



Hyperreal Power Patterns in Roy's *The God of Small Things*: A Postmodern Analysis

Mohsin Khan*, Ghulam Mustafa Mashori**

ABSTRACT: *This study aimed to analyze the power patterns exercised by the two exploiters, namely Comrade Pillai and Chacko, in Roy's (1997) The God of Small Things, in the perspective of Baudrillard's (1984, 1997) postmodern theory of simulacra and hyperreality. The analysis reveals their patriarchal hegemony to be hyperreal as it does not spring from any logical or moral reason. It is the cultural structure of the society that invests them with this hyperreal power and they manipulate the system very skillfully to legitimize it. Due to the cultural conditioning, people exploited by them never challenge their putative hegemony. The findings lead to the conclusion that most social norms and stereotyped ways of thinking are simulacra that disconnect us from reality and cause us to be exploited. The need is to be pragmatic while dealing with them and to exercise one's options and choices daringly to shatter these hyperreal models of reality that paralyze our decision making power and cause the end of dialectics at social and individual level that amounts to no possibility of any revolution or positive change in life.*

Keywords: Hyperreal power, cultural norms, conditioning, pragmatic, dare, choices

Introduction

The way we perceive reality determines the nature of our thoughts, actions and decisions and shapes our whole lifestyle. This is why, since time immemorial up to our postmodern era, the perception of reality behind the appearance of things has always been one of the most-inquired issues of humans' intellectual pursuits (Avey, 1960; Durant, 1994). The founder of structuralism, Ferdinand de Saussure maintains that every concrete or abstract reality is represented by a sign (in the form of an image or word). The sign has dual nature i.e. it is both a signifier and signified. As a signifier it represents an abstract or concrete reality and as a signified it refers to or hints at the existence of that abstract or concrete reality in our physical world (Palmer, 1981). This means sign is one thing and reality, another thing. The sign only represents it on dual basis (Culler, 1985). According to Saussure, all signs are arbitrarily structured by a society to determine the nature of reality

* Lecturer in English at Govt. Islamia Arts & Commerce College Sukkur, Pakistan.
(Corresponding author E-mail address: professormohsin@yahoo.com)

** Professor and Director Institute of English Language and Literature, Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur Sindh, Pakistan.

so he also acknowledges that these signs are arbitrarily assigned the duty of reflecting the reality that society wants them to reflect otherwise the reality is one thing and the signs are another thing (Charles & Albert, 1959).

Derrida (1997), one of the founders of postmodern movement, made the most of this point and established the idea that signs used for the communication of reality are mere names, not the realities as they do not have any intrinsic or metonymic relation with reality. They are just arbitrarily created representations for the concepts of reality held by a community or an individual. Their arbitrary nature hints at the strong possibility that there might be a huge difference between the reality and the sign arbitrarily created to represent it. Even the concepts of reality that our mind forms after going through an experience might be different from the reality as our concepts are the results of our sense perceptions and senses are often deceived by the appearance of things and have proved to be very unreliable sources of knowing reality. Moreover from post-structural point of view signs or images as representations can represent many realities that often cause people to differ diametrically about their ultimate interpretations. Derrida (1997) maintains that no definite abstract reality or signified can be perceived behind a sign as a signifier. In such scenario one must not look for a signified or some abstract reality behind every signifier. Once a signifier is created, it itself becomes a reality and refers to a number of other signifiers for its understanding. So instead of looking for some signified behind every signifier we must move from one signifier to another signifier to discover the new horizons of reality and to understand the ever changing nature of reality (Derrida 1997).

In this postmodern polemic the noteworthy point is that both the structuralists and post structuralists agree on the idea that we make sense of the reality in terms of signs. A sign may become a symbol when majority of the society attaches some specific concept of reality to it. But even such symbols are merely the representations of reality, they themselves are not reality. These representations of reality can be true or false. The crux of the matter is that the perception of reality through these symbols, signs or representations deeply affects our thoughts, actions and whole lifestyle.

