



RESEARCH PAPER

Discourse of Violence in Roy's *The God of Small Things*

¹Aeisha Altaf* ²Ifrah Khan and ³Dr. Bushra Siddiqui

1. PhD Scholar, Department of English and Literary Studies, School of Liberal Arts, University of Management and Technology, Lahore & Lecturer, University of Engineering and Technology, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. M.Phil., Department of English Literature, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Assistant Professor, Department of English and Literary Studies, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

*Corresponding Author | aeishaaltaf@uet.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to expose the platforms explored by the aboriginal hierarchies of power to exercise violence and to locate the positioning of the victim on these platforms. This research explores the cultural platform that is used by those in power to keep their authority intact in the context of Roy's *The God of Small Things*. The hypothesis developed is that when lesser god tries to intervene the discourse of bigger god he gets subjected to severest forms of violence for attempting to manipulate the discourse of the powerful. Methodology is qualitative in nature, theoretical framework is constructed from Foucault's theory of Power and Discourse. He states that power must be understood from the context of force relations and their trajectory with state apparatus. The conclusion drawn is that discourse should be interpreted as a subjective will to truth. Foucault states that four principles which will carry the debate of discourse forward which are Principle of Reversal, Discontinuity, Specificity, and Exteriority.

KEYWORDS Discourse, Foucault, Power, Violence

Introduction

This research takes the position that after the departure of the colonizer the influential native hierarchies have taken the position of the colonizer and generate similar sort of violence, as exercised by the colonizer on the colonized. The objective of this research is to expose the platforms explored by the aboriginal hierarchies of power to exercise violence and to locate the positioning of the victim on these platforms while exposed to violence. This research explores the cultural platform that is used by those in power to keep their authority intact. Discourse of violence in a hierarchical manner depict the positioning of the colonized before being exposed to the physical violence. Thus the hypothesis developed is that when lesser god tries to intervene the discourse of the bigger god he gets subjected to severest forms of violence for attempting to manipulate the discourse of the powerful ones. This research will operate through Michele Foucault's concept of Power who is a lead contributor to the theory of Power and Discourse.

The context of the study is that Arundhati Roy almost writing in the concomitant times of Post-Colonialism represent the episodes of violence enacted by the aboriginal hierarchies of power on those who had no access to power. Roy discusses Post-Colonial India and talks about violence on domestic level. The family presented in the work of Roy are shown in a fastidious mood celebrating the pickles business while on a deeper note these achievements are shown in juxtaposition to personal failures of all the characters

celebrating family reunion mutually. In the text the crescendo point reaches when the characters not belonging to the web of discourse try asserting their power by gaining access to discourse. Random, unplanned, unexpected death of a child gets hijacked by the characters of the novel and used against those who were least expected to be associated with such a heinous crime. As a consequence, right of the powerless to express or defend himself was immediately denied. Thus, the discourse was made to turn against them. So, their discourse of silence got represented as discourse of absence resultantly the accused were concluded guilty of the crime which they had never committed.

The research would be conducted by analyzing the elements that snatches the power of discourse from the marginalized. The study combines the elements of identity, different forms of discourse, social power structures that form the hegemony of a certain group. The study proposes to identify the elements because of which the powerless are silenced by exercising violence in discourse. The novel manifests the characters struggling for individual and established identities and their juxtaposed version in contrast to the struggling ones are those characters who consider themselves to be the pillars of the so called established order and who in Foucault's terms control the Discourse. This research aims at finding the answers to the questions that who grants one access to discourse? How power relations operate in a web like structure to keep the power of discourse intact? What are the means through which violence gets involved in Discourse and how to avoid them?

The God of Small Things written in the year of 1969 and 1993 in the state of Kerala of India explores the narrative of a Syrian Christian family who shifted to Ayemenem almost five generations ago and are running a pickle factory and compromises of a divorced daughter, a divorced son, an aunt and a circular motion of time as time is reduced to the position of a subaltern. It is the very settings of the novel which is impacted by the idea of power versus the god of the smaller things. Novel narrated through the circular time introduces to us the twins of the divorced daughter, Estha and Rahel who are living with their mother after she got divorced from her father. The twins are in love with a "paravan" (Roy,1997, p.134) a representative of the untouchable community and who is loved by the kids and their mother equally yet differently. Except the multitude of memories explored in the cyclical nature of time presented in the novel the most influencing one is the arrival of Sophie Mol and her accidental death that got hijacked by the aunt of the kids to remind the untouchable carpenter Velutha that he has crossed the boundary and has broken the rules by pursuing a divorced woman of the Syrian Christian community. Resultantly, Velutha pays the price of having broken the rule.

