IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Love Laws And Broken Lives: The Politics Of Forbidden Desire In The God Of Small Things

[1]Akankshaya Biswal, [2]Dr. Minushree Pattnaik,
[1]Master's Student, [2]Associate Professor
Department of HSS, C.V. Raman Global University, Bhubaneswar, India

Abstract:
Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things (1997) intricately examines the consequences of forbidden desire within the context of postcolonial India, particularly through the lens of rigid caste structures, gendered oppression, and familial expectations. Central to Roy's narrative is the concept of the "Love Laws" — the societal and cultural rules that dictate "who should be loved, and how. And how much?" These invisible yet brutal codes govern personal lives, criminalise love across boundaries, and precipitate tragic downfall. This paper investigates how Roy's novel "Love Laws" regulates human relationships and reflects the broader politics of forbidden desire. It analyses Ammu and Velutha's intertwined fates, Estha and Rahel's silent traumas, and Roy's subtle critique against the colonial and patriarchal legacies that continue to haunt modern India. Through a multidisciplinary approach combining literary criticism, postcolonial theory, and feminist analysis, this research explores how personal acts of rebellion against the "Love Laws" ultimately reshape, damage, or destroy the lives of individuals. In doing so, it argues that The God of Small Things positions forbidden desire as both an act of radical defiance and a catalyst for inevitable ruin, highlighting the tragic impossibility of love in a world circumscribed by social, historical, and cultural violence.

Keywords Forbidden Desire, Love Laws, Postcolonial India, Caste and Gender, Familial Oppression, Radical Defiance

Introduction

The God of Small Things by Arundhati Roy is a chilling tale of broken lives, trauma that spans generations, and the horrific repercussions of defying deeply ingrained social standards. The story follows the entwined lives of Ammu, her twins Rahel and Estha, and the Dalit carpenter Velutha in Ayemenem, Kerala, with time periods ranging from the 1960s to the 1990s. The idea of the "Love Laws," which are defined as those "that lay down who should be loved, and how. And how much" (Roy 33), is at the heart of the book. These unspoken rules serve as tools of control, maintaining a rigid social structure based on gender, caste, and class divisions.

This essay makes the case that The God of Small Things views forbidden desire as a deeply political act of resistance rather than just a romantic or personal violation. Roy exposes the violent mechanisms that underpin seemingly harmless societal expectations by showing how love is criminalized when it violates caste, gender, and class norms. This critique is anchored by the tragic love story of Ammu and Velutha, but Roy also examines other types of forbidden passion, such as sibling intimacy and a childlike need for security and independence. The novel breaks down the dichotomies of clean and impure, lawful and illegal, sacred and taboo, with its nonlinear structure, poetic diction, and subversive voice.

This essay examines not only the thematic but also the structural and linguistic tools Roy uses to foreground how private desires become entangled in public systems of oppression. Roy's novel is deeply rooted in India's sociohistorical context, criticizing the colonial residues and caste hierarchies that still

shape post-Independence life. Scholars such as Anuradha Dingwaney Needham have stated that the novel's "representation of subaltern agency is entangled with the limits imposed by history and discourse," which Roy navigates through a delicate interplay of form and politics (Needham, 2002).

I. The "Love Laws": Defining the Boundaries of Desire

The harsh restrictions imposed by caste, patriarchy, and social propriety are encapsulated in The God of Small Things by the concept of "Love Laws." According to Roy, "it was a time when the impossible truly happened and the unthinkable became thinkable" (Roy 31). Although the laws are not written down, they have the same power as divine commandments—they are unchangeable, unassailable, and lethal if broken. Everyday institutional, religious, and familial traditions serve to uphold these regulations and guarantee adherence, particularly by women and lower castes.

"The psychological scars of caste and colonial rule linger not merely in institutions but in the emotional lives of individuals," as sociologist Ashis Nandy notes (Nandy, 1998). This is demonstrated by Mammachi's hypocrisy, as she punishes her daughter Ammu's love while tolerating her son Chacko's sexual entitlement. According to Roy's narration, "because of the women he brought home, Mammachi had a separate entrance built for Chacko's room" (Roy 160). Ammu's voluntary relationship with Velutha, on the other hand, causes indignation, exile, and ultimately death. The asymmetry shows how caste and gender interact to influence moral perception.