Lyotard (1984) and Baudrillard (1983, 1997) took the sign theory to yet another level when they pointed out that in our postmodern times signs are being created artificially to control people's sense of reality. Baudrillard (1983, 1997) termed such signs as simulacra and the process of creating them, simulation. He theorized that such artificially constructed signs are merely the models of reality with no reality behind them. Their apparent veracity wins our credence as in their appearance they seem realer than the real. They invoke specific desires or fears in us and resultantly we shape our

lifestyle in accordance with them. They blend the power of reality and imagination or apprehensions and become so convincing in their appearance that in spite of the apprehension that they may be unreal we cannot help believing in them. Thus they affect our heart and mind and keep us into a hyperreal state in which we live under a deceiving idea that we are connected with reality and our whole lifestyle is in accordance with reality. The exploitative and oppressive forces in the society create them as a strategy of deterrence and peaceful coexistence, for these signs paralyze the vying forces in the society and cause the end of dialectics i.e. killing any possibility of revolution or positive change in society that may end the putative authority of the exploitative forces in the society.

Baudrillard's postmodern theory helps us make a very cogent and authentic analysis of our postmodern times. It convincingly elaborates how we have entered an era where everything can be simultaneously true and false, real and unreal. Baudrillard calls this scenario as the operation of simulacra and hyperreality. Improving upon the sign theory of Ferdinand De Saussure, Baudrillard points out that in the postmodern age all signs have lost their referents, so all signs have become meaningless and unreal and in these meaningless signs we try to find meaning.

To elucidate his concept further Baudrillard (1983, 1997) explains that sign, as a representation of reality, has gone through the following four successive phases to reach this simulacral or hyperreal stage:

In the first stage sign signifies some profound reality underneath it. Thus in the first stage sign has its relation with reality.

In the second stage sign masks or denatures some profound reality. Hence here the reality still exists behind the sign but sign misrepresents it and misleads us.

In the third stage sign tries to represent some reality whereas in real there is nothing behind it. It tries to represent something that actually does not exist. It may represent some reality that has long died and disappeared but sign is duping us to believe that it still exists. Baudrillard exemplifies that sometimes dead morality is artificially revived in a society just to commit some even bigger immoral act. This artificially resurrected dead morality provides superstructure to yet another even bigger immoral scheme.

In the fourth stage not only the sign is unreal but the meaning it is signifying is also unreal. This is the culmination of the process of simulation or simulacrum.

Within this theoretical framework of Baudrillard's ideas our study aims to analyze the nature of power patterns exercised by Comrade Pillai and

Chacko, the two main exploitative characters of Roy's (1997) *The God of Small Things*.

Literature Review

Nowadays the influx, of a great number of studies, reflects that researchers have started to rely more confidently on the tools and apparatuses, provided by Baudrillard's theory of hyperreality and simulacra, to make sense of our deeply complex postmodern existence. They assume that the theory shows us practical ways to make our lives really meaningful and well directed in these all ambiguous postmodern times.

Guha (1997) and Lauro (2012) argue that in ancient times people were enslaved physically but now they are disenfranchised mentally in a very subtle way. The corporate powers insinuate such signs in their mind that their whole way of looking at life changes and they behave the way their manipulators want them to behave. Thus in the name of freedom they live the life of utter thralldom.

Wolfardt (1996) and Woolley (1994) maintain that all forms of media in these times are playing the most powerful role to popularize the artificial realities in the society. They are considered the ultimate sources of information and knowledge and people's faith in these sources of information helps the capitalist powers to shape their minds and lifestyle in such a way that suits their interests. First they make people desire something that has no existence and then they create it artificially so that people may at once run after it as the fulfillment of their desire. Thus even the dreams of so called modern men are created by the corporate powers. Aggar (1991) and Elliott (2010) also point out to this sorcery of the capitalism. Leonardo (2003) argues that in such scenario Baudrillard's theory presents the most powerful lenses that help us discern the subtle tactics and operations exercised by the capitalism to undo the social praxes or revolution.