Foucault is known in literary circles for his work on Power and Discourse and the way elements of Power influences discourse of the society. Discourse he explains as a web of exercises that takes place within "established order of things" (Mills,2003, p.25) and this order provides discourse with enough power required for its sustenance and the indelible power that it operates with. These established order of things are the institutions who have blessed the discourse with the extent of power considered enough to exercise violence on the level of discourse. Foucault insists that our contemporary societies operate solely on "the rules of exclusion" (Foucault,1972, p.220). These rules of exclusion determine what should not be said and in which situation under which circumstances. These rules of exclusion differentiate the prohibited practices from the rest. Foucault contends that there are "three types of prohibition, covering objects, ritual with its surrounding circumstances, the privileged or exclusive right to speak of a particular subject" (Foucault,1972, p.219). These prohibitions in his opinion work in liaison with each other and collectively create a synergy effect thus for individuals it is impossible to avoid them. The relation of these prohibitions get most complicated with the areas of "politics and sexuality" (Foucault,1972, p.220) as it is the most vulnerable area of social existence so any trespassing here remains

unforgiveable. Foucault's theory of discourse and the way it leads discourse to violence has been of much consequence in South Asian Literature because South Asian region since the times of recorded history has witnessed frequent episodes of distinguishing against the unprivileged and depriving it of the powerful positions by depriving its right to discourse.

For Foucault, a set of structures and rules constitute a discourse, and it is these rules in which Foucault is most interested rather than the utterances and text produced. A discourse is a regulated set of statements which combine with others in predictable ways. Discourse is regulated by a set of rules which lead to the distribution and circulation of certain utterances and statements. Some statements are circulated widely and others have restricted circulation. (Mills,2003)

Foucault contends that instead of interpreting discourse as a compilation of different narratives it should be analyzed as a trajectory operational on the principle of Power. This principle of power operates in such a manner that all the narratives not complying with the narrative of power are denied access to realms of expression within the given trajectory. The operational principle of Power keeps those narratives alive who serve the purpose of those in power and the narratives which intend to harm the power hierarchies are denied access the trajectory. As it can be seen in the given text that the society of Ayemenem operates on a few defined social codes which they claim as Laws and whoever breaks those laws face the consequences of it.

The point that needs emphasis over here that the right to discourse decides one's positioning in the society as Baby Kochamma despite being a burden on the family continues to enjoy a position of power which she exploits by declining the right of discourse to Ammu and her two-egged twins. Ammu despite being the daughter of the family lives a life of third world marginalized woman because the structured system of Ayemenem formulated the discourse that proved Ammu guilty of first eloping with a man of another caste and then daring to love a man from an untouchable cast. As Foucault states "we must conceive of discourse as a violence which we do to things, or in any case as a practice which we impose on them; and it is in this practice that the events of discourse find the principle of their regularity" (Foucault,1972, p.234).

Foucault in his theory on discourse elaborates that our understanding of reality takes place through the way discourse is structured and this is evident in *The God of Small Things* which manifests the unequivocal reality that it is the power of discourse that grants one a position in the society. The whole novel consists of episodes of betrayal of discourse in a rounded time. The culprits of the society the twins being described as the "worst transgressors" (Roy,1997, p. 20) along with their Ammu. Foucault elaborates that discourse is the only element through which the humans perceive the structures of reality and it is the very element denied to the discourse less god of *The God of Small Things* incarnated in Velutha and Rahel. Thus, in the "History House" (Roy,1997, p.289) discourse of violence gets written in its infamous historical moment. Foucault goes on to say that this presented reality can only be perceived through the structures dictated by the discourse which is actually seen happening in *The God of Small Things*. When Ammu tried to change the structure of things the reality had shaped, as she lacked the power to discourse, she gets insulted by a policeman who reminds her that she is a third world subaltern in the Ayemenem society.