Roy gives societal norms an air of invincible authority by referring to them as "laws" as opposed to traditions or convictions. "Roy dramatizes the way in which the state and the family coalesce in their disciplinary functions," according to scholar Elleke Boehmer (Boehmer, 2005). The "Love Laws" are enforced by internalized humiliation, violence, ostracism, and rumor; they are not subject to legal action. By establishing the bounds of acceptable affection, they help to maintain inequitable regimes.

Furthermore, Roy frequently juxtaposes the tenderness of forbidden love with the abstract cruelty of these prohibitions in his poetic prose. The narrator observes, for instance, that Ammu and Velutha's love was "a little less lawful, a little more wild, a little more fallible" (Roy 176). In addition to crossing boundaries, this linguistic framing emphasizes the radicalism of their devotion by upholding the validity of emotional truth over social norms.

II. Social Transgression and Forbidden Love: Ammu, Velutha, and the Cost of Desire

The connection between Ammu and Velutha, a Dalit man and an upper-caste Christian woman, lies at the heart of Roy's criticism and serves as the novel's most overt example of disobedience of social norms. Since it challenges the caste and gender hierarchies in India, their love—which is characterized by kindness and desire on both sides—is illegal. "They had nothing, no future," Roy narrates. Thus, they focused on the minor details (Roy 177). Even transient acts of love can threaten systemic control, as evidenced by their brief but profoundly meaningful moments of intimacy.

Ironically, Velutha, whose name translates to "white" in Malayalam, is the ideal subaltern: competent, quiet, and submissive—until he dares to want something. He is not protected when charged, even if he is talented and loyal. When he is beaten to death for a love that is considered unclean, his very name takes on a sad irony. "Velutha's death is less a tragedy and more an inevitability within the caste structure," according to scholar Susie Tharu (Tharu, 2001). His body turns becomes the stage for the brutal enactment of the community's moral terror.

Ammu also had to pay a high price for her affection. The sentence "Ammu died in a lodge somewhere near the railway station" (Roy 161) ruthlessly captures the social desertion she experiences. She was already at risk due to her status as a divorcee without male protection, but her friendship with Velutha makes her much more vulnerable. She loses custody of the children, and her family disowns her.

Roy's message is unmistakably political: love that violates social norms is not only discouraged but destroyed. Roy "locates resistance not in grand political gestures but in private acts of dissent that are no less radical for their intimacy," according to scholar Priyamvada Gopal (Gopal, 2009). The love between Ammu and Velutha is shown as a radical challenge to systematic oppression, one that they are both executed for, rather than as a romantic ideal.

III. Childhood Innocence and the Inheritance of Broken Laws

Ammu's twin children, Rahel and Estha, both witness and suffer from the harsh consequences of the "Love Laws." The shock of Velutha's passing and their mother's rejection have permanently altered their lives. "In those early amorphous years when memory had only just begun, when life was full of beginnings and no ends, and everything was forever, Esthappen and Rahel thought of themselves together as Me, and separately, individually, as We or Us," writes Roy in a moving lyrical passage that encapsulates their relationship (Roy 4).

Normative conceptions of love, identity, and separateness are complicated by the portrayal of their relationship as symbiotic, even before language. Their subsequent incestuous intercourse is portrayed in the story as a desperate act of healing and reclaiming rather than as disgusting or sensational. "Just that there were tears," writes Roy. The only difference was that Emptiness and Quietness matched like stacking spoons (Roy 310). Their connection serves as a last haven in a world when all other types of intimacy have been outlawed or destroyed.

Normative conceptions of love, identity, and separateness are complicated by the portrayal of their relationship as symbiotic, even before language. Their subsequent incestuous intercourse is portrayed in the story as a desperate act of healing and reclaiming rather than as disgusting or sensational. "Just that there were tears," writes Roy. The only difference was that Emptiness and Quietness matched like stacking spoons (Roy 310). Their connection serves as a last haven in a world when all other types of intimacy have been outlawed or destroyed.