Hrolfsson (2009) points out that people are also kept in hyperreality by the presentation of wrong information that, in spite of being wrong, is congruent with their sense of morality or reality and thus people keep acting according to the demands of that wrong information. Erlingur (2006) argues that society merely looks at the images of things and rarely thinks how these images are created and what purpose they are serving. People create their opinions merely on the basis of tactfully fabricated montages that they see in media. Due to the herd instinct other people behave the way majority behaves. Thus sometimes in spite of not believing in an idea we act according to it seeing that majority believes in it. Osmundsen's study (2012) notes that in these postmodern times humans deliberately embrace hyperreality when they do not like the external realities or when they feel that

they cannot change them. Nizamdoost and Amjad's (2011) analysis of Tom Stoppard's *The Real Inspector Hound* also concludes that often in life reality and imagination substitute each other. Sometimes the real seems imaginary and sometimes the imaginary seems real. So the issue of reality and hyperreality is really a problematic one and needs a deep analysis to be understood properly.

Dainton (2002) argues that there is a strong need to put restrictions on simulations, to stay connected with reality though it seems an impossible task considering the nature of this world. Woolley (1994) also strongly asserts that we must learn to understand the hyperreal nature of this postmodern civilization to stay connected with reality.

Research Methodology

The purpose of this study is to analyze the nature of power patterns that provide hegemony to the two main patriarchal characters of this novel, namely Comrade Pillai and Chacko in the light of Baudrillard's (1997, 1983) theory of hyperreality and simulacra. The aim is to find out if the power they exercise is hyperreal and simulative in nature and what strategies they adopt to perpetuate it. For this, in accordance with the research methods advocated by Derrida (1997), Barry (2002) and Barth (2002) the facts regarding these two patriarchal characters and their interactions with other characters of the novel will be taken as signs and these signs will be compared and contrasted with Baudrillard's (1997) theory of hyperreality and simulacra. The apparatuses of Baudrillard's theory will determine to what extent these signs are simulacra and also the true nature of the hegemony that they claimed.

For the sake of clarity the data analysis and interpretation of the two characters will be kept apart and will be presented as data analysis and interpretation I and II.

Data Analysis I

Comrade Pillai

Comrade Pillai is a lower class local leader of the communist party in Aymanam Who had the gift of the gab. He owns a printing press as well. Though he poses to be the sever opponent of the upper class of the society, he maintains good relations with Chacko, a local Christian landlord who also runs a pickle factory in the area. Comrade Pillai gets a lot financial benefit from Chacko in the form of advertisement that Chacko gets printed from his printing press. Comrade Pillai has a very strong position in the party as far as his small locality is concerned but his eyes are on becoming the member of parliament for which he has to become even more powerful in the party. A

young man Velutha seemed to him a snag in his plans for he is very sincere and hard working activist of the party working under his commands in Aymanam. Velutha belongs to the caste of Prawans, people who are considered untouchable in the society by upper classes, that is why most of other party workers do not like him. But Velutha is very talented. Because of his rare talents he is a man –of- all-work sort of servant in the factory of Chacko. He could put in order every technical problem in the factory of Chacko. That is why when once Comrade Pillai secretly asked Chacko to take Velutha he plainly refused him saying that he (Velutha) was inevitable for him (Chacko) though the other workers of the factory despised him for his being an untouchable Prawn. This infuriated Comrade Pillai, who knew that someday Velutha can overthrow him from party politics as he is more daring and sincere to the cause of the party though he (Velutha) himself did not know of his talents and importance. He (Comrade Pillai) gets an opportunity to do away with Velutha when he comes to know that Velutha has a love affair with Ammu, the divorced sister of Chacko and now their family want to punish him for taking this liberty. When Velutha comes to him for help he refuses to lend him any support on the name of party discipline. This makes Velutha run away and take refuge in a desolate bungalow in the island in the river near their village, for he knows that Chacko's family will use police to torture him for loving Ammu. Chacko's aunt Baby Kochamma registers a false complaint against Velutha in the police station, accusing him of assaulting her niece Ammu, threatening the family of dreadful consequences and kidnapping the children of the family who happened to be missing on that very day when she filed the complaint. As they were an upper class family the police took prompt action on their complaint. Unfortunately the bungalow where they caught Velutha, the children were also hiding in a room of that bungalow, all unaware of one another's presence in the same place. But for the time being this proved that the allegations laid against Velutha were true. So the Police beat him brutally that brought about his miserable death in the end. Later comrade Pillai conducts indignant protests on the death of Velutha declaring him as their invaluable party worker. Though Comrade Pillai claimed to wage war against the capital system of the society, he helps his son to become successful and prosperous in that same system after gaining good education.