Foucault believes that the discourse provides us with a structure and it is only through this structure that we adjust our frame of reference of the physical world and its experiences and record them accordingly. In this process of adjusting and constructing our frame of reference of physical world we solidify the structures on which discourse is

constructed and those structures solidify our experiences in exchange. Foucault's theory of discourse resides on the basis that discourse is a way of practicing violence. To elaborate this point his theory of discourse and power will come into play. "When Foucault discusses discourse, he focuses on constraint and restriction; he is aware that we could potentially utter an infinite variety of sentences, but what is surprising is that, in fact, we choose to speak within very narrowly confined limits" (Mills,2003, p.56).

This constraint and restriction; he elaborates gets into action because discourse is a way of practicing violence and to practice such mode of violence power is needed. This concept forms very basis of Foucault's works because Foucault sees power to be a force carrying infinite strength in social structures. Foucault's theory of Power suggests that power relations constitute their own organization ,that it is always through the passage of time and endless struggles that these force relations come into full form or get reversed, these force relations always operate through a whole system and linked structures and their strength is their unity because power relations always operate through chain reactions and if even one strand of the chain gets exposed to the resistance then the rest of the chain would not be able to function. If they develop confrontations even, they gain strength from binary oppositions and lastly these power relations always operate through the state apparatus which is always socially and legally recognized by the pillars of the state and society because it is always through their influence that at the macro and micro level the resistance of the oppressed gets controlled. Foucault points out the fact that power is an inescapable phenomenon and is to be witnessed in all social interactions.

According to Foucault power is to be witnessed everywhere and in all social relations independent of the fact that power chooses to be exercised in those social relations or not. As it can be seen that in Ayemenem all the social relations that exist; from the very docile association of twins to the most arrogant relationship between the policeman and Ammu, operate through the phenomenon of power. This power phenomenon shapes the discourse and which ultimately determines the positioning of an individual in the social hierarchy of the society. Foucault's extensive research on the realms of Power has brought him to the understanding that power operates chiefly through different modes which he terms as the modern modes and the traditional modes. As this research is focused on the South Asian Literature so the point of discussion would remain the modern modes through which the power operates. According to Foucault the element of power has to be interpreted at two levels. One level is concerning the theory and second level is concerning the application. He contends that the theory is related to the historical development of the channels through which power chooses to operate and the practical form of power is composed of the modern uses of power. The pre modern or the historical development of the power channels get named by Foucault as "sovereign power" and the modern forms of power gets named by Foucault as "disciplinary power" and "bio power" (Taylor,2011, p.13). Foucault's focus has remained the modern form of power and which has influenced the contemporary scholars at stretch.

Foucault's concept of discourse and power granted in social contexts to the authorities is crucial to understand the demographics of violence. His theory of discourse comprises of the components of the types of discourse, the types of prohibition attached to the discourse, systems of exclusion from the discourse, power and desire, internal and external values of the system of discourse, formulas of control of discourse and the conditions without which discourse cannot operate.

Literature Review

Arundati Roy when intrigued with the question of explaining the term 'small' in the title of *The God of the Small Things* answered that for her the word 'small' in the title represents the little things that life offers to them who live close to the little pleasures of life. She states that the Big God is in control of all big things but this small god represents the small world on which he loses control because the big world sees it as a threat.

The first article to complement this research in this section is Binayak Roy's research paper titled *The Title of the God of Small Things: A Subversive Salvo* (2010) suggests that the absent Big God in the title of the novel "Big God" (Roy,2010) may be either an institution or an individual, but it is always a wielder of tyrannical power" and the Big God uses this power to influence the lives of those around in contrast to the "small god" (Roy,2010) who is "cozy and contained, private and limited" (Roy,1997, p.19). Roy argues that Big God is synonymous to the "Big Man" (Roy,2010) and "small god" (Roy,2010) respectively to the small man. This article clearly signifies the importance of social and cultural status in the novel.

As Arundhati Roy in the novel has compared big man to the lantern and small man to the candle. Binayak goes on to argue that "A lantern is a portable lamp" (Roy,2010) which signifies that the glass around the glow can protect and stabilize the focus and dreams of the big man because he does not have to protect the flame for survival all the time. His bigness does render him this freedom whereas "a candle is exposed to the vagaries of the wind" (Roy,2010) is dependent on the circumstances for the survival of its flame and so like the candle the small man is always dependent on the bigness of the big man to allow the smallness of the small man to survive even if it is episodic survival. Roy claims "Big Man is invariably a social being; Small Man is as invariably a natural being" (Roy,2010). Roy claims that the title small god is used for Velutha and big gods are Pappachi, Baby Kochamma, Mammachi, Chacko, Comrade Pillai, and Inspector Thomas Mathew whereas small gods are Ammu, Velutha, Rahel, Estha, and Sophie Mol.