Estha's silence—his inability to talk after seeing Velutha arrested—is political commentary as well as psychological retreat. A system that penalizes honesty and encourages acquiescence silences him. According to academic Brinda Bose, Estha's silence is "a symptom of the larger silencing of dissent in postcolonial India" (Bose, 2003). The long-term emotional effects of social repression are also shown in Rahel's sense of alienation and her incapacity to develop enduring relationships as an adult.

Although some readers may find their incestuous reunion upsetting, it is a metaphor for the wounds caused by broken laws. They are looking for psychic wholeness rather than physical fulfillment. The twins' relationship demonstrates how profoundly even the strongest emotional ties are impacted by the social policing of desire, turning love into a place of loss, trauma, and longing.

IV. Gender, Caste, and Colonial Memory: Intersections of Power and Resistance

It is impossible to separate the novel's depiction of forbidden love from the interlocking caste, patriarchal, and colonial power structures that govern Ayemenem society. Being a Paravan places Velutha at the bottom of the caste system, while Ammu is similarly disenfranchised as a woman without masculine or financial support. Because their relationship simultaneously threatens several axes of authority, it is not only scandalous but also subversive.

By situating these interactions within larger histories of colonialism and cultural control, Roy weaves together the intimate and the political. Relics of colonial nostalgia abound in the Ayemenem House, including furnishings, language, and customs that express the family's desire to be white and western. At home, Chacko, who considers himself a liberal Marxist with an Oxford education, upholds a colonial patriarchy. Roy describes Chacko's grab of power and labor as a "working-class memory," revealing the duplicity of postcolonial elites (Roy 61).

Gyanendra Pandey contends that the urge to adhere to a European standard of politeness is equally as much a part of colonialism's legacy as the laws and bureaucracy (Pandey, 1997). Roy demonstrates how, despite official independence, these legacies continue to oppress people. The disarray and incoherence caused by these overlapping systems are reflected in the novel's fractured narrative structure, which is characterized by frequent changes in time, perspective, and syntax.

Roy employs poetic language and child perspective in a way that is not only beautiful but also political. She reclaims narrative space for people left out of official histories by giving voice to the marginalized, the voiceless, and the innocent. In her book, love is brave rather than triumphant. It is an act of resistance, even if it ends in tragedy. "It didn't matter that the story had no moral," says Roy. That it was merely a

silly, transient thing. Between the crevices of a better existence, a stopover (Roy 308). Love's transient nature simply makes it more significant as defiance.

Conclusion: The Fragile Architecture of Love and Defiance

A harsh yet poetic critique of the "Love Laws" that aim to categorize, control, and penalize human emotion may be found in Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things. Roy demonstrates how forbidden impulses are never only personal issues but rather pose serious challenges to social structures based on violence, hierarchy, and exclusion through the entwined fates of Ammu, Velutha, Rahel, and Estha.
Roy portrays love as brittle, perilous, and intensely political rather than idealizing it. Love that transcends caste, gender, or societal boundaries is portrayed as extremely risky rather than liberating. However, Roy finds a vision of human dignity and resistance right in this risk. Roy comments, "It is interesting how the memory of death can sometimes linger so much longer than the memory of the life it stole" (Roy 19). Instead of forgetting, the book chooses to show the systematic brutality that aims to destroy human ties.
In the end, The God of Small Things presents a revolutionary vision of persistence rather than victory. insisting on the importance of love despite punishment. insisting on remembrance despite the pain. a focus on the little things that are left, that are important, and that are resistant. Roy reveals the high price of love in a world that is set up to destroy it—as well as the silent, unwavering bravery needed to love in spite of this—through her beautiful, fractured, and radical narrative.

References

[1] Bose, Brinda. In Desire and in Death: Eroticism as Politics in Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things. ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature, vol. 29, no. 2, 1998, pp. 59–72.

[2] Tickell, Alex. Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things. Routledge Guides to Literature, Routledge, 2007.

[3] Nair, Rukmini Bhaya. Melancholy of the Subaltern Child: The God of Small Things. Economic and Political Weekly, vol.. 35, no. 43/44, 2000, pp. 3829–3832.

[4] Pellissery, Sony J. and George, Susan Thomas. Caste and the Power of Law: Unwritten 'Love Laws' in Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things. Indian Journal of Human Development, vol. 5, no. 2, 2011, pp. 379–391.