchal systems. The discourses created by males support the dominance. The principal character in *The God of Small Things*, Ammu is exploited in different ways. As she is a divorcee living in maternal house, she is not allowed to be involved in different social ceremonies and functions. The family and society look down upon her. When she started physical relationship with her family carpenter, she is considered an outcaste.

It is due to the sexual act of subaltern people, the laws and system are broken, all things dismissed, impossible become possible. Such instinct guided by 'Id' is uncontrollable. In the matter of sex touchable and untouchable, master and servant, higher caste and lower cast all are equal; there is no boundary. The same thing takes place in *The God of Small Things*.

The thesis proved that elite group dominates the subaltern people in the society in different ways. The society doesn't tolerate such violation, thus the tragedy occurs. The outcaste people can never coexist peacefully with the "touchable" communities for as long as the stigma of untouchability is attached to them.

## Work Cited

- Abhrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Nodia: Harcourt College Publishers, 2000.
- Ashcroft, Bill, et al, eds. *The Post Colonial Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Bertans, Hans. *Literary Theory: the Basics*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Bhadra, Gautam. "The Mentality of Subalternity: Kantanama or Rajdharm." *Selected Subaltern Studies*. Ed. Ranjit Guha. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1988. 63-69.
- Cowley, Jason. *Why We choose Arundhati*. Rev. of *The God of Small Things*, by Arundhati Roy. *India Today*. 27 oct. 1997.
- Dhawan, R.K, ed. *Arundhati Roy: The Novelist Extraordinary*. New Delhi: Prestige, 1998.
- Dodiya, Jyodip Singh and Jaya Chakravorty, eds. *The Critical Studies of Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things*. New Delhi: Prestige, 1999.
- Foucault, Michael. *Method*. Trans. Robert Huxley. *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. I. New York: Vintage, 1990. 92-102.
- Guha, Ranajit. Ed. *Selected Subaltern Studies*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Prasad, Amar Nath. *Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things: A Critical Appraisal*. New Delhi: Sarup and Sons, 2004.
- Roy, Amitabh. *The God of Small Things: A Novel of Social Commitment*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, 2005.
- Roy, Arundhati. *The God of Small Things*. India: Penguin Books, 2002.
- *The End of Imagination*. Kottayam, Kerala: D.C Books, 1998.

- Sarkar, Sumit. "Conditions and Nature of Subaltern Militancy: Bengali from Swadeshi to Non-cooperation". *Subaltern Studies III*. Ed. Ranjit Guha. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Seldon, Raymond. *A Readers Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. 2nd Ed. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "A Literary Representation of the Subaltern: Mahasweta Devi's Standayani". *Subaltern Studies V*. ed. Ranjit Guha. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987. 91-133.
- "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Studies: A Reader* ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrismass. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994. 66-111.
- Visweswaran, Kamala. *Gender and Subaltern Studies VII*. Ed. Shahid Amin and Dipesh Chakravorty. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996.