As Velutha is the one who throughout the novel is dependent on the bigness of all the big men involved, for his own survival. The several gods of big things which will be elaborated upon individually do not let the gods of small things survive because the god of small things had dared to disturb the established unbreakable boundaries of the gods of big things and on these boundaries all the big things of the society depended. Roy calls it "maladjustments or dislocations" (Roy,2010) and emphasizes that the big god synonymous of big man represents the community who is the social pillar of the society and small man or god of small things/candle are the individuals living on the margins of the society.

The same contention has been forwarded by Anuradha Dingwaney Needham in her research paper *The Small Voice of History in Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things* (2006) argues that Arundhati has explored Guha's concept of Subaltern and states that Roy in her novel has presented a confrontation between the subaltern and the elite. The subaltern represents the small god and the elite represent the big god.

In the same way the research paper by Youngsuk Chae titled *Postcolonial eco-feminism in Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things* (2015) elaborates on the violence experienced by the marginalized of the Indian Society as represented by Roy. The narrative that is designed to shuttle between different time zones and different narrators basically brings to life the hidden agenda of violence exercised upon the marginalized in the name of patriarchy and global development. In this research paper Roy's novel has been discussed from the perspective of Eco-feminism by Youngsuk Chae. He claims that Roy's novel which exposes the schisms of class consciousness of the society and marginalization of the untouchables including women manifests "an eco-feminist consciousness" (Chae

2015). Roy's work highlights the violence brought to the people in particular by being exposed to the unbreakable shackles of patriarchy, violence brought about because of marginalization and the withering of the natural environment on local and international realms.

So, it gets evident that *The God of Small Things* has never been discussed before in the context of the discourse of violence, connected together in a hierarchy of chain reactions of being denied to the power of discourse and then exposed to violence.

Material and Methods

The hypothesis developed is that when lesser god tries to intervene the discourse of the bigger god he gets subjected to severest forms of violence for attempting to manipulate the discourse of the powerful ones, as it is only through the possession of the power of discourse that smallness of the smaller god and bigness of the bigger god get defined. This process of silencing the smaller god through social rules and traditions has been named by Foucault as discourse. "Discourses are discontinuous, risky, and overlapping. We are actually using discourses as a form of violence" (Stahl 2004).

Foucault's theory of discourse can be divided on two levels. The first level encompasses the types of discourse, types of prohibitions attached to the discourse among which the reason and folly are most inevitable, systems of exclusion according to which the discourse operates, its innate reason of existence which is power and desire, internal and external values of the system of discourse, formulas of control of discourse applied by the presence of rituals, fellowships of discourse, doctrine of discourse, social appropriation, and the conditions without which discourse cannot operate. The second level of Foucault's theory of discourse is related to the concept formulated by Foucault on Power and the way power struggles influence the discourse and the society consequentially.

In *The God of Small Things*, the characters which face violence because of manipulation of discourse are Velutha, Ammu, and her twins. The manipulators of discourse in the novel are the characters of Baby Kochamma and Comrade Pillai. Through the application of Foucault's theory of discourse one of the major platforms of cultural violence gets exposed. Foucault in his theory of discourse talks about the prohibitions that are attached with the utterance of the discourse. He says that these prohibitions are associated with desire and power and it is through the medium of speech that this innate dream of power gets exposed or anchored for fulfillment. Before moving on to the explanation of the types of prohibitions it is necessary to explain Foucault's concept of Power.