Data Interpretation I

Roy points out that comrade K.N.M.Pillai was essentially a political man. A professional omeletteer [Sic]. He walked through the world like a chameleon. Never revealing himself, never appearing not to. Emerging through chaos unscathed. [Sic] (Roy, 1997, p.14)

So he was the perfect example of simulacrum, for as a sign he connoted many false realities that never existed behind his representation.

Baudrillard (1997, 1983) theorizes that in the process of simulation the unreal absorbs the power of real and becomes realer than the real. Comrade Pillai, in spite of all his hypocrisy seems to people the champion of their rights as he had the gift of the gab. He knew people's desires and voiced them most powerfully and vehemently. "In his speeches he managed a clever mix of pertinent local issues and grand Maoist rhetoric which sounded even grandeur in Malayalam" (Roy, 1997, p.120).

This makes his speeches a perfect example of simulacra in which reality and imagination are collaborating together to create hyperreality in the minds of their listeners. These speeches do not have any truth. It is the desires of the people that are duping them to believe what this magician conjured. People's desires of revolution and positive change in the society made them attach such concepts of reality with him that actually were not existing. Chacko, the representative of the capitalistic power, was an important business client of Comrade Pillai so instead of taking his name plainly he always talked about the upper classes in general as the usurpers of their rights, "he never came out openly against Chacko....He never referred to him by name but as the management....as an abstract functionary, in some larger scheme....to subvert the revolution" (Roy, 1997. p.121).

Interestingly Roy suggests that his poverty also kept people around him in dark about his reality and made his simulations successful. This made the poor think that he was one of them and the people like Chacko always feared that he was against them. In reality he was neither against the upper class nor with the poor ones, who believed him to be their unflinching great leader. To him his interests were the most important things. Ironically he himself wanted to get rid of the poverty that for the time being imparted him great power among the rich and the poor alike. Whenever Chacko visited him he was always overawed by the poor conditions of his house. On such occasions, [Chacko always felt himself] like a general who had been stripped of his stars, he limited his smile, contained his expansiveness. Anybody meeting him there for the first time might have thought him reticent. Almost timid.

With a sense of street-fighter's unerring instincts, Comrade Pillai knew that his straitened circumstances (his small hot house, his grunting [coughing because of illness] mother, *his obvious proximity to the toiling masses* [emphasis added] gave him a power over Chacko that in those revolutionary times no amount of Oxford education could match.

He held his Poverty like a gun to Chacko's head. (Roy, 1997, p. 275)

Comrade Pillai always feared the dare and intelligence of Velutha as a sincere party worker and wanted to get rid of him so once when Chacko came to his house for some business deal he invoked the apprehensions Chacko against Velutha to get him fired from the factory. He did not want to do it at the cost of revealing his insincerity with the workers of the party so he started the conversation very tactfully:

“He is good worker,” He [Comrade Pillai] said thoughtfully. ‘Highly intelligent.’

‘He is’. Chacko said. ‘An excellent carpenter with an engineer’s mind. If it wasn’t for_’

‘Not *that* worker,’ Comrade Pillai said. “*Party* worker.” [original emphases]

‘Ah, I see. So he’s a card-holder. [that means the officially acknowledged member of the party.]

‘Oh yes,’ Comrade Pillai said softly. ‘Oh Yes.’ (Roy, 1997, p.277).

Here though apparently Comrade Pillai is masquerading that he is concerned about the security of Chacko and wants him to get rid of Velutha by sacking him but inwardly he is concerned with his own security as a leader for the daring workers like Velutha could any time overthrow such opportunist leaders. The whole conversation is a process of simulation by the two characters, for the real purpose of Chacko’s visit was also to know the reality of Velutha and Comrade Pillai also wanted to invoke his apprehensions regarding Velutha but they both discuss this matter as if it just sprang unexpectedly during their conversation.

