

## Chapter I: Exploration of Cultural Violence in Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*

Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) portrays violence as the source of traumatic experience in an individual's life. The novel revolves around communal violence in a small village, Pachigam in Kashmir and its aftermath in the life of the characters in the novel. Shalimar, a juggler in the village of Pachigam, Kashmir is one such victim of violence that erupts in the name of the conflict between the Hindus and the Muslims which enters into the village with the arrival of Maximillian Ophuls, an American ambassador to India. He incites people into various cultural groups, and hence there is a violence taking place in the village that eventually leaves Shalimar vowing for vengeance.

Culture sets up the mannerism and way of living of the people of a certain community. It is about the internalized feelings that people earn and possess towards the certain pattern of behavior. As such, when these idealized behaviors are hurt, people restore to violence and vengeance. The case of Shalimar from novice to feared terrorist is associated with his cultural values being hurt and challenged.

Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* is set in the postcolonial India and takes the issue of violence as an inborn when cultural values and mores are challenged. With the end of colonial era in India in 1947, India was formally divided into two separate nations – Hindustan and Pakistan. However, this division was based on bitter rivalry of cultural conflict. Cultural hatred gave rise to communal feelings which is allegiance and association to a certain ethnic or religious group. *Oxford English Dictionary* defines communalism as “a greater loyalty to an ethnic or religious group than to society in general” (39). This concept of inclination and nepotism towards a group of people has been the chief cause of increasing enmity between the people of two different communities, resulting in communal riots and

violence. People of South East Asian nations are the greatest sufferers of this evil practice. Especially, in India and Pakistan this trend has claimed thousands of lives since ages and damaged property worth millions. Unfortunately, this seems to be a cultural trend cropping for its existence in these nations.

Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* follows the similar line of communal issues and its aftermath, from local to global scenario. The plot of the story is set in various parts of the world, starting from a small village in Kashmir. It takes revenge as the central issue, which is rooted in communal hatred that grows from an individual level. However, as Mahatma Gandhi famously opined that an eye for an eye will make this world blind, this novel also is the saga of these blind people. Shalimar is in a state of mental torture and pain when he learns that his beloved is pregnant of the American Max. As such the story develops on a line of growth from the local level of vengeance to the international scenario of violence and bloodshed.

The terminology 'violence' has its root in almost every uprising from the famous Boston Tea Party during the American War of Independence to present day uprising being witnessed in nations and communities around the world. Many people are victims to this violation where the forces of the government and rebels compete, resulting in physical and mental damage to the common people. Many of the rebels are termed terrorists during the insurgency and later when they come to power, theirs' action turns pious. Thus, there has always been violence, in one or other excuses.

Violence is closely associated with terrorism. Any act of threat of violence, especially bombing, kidnapping and abduction and association, and such is carried out to address some political demands. This act of violence is forced upon innocent people who, practically have nothing to do with these inhumane acts. According to Daniel Benjamin, terrorism was "first used in France

to describe a new system of government adopted during the French Revolution” (123). Benjamin further writes that in those days terrorism meant reign of terror. This reign of terror is intended towards making the demands of some specific group to the government or stakeholders.

Today, it is almost impossible to differentiate between the acts of violence and terrorism. All terrorist acts involve violent activities, or the threat of violence to accomplish certain demands from the power holder. Shalimar is one such example who resorts to violence to take revenge on his target, Max.

Cultural violence is an attempt to sow panic and to dismantle confidence in the government and political leadership of their target country. Terrorism is, therefore, designed to have psychological effect that reach far beyond its impact on the immediate victims or object of an attack. Terrorists mean to frighten and thereby intimidate a wider audience, such as a rival ethnic or religious group, an entire country and its political leadership, or the international community as a whole.