Diana Taylor in her book *Michel Foucault-Key Concepts* (2011) states that according to Foucault power is the inevitable element of all social communications. This implies that social relationships fail to operate without the element of power. He observes that the noblest social relations even are constructed around the web of power. Foucault's theory of discourse resides on the basis that discourse is a way of practicing violence. As Foucault sees power to be a force carrying infinite strength in social structures. Foucault's much preached concept gets elaborated in his words as "It seems to me that power must be understood in the first instances the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as [2] the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as [3] the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, as [4] the strategies in which they take effect, whose general

design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies.”(Taylor,2013,p.19)

Foucault says that power relations create their contexts independently from other social pressures. Power always gets visible or functional only after having gone through the stages of evolution. The power structures cannot operate independently of each other. It is only through the mutual support of different dimensions and structures of power that these relations become effective. The realms of power always have a legitimate backing because of which they do not get caught while misusing the power allotted to them through the state structures. In his observation force relations are multi-dimensional and which has to be taken at the micro cosmic level because Foucault here is not talking about the strategies of state to display power. Force relations present a mutual bond of the individuals and he insists that it is only in that context of shared bond where that particular sort of power is functional and effective. Taylor goes on elaborating that Foucault has termed force relations to be “multiple” (Taylor,2013, p.19) which means that each force relation can enter multiple dimensions of influence because of the supporting force relations constructed around that. The force relations of Ayemenem include the bond between Chacko and Ammu along with her two twins. Chacko as a representative of society of Ayemenem and Ammu along with her twins represent the repressed culture. The force allotted to Chacko in this bonding is functional only in Ayemenem and not outside that sphere.

The second important position that Foucault takes to explain power is that power is a process which through endless negotiations of force relations modifies them. Foucault uses the term “substrate” (Taylor,2013, p.21) to elaborate the mentioned observation. Substrate is a variant of the word substratum which means a base or foundation in lingua franca. Foucault has used this term to signify that power as a process keeps shuffling between different stages of this substrate and get adjusted according to the modes used by the wielder of that power. It is entirely dependent on the skill of the wielder of the power that he lessens the effect of power, intensifies it or makes custom made changes in it to gain his ends. Foucault points out that “power is not an institution or a structure”, nor an individual capacity, but rather a complex arrangement of forces in society” (Taylor,2013, p.21).

The third important feature is that Foucault thinks that force relations work in the manner of chain reaction. This implies that they cooperate on collective level but do not interfere in each other’s jurisdiction. As according to Foucault power is a premeditated phenomenon which implies that the interconnection between the relations involving power are a phenomenon built around careful computations. So that there is no space for errors left. This elaborates the point that force relations contribute to the formation of power through their careful calculations. It is the ability to calculate the risk and counter it that keeps the power groups always powerful. As behind this calculation of risk is always present vested interest of those who are exercising and controlling power. Secondly, Foucault highlights that force relations always support each other and never interfere in each other’s spheres. As in *The God of Small Things* when Baby Kochamma filed a complaint against Velutha the “Untouchable” (Roy,1997, p.100), policeman before taking action consulted Comrade Pilli to confirm that Velutha will be sheltered by the party or not. Comrade Pillai in order to win the next election decided to sacrifice Velutha as a scapegoat to gain sympathy vote.

The fourth position of Foucault on the concept of power is that power relations become that effective because they have been blessed by the social order and have unstinting support of the state. Here Foucault means that power is a series of strategies

based on specific achievable objectives around which the force relations are formed. These strategies are always backed by the systems at macro cosmic level which means that the state invariably backs them by using its entire means. In case of *The God of Small Things* the state apparatus was in complete support with the Syrian Christian Community and whatever it states got acknowledged as official discourse. Precisely because of which Velutha belonging to an untouchable caste never got a chance to get his justification recorded or even heard at any forum.

Tracing the argument back to its position of discourse that needs to be elaborated in detail and for which explanation of Foucault's theory of Power was inevitable. Foucault's theory of discourse encompasses the types of discourse, types of prohibitions attached to the discourse among which the reason and folly are most inevitable, systems of exclusion according to which the discourse operates its innate reason of existence i.e. power and desire, Internal and external values of the system of discourse, formulae of control of discourse applied by the presence of rituals, fellowships of discourse, doctrine of discourse, and the conditions without which discourse cannot operate. Foucault elaborates the position of institutions and the imagined reply of the institutions to Foucault is that discourse always operates "within the established order of things" (Foucault,1997,2016) and this order is provided by the institutions. "The institutions provide discourse with an indelible power and unstinting support where power can get further strengthened" (Foucault,1997,2016).