Here the point to note is that Comrade Pillai, who as a sign represents communist forces, is working against his own class whose rights he claims to champion. Baudrillard (1997) argues that in these postmodern times all the binary terms have lost their significance for they are not sincere with the system of meaning that they represent. So there is no difference between a communist and a capitalist. They both are sincere only with their personal gains for which they can deceive any one.

Chacko refuses to sack Velutha and acknowledges his indispensability to him in this way, “My dear fellow, Chacko said, “That’s impossible. He’s invaluable. He practically runs the factory...and we can’t solve the problem by sending all the Paravans [the untouchables] away. Surely we have to learn to deal with this nonsense.”

“That may be, he [Comrade Pillai] said caustically. “But Rome was not built in a day. Keep it in mind, Comrade, that this is not your Oxford College. For you what is nonsense, for Masses it is something different.” (Roy, 1997, p.279)

How out of the context and mismatched the reaction Comrade Pillai has shown to Chacko’s refusal. This is another example of simulacrum for this statement has no reality behind it. He only (Comrade Pillai) wants to make Chacko feel his unflinching loyalty to the cause of the party whereas his act of provoking him against Velutha, ironically has revealed his insincerity with the ideology of the party.

About the baseless caste system and mutual hatred of the lower class people on the basis of this caste system Comrade Pillai remarks that “it is a conditioning they have from birth” (Roy, 1997, p.279). It is this conditioning or deeply embedded behavior in their psyche that he exploits. This way of thinking and behaving is an indication that these people are never sincere with one another. It makes all their unity and struggle against their exploiters a simulacrum i.e. a sign with no reality behind it. The leaders like Comrade Pillai also know it and they exploit their mutual hatred and insincerity with one another to materialize their vested interest.

These facts of the novel also endorse Baudrillard’s (1997) concept of the end of dialectics, as both the signs of thesis and antithesis are behaving alike so no synthesis or revolution is possible. There is no difference between Chacko a Bourgeoisie and Comrade Pillai a Proletariat. Ironically the hypocritical struggle of the Proletariats is strengthening the same system of exploitation against which they are struggling.

Baudrillard (1983, 1997) maintains that a system of exploitation sometimes sacrifices its own unflinching supporter to just to dupe people that the system is dying. But as a result of this sacrifice it becomes even stronger. The death of Velutha beautifully exemplifies this idea. In reality by supporting leaders like Comrade Pillai, Velutha was unwittingly cementing the same system of exploitation that he wanted to demolish. Being threatened by the family of Chacko when Velutha goes to Comrade Pillai for help he (Comrade Pillai) deliberately refuses to help him calling it a violation of the party discipline. But later when Velutha is killed by the police he leads very powerful protests to show his indignation on the death of an invaluable worker of the party, though secretly he also had a hand in the murder of Velutha. Thus the murder of Velutha gives a new lease of life to that same system of oppression and exploitation against which he had been struggling all his life. It strengthened the political position of Comrade Pillai in the area as well. Baudrillard (1983,1997) points out that this is where the apex of the sorcery of Capitalism comes forward that by playing with signs and by

creating simulacra that seem realer than the real it can even cause communism to work for its perpetuation.