The public outcry of sufferings and woes as is depicted in the novel gives rise to trauma which has stretched from psychic life to public history. Trauma is explicitly presented in several reading materials that can include romantic poetry, psychiatric histories, accounts of sexual abuse, memoirs, testimonies, documentaries, the symptoms, silences, omissions and so many others in national histories. Trauma theory can rightly be understood as a place where different critical approaches and application converge in the same streamline. As such, trauma theory cannot be termed in singular idea but should be taken in collective form. Therefore, Geoffrey Hartman turns from work on the undecidability of interpretation in literature to problems too works on the Holocaust memory and witness in the early 1990s.

Similarly, Jeffrey C. Alexander, a professor at Yale University foregrounds the concept of cultural trauma through his essay “Towards a Theory of Cultural Trauma.” According to him, throughout the twentieth century people have always focused on traumatic experiences caused by an event like bloodshed, violence and others. As such, the shift of concern has been from individual to collective and to a certain cultural or geographical concern. In the traumatic level too, the common experience and event is internalized by certain community or group. Thus, trauma is something covering the matter not only single minds but in groups, at the same time. As such, Alexander opines, “Trauma is not something naturally existing; it is something constructed by the society” (2).

In regards to collective trauma, Alexander opines that it gives birth to communal trauma because the mental level of suffering has to do with social and cultural setting. According to him, cultural trauma occurs:

When members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to horrendous event that leaves indelible mark upon their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways.

Cultural trauma is first of all an empirical, scientific concept suggesting new meaningful and casual relationship between previously unrelated events, structures, perception and actions.

(1)

It is an indication that cultural trauma is a result of the group practicing for distinct and collective identity. The aim with Alexander’s notion of cultural trauma is to create a notion of ethical identity associated with the victim’s sufferings.

Concerning to cultural trauma experiences, people in the contemporary world suffer from anxiety, frustration, alienation, depression, broken relationship, dislocation, robbery and many kinds of physical and mental diseases created by the chaotic and destructive world affairs of the World Wars I and II. The undergoing suffering from all sorts of experiences somehow lead to path near to traumatic survivor and its attempted prospect neither has procedure a course of phase out. That is why, contemporary world is disintegrated with its historical perspective, mainly due to the destruction of agrarian society and the development of modern technology, urbanization, industrialism, capitalism or say in whole globalization establishes itself in definitive break from the past.

As such, it becomes clear that cultural trauma theory is developed from mental sufferings which not only includes those psychoanalytical theories but also includes other various field like societal happenings and others, like in the case of the tragic incidents in *Shalimar the Clown*. As witnessed in the case of Shalimar who joins the Muslim extremist organization and learns to use weapons, and then moves on to join the underground gang in Philippines. Initially, these groups have few members, limited firepower, and comparatively few organizational resources. However, there are some powerful resources coming in support who aid them to a larger level, and things turn from bad to worse. For this reason, they rely on dramatic, often spectacular, bloody and destructive acts of hit-and-run violence to attract attention to themselves and their cause. Through the publicity generated by their violence, terrorists seek to obtain the leverage, influence, and power they otherwise would lack.

Cultural violence is, by nature, political because it involves the acquisition and use of power for the purpose of forcing others to submit or agree to terrorist

demands. A terrorist attack, by generating publicity and focusing attention on the organization behind the attack, is designed to create this power. It also fosters an environment of fear and intimidation that the terrorists can manipulate. As a result, terrorist's success is best measured by its ability to attract attention to the terrorists and their cause and by the psychological impact it exerts over a nation and its citizenry. It differs in this respect from conventional warfare, where success is measured by the amount of military assets destroyed, the amount of territory seized, and the number of enemy dead. Acts of cultural terrorism are typical attempts to justify their use of violence by arguing that they have been excluded from, or frustrated by, the accepted processes of bringing about political change. Commenting on this issue Bruce Fuller writes:

They maintain that terrorism is the only option available to them, although their choice is a reluctant – even a regrettable one.