So, it gets evident that discourses cannot operate in the absence of institutions and it is always the institution which infuses power into the discourse for it to become instrumental. Sara Mills emphasizes that discourse is an instrument which builds perspectives. In fact, it is a system which constructs our take on the presented circumstances and according to that take we declare a judgment on the situation. She refers to Foucault's contention that discourse is a version of violence that we choose to manipulate situation to advantage a few and to deprive others of that advantaged position and thus the chain reaction of the events within that discourse works as a catalysis for the imposition of violence on the disadvantaged few. The first point in Foucault's theory is his division of the types of discourse. Foucault categorizes the discourse in different categories and insists that his theory of discourse is applicable on all of these types of discourse. According to him the types of discourse are the official discourse and the informal discourse, the nonverbal forms of discourse, and all the forms of discourse which are under construction and need to be spoken.

Results and Discussion

In *The God of Small Things*, the novel is shuttling between 1969 and 1993 makes it twenty-five years of movement in the narrative. During these multiple narratives there are two types of discourses that take the novel towards its crescendo point. First discourse is in which the normal activities of the novel is taking place in which the reader is introduced to all the characters during the unfolding of the events and history. This discourse is the coherent whole under which all narratives are operating. The second type of discourse which is presented in the novel is the formal discourse to which only a few have access. This discourse is operated by a few to benefit themselves and exclude others from entering into the dimension of this discourse. The discourse that is generated by Baby Kochamma against Velutha in the police station stands in sharp contrast to the reality that took place that night. The narrative of Baby Kochamma and Comrade Pillai along with police is considered the official discourse by the society of Ayemenem. When Velutha went to take help from Comrade Pillai after Baby Kochamma threatened him, Comrade Pillai denied help to Velutha on the basis that party is not there to help comrades in their personal

matters. But on the official level Comrade Pillai in order to gain sympathy vote did take the position that Velutha has been targeted because he was a card holding member of the party.

The next crucial point that Foucault makes in his theory of Discourse is elaboration on the types of prohibitions in the functioning of discourse which he calls "rules of exclusion" (Foucault,1997, p.217). Foucault insists that human society is conditioned in such a manner that nobody can exercise the freedom to say anything of their choice unless and until the rules of the discourse permits that expression. He elaborates that there are "three types of prohibition, covering objects, ritual with its surrounding circumstances, the privileges or exclusive right to speak a particular subject; these prohibitions interrelate, reinforce and complement each other, forming a complex web, continually subject to modification" (Foucault,1997, p.216). Foucault says the most minutely monitored areas are the areas concerning "politics and sexuality" (Foucault,1997, p.216). The novel under consideration involve these minutely monitored areas of politics and sexuality. In *The God of Small Things*, the story of Mammach's daughter Ammu and a Paravan gained so much currency because the people of Ayemenem later remembered the "scandal" (Roy,1997, p.129) as the one that "involved sex and death" (Roy,1997, p.129).

Next important point in Foucault's theory is system of exclusions. Foucault says "prohibited words, the division of madness, and the will to truth" (Foucault, 1997, p.219) are the greatest systems ever invented for exclusion. Among Foucault's most discussed idea is his idea of "will to truth" (Foucault, 1997, p.219). The multiple discourses in the novels reveal the fact that truth is a subjective entity. All the discourses operating in the novel on all levels are half-truths which are done consciously to highlight the fact that truth is a subjective entity. So, Foucault insists that in order to crystallize being's inherent search of truth, being starts insisting that only his truth is the whole truth and excludes all other truths. The fact that needs elaboration is that Foucault considers will to truth as a tool functioning in the system of exclusion of discourse. This implies that the being's desire to reach the truth is misguided as truth is a subjective phenomenon. So, the hierarchies of power succumb to only their version of truth which they use as a system of exclusion. By using this tool they exclude the rest of the truths and thus the truth gets registered as official discourse which is designed to negate all other truths. The next important contribution of Foucault through his theory is his elaboration on formulae of control of discourse which are ritual, fellowship of discourse, and the doctrine of discourse. "The most superficial and obvious of restrictive systems is constituted by what we collectively refer to as the ritual; ritual defines the qualifications required of the speaker; it lays down the gestures to be made, behavior, circumstances and the whole range of signs that must accompany discourse" (Foucault 1997). Ritual of Discourse when applied to *The God of Small Things* reveals the chasms created by rituals in daily life of the characters. For instance, when Sophie Mol visited Ayemenem, Ammu and her twins were rendered disqualified to participate in the game of welcoming a foreign child.