Data Analysis II

Chacko

Chacko was the brother of Ammu and the nephew of Baby Kochamma. He studied in England as the Rhodes scholar. There an English lady Margaret fell in love with her and married him. She took him for a highly educated man who would prove a responsible and loving husband in future. But after marriage Chacko proved an utterly irresponsible, lazy person who was happy to see his wife working in a restaurant as a waitress to bear the expenses of their family while he stayed in the home lazily. Lady Margaret was soon disillusioned and after giving birth to a daughter she divorced him. Chacko had to return India with a broken heart. Here first he worked as a lecturer in a college but soon he left that job and in spite of all the disliking of her mother, he started administering the pickle factory that her mother had established after a great deal of hard work. He planned to form the union of factory workers and conduct elections among them so that he may control them and may prevent them from falling prey to the influence of Comrade Pillai. Whenever the factory workers showed some resentment on their low wages or the terms and conditions of their service he sided with them pretending that he was also a worker like them in the factory and his mother Mammachi is the owner. Being the only male member of the family according to the culture of the area he was the virtual owner of everything that their family had. Thus all the ladies of family were dependent upon him. He introduced himself as a Marxist to the factory workers though he unscrupulously used all the capitalistic tactics to exploit them. He even did not spare his divorcee sister Ammu and used her skills to manage the affairs of the factory without paying anything to her. The jobless and shelter-less Ammu kept serving him like a slave as she felt that she had no other way to support her two children but to serve him. Chacko used to take liberties with the female workers of the factory to gratify his lust. When he came to know that the second husband of his previous wife had died in an accident he requested her to come to India with his daughter to spend their vacation. He hoped that he would renew his relation with his previous wife. After coming to India, in an accident his daughter died by drowning when she was trying to flee from the house with other children. They all were unhappy at the stern and unempathetic behavior of her mothers. Baby Kochamma instigated Chacko that Ammu was responsible for all the miseries of the family so Chacko expelled him from the house. Later due to the extrajudicial murder of Velutha things became extremely difficult for him. He had to wind up the factory and shift to Canada for good to run an unsuccessful antique business.

Data Interpretation II

All the details regarding Chacko indicate that he is a perfect example of all the definitions of simulacra and simulations formulated by Baudrillard (1983, 1997). As a simulative sign he seemed to have an aura of innocence around him that always caused people succumb to his simulacra. He was jolly, vivacious and highly educated so Margaret succumbed to his charms mistakenly believing that he would prove a good husband that he never was to be. Thus as a sign he reflected a reality to Margaret that did not exist.

His act of siding with the factory workers during their protests showed that as a sign he deliberately kept his meaning ambiguous to control people around him. This exemplifies Baudrillard's idea of simulacrum in which sign deliberately distorts the reality behind it. His plan of creating the so called union of the factory workers and conducting election among them to control them is a striking example of how the powerful ones in the society spin the webs of simulacra to carry on their hegemony without letting people discern it. People feel that they are free in running their affairs but on the name of liberty are controlled and they do not know it.

Though he was a landlord and a thoroughgoing capitalist but he introduced himself in the area as a Marxist to win the sympathies of his workers. He always called his workers as comrades making them feel that he was one of them. Thus as a self-proclaimed Marxist he exemplifies a sign that simulates a reality that actually does not exist behind it. The mask of this self-proclaimed Marxist hid a cruel capitalist that even exploited the lady workers of the factory to satiate his lust.

From cultural point of view Chacko is a model of reality with no reference behind it. The culture of the area has conditioned the female members of the family to attribute such values and meanings to him that he does not possess at all. Being a male member of the family the culture entitled him to be the owner of all the property of the family. So all females felt themselves dependant upon him from every aspect. Objectively speaking the females of the family were more talented and proactive but simply because of the cultural conditioning they took him their custodian. They felt that without him they cannot survive in the society. This erroneous thinking became a reason of the destruction of Ammu's life as she kept serving him in spite of knowing that he is not sincere to her and her children.

Chacko had the knack of making an objective analysis of things and acting accordingly. This is why in spite of all the admonitions of Comrade Pillai he did not sack Velutha from factory for he knew that it is Velutha who practically is running the factory being an engineer minded man of all works who could put in order any sort of technical problem of the factory. So From

the perspective of Derrida's philosophy he was a center that depended upon the paraphernalia to carry on its centrality but being a master of spinning simulacra he never let the paraphernalia discern this fact. When in the fit of anger his family got Velutha murdered by the police, then everything toppled down and the center lost its centrality.

Findings

The data analysis and interpretation procedures have led to the following findings.

As signs the patriarchal exploiters always put on the meanings that people desire from them. Sometimes people's desires and wishful thinking also cause them to attach such meaning with these exploiters that they do not possess. The exploiters understand the psyche of the people they are controlling and treat them accordingly.

The exploiters artificially create the reality that people want to see. Such a reality is actually a hyperreality. Instead of confronting the resentful and deprived factions of the society they side with them. They become their leaders and keep exploiting them on the name of championing their rights. As in this way the exploited ones help their own exploiters so all the differences between the opposing binaries wipe off and any possibility of revolution or positive change in the society as a result of people's struggles becomes impossible. Baudrillard terms this scenario as the end of dialectics.

These exploiters as signs keep their meaning ambiguous and can side with any class that can impart them power. As leaders these signs let people feel free in their decisions and on the name of freedom they keep them in their servitude. Cultural norms also help the exploiters to perpetuate their hyperreal power. People being culturally conditioned take them as true symbols of power. But their power is actually hyperreal in nature as it has no moral or logical origin. They enjoy it because they know how to use the system to invoke it. They analyze things objectively and take pragmatic steps to keep things in their control.

These exploiters are very clear about their interests and objectives and keep them in the forefront. They proactively manipulate all the resources around them to materialize their goals. They lead people because they are their own leaders. They don't let others dictate their lives. They make an objective analysis of their pros and cons and take concrete steps to settle their problems. The exploitative forces make things happen instead of waiting them to happen and make the best of every opportunity. They can exploit even the worst of the situation to their favour. The exploiters keep people in ignorance or present information to them in such a way that people always derive the meanings that favours their interest.

In spite of being rivals to each other these two patriarchal characters do not expose each other. Rather they help each other to maintain their simulacra as by exposing each other they might not be able to carry on their exploitations. The findings show that the perception of reality is always doubtful in these hyperreal times when signs have no relation to some specific reality. All signifiers are just signifiers without any signified or referent. In the midst of this vertiginous situation one has to be daring and objective to know the reality of signs. One must challenge the claims of these signs constantly and if one feels that they are not what they are claiming to be then one must stop trusting them. For this one must have to be objective and proactive.

Though as signs the exploitative forces are really contemptible, still they have many qualities that we can learn and can become successful. Their practical, objective and result oriented approach to the affairs of life points out that they do not remain content with the way things are. They mould them so that they may serve their interests.

Most importantly the patterns of reality that we inherit from our culture are very dangerous. We never challenge them as we are deeply conditioned by culture to accept them without any question. These patterns provide the hyperreal power to our exploiters and they keep exploiting us with our own consent for we believe that that they have the license to do so. In the novel Chacko keeps usurping the rights of the female members of the family due to the illogical ascendance that culture grants him over the female members of the family. Only the daring ones can challenge the morality of such illogical ascendance and bring positive changes in the structure of the society.

By providing wrong information and by invoking the illogical values of the society the exploiters often paralyze the hearts and minds of their preys and do not let them make daring decisions that can release them from their sorceries and simulacra. Again the only way to get out of this paranoia and psychosis is to keep exploring one's options and making daring and brave decisions. If we let people's likes and dislikes control our lives then we should never complain for our miseries and dejections.

Conclusion

Our application of Baudrillard's postmodern theory of simulacra and hyperreality upon the data provided by Roy's(1997) *The God of Small Things* convincingly points out that the theory can provide us effective intellectual tools to discern the nature of the simulacra or the hyperreal models of reality that exploitive powers fabricate to control our life style in these postmodern times. But the mere perception of simulacra and hyperreality is not sufficient