The next formula of control of discourse is fellowship of discourse which insists that discourse can be distributed only among a privileged few. Foucault here elaborates that fellowship of discourse restricts the manipulation of discourse. By fellowship of discourse Foucault means the authority which can bring major perspective changes in the discourse. Privileged few are those power structures who are deciding the course of the discourse. In *The God of Small Things* this close community is Comrade Pillai and Baby Kochamma and to an extent the policemen. Baby Kochamma was the only one that night who had the honour of possessing fellowship of discourse.

Doctrine of discourse in Foucault's opinion is opposite of the fellowship of discourse. In doctrine of discourse "The sole requisite is the recognition of the same truths

and the appearance of a certain rule conformity with validated discourse" (Foucault, 1997, p.226). Foucault elaborates that the power structures condition the society by injecting in them certain doctrines of discourse. Doctrine of discourse always works in the favour of those who have created those doctrines which should not be challenged and they diffuse it in a manner that maximum people should hold it as their ultimate truths. Such examples include the unchallenged patriarchal system which holds women at all levels inferior to men, the belief that official discourse is the ultimate truth which should be accepted and should remain unquestioned. In *The God of Small Things* this Doctrine of Discourse lays down the "Love Laws" (Roy,1997, p.45). These love laws are developed to encompass all the relationships that surface in the novel. Ammu, Velutha, twins did not submit to these love laws and pay the price for crossing the territory laid out by love laws. These love laws had been pre-determined long ago and had decided that untouchables cannot get indulged in relationship with elite women, that land and property will always belong to Chacko and the honour of the family and the cumbersome task of living the fragility of such honour will always be Ammu's responsibility, that no matter how much well behaved the twins remain they will always remain "Half Hindu Hybrids" (Roy,1997, p.50), no matter how many gifts Velutha brings for Ammu he should never expect Ammu's womanhood as a return gift, no matter how promising Comrade Pillai's revolution speeches are they should only be believed in and never to be relied on in testing times, that no matter how many times the separation between twins occur their "Siamese soul" (Roy,1997, p 50) will always remain connected even if it has to break the sanctioned love law of brother sister through incest.

Another inevitable dimension of the discourse theory is the "conditions of discourse" (Foucault, 1997, p.224). This rule imposes that the area of discourse is forbidden for all others who do not fulfill the specified conditions outlined by the hierarchies of power. "Not all areas of discourse are equally open and penetrable; some are forbidden territory while others are open to the winds and stand, without any prior restrictions open to all" (Foucault,1997, p.224). In *The God of Small Things* carpenter Velutha who is a Paravan, along the rest of the untouchables failed to fulfill the conditions to be able to speak in an official discourse. The official discourse according to which Baby Kochamma had framed Velutha, never asked for explanation or justification from Velutha. As Velutha being a paravan was forbidden to enter the domain of the official discourse where only the Syrian Christian Baby Kochamma and the policemen could enter. Velutha's father revealed it to Mammachi who was Ammu's mother that his son is indulging in an affair with their divorced daughter. On the realization of this revelation Mammachi threatened Velutha that she will get him killed if he is seen again. Velutha in the novel appears to be an active member of the Communist party. Concerned Velutha after being threatened visited the party's leader Comrade Pillai for help to which he replied "It is not in the party's interests to take up such matters. Individual's interest is subordinate to the organization's interest. Violating Party Discipline means violating Party Unity" (Roy,1997, p.287). Velutha was denied help from Comrade Pillai because "It was not his fault if he lived in the society where a man's death could be more profitable than his life ever had been." (Roy,1997, p. 281). Being a paravan, death of Velutha was not death of a human being, it was to be framed by Comrade Pillai as death of a member belonging to Communist party and because of which the sympathy vote of workers would remain on Comrade Pillai's side which will make him successful in next elections. Because what Comrade Pillai needed was not success but a tirade of success. "Did Comrade Pillai realize that what he really needed was the process of war more than the outcome of victory" (Roy,1997, p.281). After the death of Velutha "All that had been in the papers. The official version" (Roy,1997, p. 280) claimed that "Ayemenem's own Crusader for Justice and Spokesman of the Oppressed Comrade N. K. M. Pillai claimed that the Management had implicated the Paravan in a false police

case because he was an active member of the Communist Party. That they wanted to eliminate him for indulging in Lawful Union Activities" (Roy,1997, p. 303). In the end "To be fair to Comrade Pillai, he did not plan the course of events that followed. He merely slipped his ready fingers into History's waiting glove" (Roy,1997, p. 281).

Foucault's concept of discourse and the power discourse gains in social contexts is crucial to understand the demographics of violence. Mills states that Foucault's concepts on "discourse and power" (Mills,2003, p.66) has enabled the contemporary critics and theorists to interpret all sorts of "information" (Mills,2003, p.66) as a tool of power politics custom designed to keep a few empowered and others subservient to the empowered groups of the society. Mills stresses the fact that because of Foucault's work truth has lost its dignity of being revealed from the heavens and now truth should be conceived as a statement stripped off from its social religious and aesthetic sanctity that has kept the surgeons of discourse at bay from the fear of unveiling it.

Conclusion

The research questions that got answered highlighted a few findings that can be discussed further. The first and the foremost is the ability to interrogate our will to be able to create an objective truth because truth is a subjective phenomenon. While constructing discourses it should be kept in mind that our will to construct truth is subjective. Second important decision that should be taken to eliminate violence from discourse is to acknowledge discourse as an event that took place among many other events. Foucault has used the term "event" (Foucault, 1972, p.223) for discourse which implies that it is not a fact. An event can be analyzed from multiple perspectives and the version of each perspective can be put to trial. The third ground breaking decision that should be taken is "to abolish the sovereignty of the signifier" (Foucault,1972, p.223) and this can be achieved by questioning all the structures of the society whose opinion is considered important while deciding about the rest of the society's smaller gods.

Foucault also elaborates a little on the principles which will carry the discussion of discourse in future. He elaborates it as "Principle of Reversal, Principle of Discontinuity, Principle of Specificity, Principle of Exteriority" (Foucault,1972,229). "Principle of Reversal" (Foucault,1972,229) in Foucault's opinion means that Discourse should not be analyzed on what it says in fact discourse should be an instrument to reveal what it does not say. So, as the first principle Foucault elaborates that if discourses are read to observe about whom the discourse does not talk about then the repressed one will be saved from a lot of violence. "Principle of Discontinuity" (Foucault, 1972,229) in Foucault's opinion refers to the notion that discourse should be interpreted in episodes disconnected from each other. The broken episodes will reveal the shallowness of the crafted truth. Foucault insists that if the principle of discontinuity gets applied on the discourse then it will be revealed that the presented truth is only one perspective which means it is a half-truth.

"Principle of Specificity" (Foucault,1972,229) refers to the fact that we should contextualize discourse in the operational time of the discourse. This principle highlights the importance of temporal and spacial compatibility for the interpretation of the discourse. Next, "Principle of Exteriority" (Foucault, 1972, p.229) relies on the fact that external factors should be considered while interpreting discourse. This principle elaborates the fact of circumstances in the formation of discourse. While interpreting discourse it is of high importance to interpret the surrounding circumstances. For example, Estha's "Yes" (Roy,1997, p.210) over the years kept haunting him because it was although one word but it became the part of the discourse that led to Velutha's murder.

To conclude discussion on Foucault's theory of discourse it can be said that discourses should be observed very closely before accepting them as whole truths and this close observation will lead one to discover the schisms of the crafted truth.

References

- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge Classics,
- Mills, S. (2003). *Routledge Critical Thinkers*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Gosh, R. & Tejero, N. (2009). *Globalizing Dissent, Essays on Arundhati Roy*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Roy, A. (1997). *The God of Small Things*. London: Flamingo
- Roy, B. (2010). *The Title of the God of Small Things: A Subversive*. ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/ANQQ.22.3.56-64>.
- Stahl, B. C. (2004). *Whose Discourse? A Comparison of the Foucauldian and Habermasian Concepts of Discourse in Critical IS Research*." Proceedings of the Tenth Americas Conference on Information Systems
- Taylor, D. (2011). *Michele Foucault Key Concepts*. Acumen
- Torring, David & Jacob. (2005). *Discourse Theory in European Politics: Identity, Politics and Governance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Chae, Y. (2015). Postcolonial ecofeminism in Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*, *The Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 51(5), 519-530