enough to lead a successful life. After being able to discern simulacra and hyperreality we still need some standard of reality or truth that may ensure us that our efforts are in the right direction. In this regard pragmatic theory of truth presented by Pierce and Dewey (as cited by Randall & Buchler, 1956, p133-42) is really a powerful postmodern instrument that can keep us on the right track. They assert that the truth or the reality of an ideal comes forward after its practical application. Pragmatists believe that truth means success in enquiry. If an idea or way of thinking is helping to achieve our objectives it is true, if not, it is not true and we have to discard it to find out a new one in the light of our previous experiences. This approach is exactly in tune with Derrida's (1997) concept in which sign as a signifier leads to other signifiers and we must move from one signifier to other signifiers to discover the true nature of reality and its new horizons. The only thing is that we have to be clear about our objectives and must keep analyzing if we are on our way to achieve them or we are just serving the interests of others on the name of struggling for our aims. If we observe the way of thinking of the exploiters in Roy's (1997) *The God of Small Things* we find that they are instinctively pragmatists. Comrade Pillai knows that the struggle of the communist party is a simulacrum as not only the leaders but also the workers are not sincere with the ideology of the party. So in this scenario one must at least be sincere with one's own aims. We ourselves are responsible for our success and failure and can control our actions more objectively and the best way is to be pragmatist in these hyperreal times with reference to our aims and objectives.

References

- Agger, B. (1991). Critical theory, Poststructuralism, Postmodernism: Their sociological relevance. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17(1991), 105-131. Retrieved April, 15, 2014 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/208333>.
- Avey, A. (1960). *Handbook in the history of philosophy* (5th ed.). New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Barry, P. (2002). *Beginning theory: An introduction to literary and cultural theory*. (2nd ed.) Manchester, United Kingdom: Manchester University Press.
- Barthes, R. (2002). *S/Z*. (8th ed.). United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Limited. <http://www.blackwellpublishing.com>.
- Baudrillard, J. (1997). *Simulacra and simulation*. (4th ed.). Michigan, USA: The University of Michigan Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (1983). *Simulations*. Trans. Paul Foss, Paul Patton and Philip Beitchman. U.S.A: Semiotext[e].
- Charles, B., & Albert, S. (1959). *Course in general linguistics*. New York City: The Philosophical library, Inc 15 East 40th Street.
- Culler, J.(1985). *Suassure*. (6th ed). London: Robert Hartnoll (1985) Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall.
- Dainton, B. (2002). *Innocence lost: Simulation scenario: Prospects and consequences*. University of Liverpool. Retrieved September 3,203 from www.simulationargument.com/dainton.Pdf.
- Derrida, J. (1997). *Of grammatology*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. DOI: www.mohamedrabee.com/books/book1_3997.pdf.
- Durant, W. (1994). *The story of philosophy*. (2nd ed.). New York: Washington Square Press.
- Elliott, A. (2010). *Routledge companion to social theory*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Erlingure. (2006). *Postmodernism and the Simpsons: Intertextuality, hyperreality and the critique of metanarrative*. Retrieved April 4, 2014 from <http://www.siguros.co.uk/media/simpsons>. Pdf.
- Guha, R. (1997). *Dominance without hegemony*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lauro, R. E. (2012). *Beyond the colonization of human imagining and everyday life: Crafting mythopoeic life world as a theological response to hyperreality*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk> .

- Leonardo, Z. (2003). Resisting capital: Simulationist and socialist strategies. *Critical Sociology*, 211-236.
doi:crs.sagepub.com/content/29/2/211.full.pdf.html
- Lyotard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. (Vol.10). Minneapolis, US-MN: The University of Minnesota Press Minneapolis.
- Nizamdoost, N., & Amjad, F. A. (2012). Traces of hyperreality in *Tom Stoppard*. *Iranian EFL Journal*, 8(6) Retrieved April 12,2014 from www.iranian-efl-journal.com.
- Osmundsen, M. (2012). *The loss of the real*. Master's thesis, university of Agder. Retrieved from <http://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/id/91559/Marthe>
- Palmer, F.R. (1981). *Semantics*. University of Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Randall, J., & Buchler, J. (1956). What is truth. *Philosophy: An introduction* (10th ed.). New York: Barnes & Noble, New York.
- Roy, A. (1997). *The god of small things*. (1st ed.). New Delhi, India: Thomson Press India.
- Wolfardt, C. (1996). *Disneyland: An aesthetic of postmodern consumer culture hyperreality and semiotic content in the visual art* (Doctoral dissertation) URL:<http://hdl.handle.net/2263/23931>.
- Woolley, B. (1994). *Virtual worlds: A journey in hype and hyper-reality*. London: Penguin Books London.