Whether someone agrees with this argument or not often depends on whether the person sympathizes with the terrorists' cause or with the victims of the terrorist attack. The aphorism "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter" underscores how use of the label terrorism can be highly subjective depending upon one's sympathies. (130)

At the same time terrorist acts, including murder, kidnapping, bombing, and arson have long been defined in both national and international law as crimes. Even at the time of war, violence deliberately directed against innocent civilians is considered a crime. Similarly, violence that spreads beyond an acknowledged geographical theater of war to violate the territory of neutral or noncombatant states is also deemed a war crime.

Terrorism has occurred throughout history for a variety of reasons. Its causes can be historical, cultural, political, social, psychological, economic, or religious—or any combination of these. Some countries have proven to be particularly susceptible to terrorism at certain times, as Italy and West Germany were during the 1970s. Terrorist violence escalated precipitously in those two countries for a decade before declining equally dramatically. Other countries, such as Canada and the Netherlands, have proven to be more resistant, and have experienced only a few isolated terrorist incidents.

In general, democratic countries have provided more fertile ground for terrorism because of the open nature of their societies. In such societies citizens have fundamental rights, civil liberties are legally protected, and government control and constant surveillance of its citizens and their activities is absent. By the same token, repressive societies, in which the government closely monitors citizens and restricts their speech and movement have often provided more difficult environments for terrorists. But even police states have not been immune to terrorism, despite limiting civil liberties and forbidding free speech and rights of assembly.

Despite the notion of individual freedom in democratic nations, the idea of collective trauma has been prevailing and in fact, flourishing. Approving this notion, noted theorist Ron Eyerman comes with “Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity.” In this essay, Ron explores the notion of collective trauma as cultural from the viewpoint of African-American identity from the end of the Civil War and the Civil Right Movement. The African-American struggle for Civil Right Movement was from individual level to that of the collective conscience for the formation of collective identity. Ron opines:

The notion of unique African American identity emerged in the post-Civil War period, after slavery has been abolished. The trauma of forced servitude and of nearly complete subordination to the will and whims of another was thus not necessarily something directly experienced by many of the subjects of this study, but came to be central to their attempts to forge a collective identity out of its remembrance. [ . . . ] Slavery formed the root of an emergent collective identity through an equally emergent collective memory, one that signified and distinguished on the level of abstraction and point of view being put forward. (60)

The post-War period helped to form a collective identity on common grounds of slavery faced by the African-Americans. As such, trauma need not be faced collectively by a larger number of people but can take place to individual and be felt to people of a community.

In broader terms the causes, that have commonly compelled people to engage in violent activities are grievances borne of political oppression, cultural domination, economic exploitation, ethnic discrimination, and religious persecution. Perceived inequities in the distribution of wealth and political power have led some terrorists to attempt to overthrow democratically elected governments. To achieve a fairer society, they would replace these governments with socialist or communist regimes.

There are instances when even several governments resort to terrorism in an indirect manner. These are called state-sponsored terrorism. It is a form of covert warfare, a means to wage war secretly through the use of terrorist surrogates as hired guns. Commenting on state sponsorship terrorism Bruce Hoffman opines:

State sponsorship can also place at terrorists' disposal the resources of an established country's diplomatic, military, and intelligence services. In doing so, it has transformed ordinary groups, with otherwise limited capabilities into more powerful and menacing opponents. These services improve the training of terrorists and facilitate planning and operations of these groups. (124)

Through these help, even a small group of locally operating groups turn into powerful violent groups. For these, the governments pay these terrorists handsomely. These covert actions ultimately act as a boomerang, and one day becomes a threat to them, as well.

One of the critics of Rushdie, M. Madhusudan Rao commenting on this style of rhetoric in *Shalimar the Clown* opines:

There is nothing like a consistent theme in the novel. There are signs, however, of certain key ideas shaping up, of a perspective developing in his writing, which ultimately collect for a larger whole. However, Rushdie has revived the Indian tradition of writings, as in *The Mahabharata*, *The Panchatantra*. (31)

The rhetoric of the novel covers larger features of South Asian nationalities reviving the ways of storytelling of the ones who have been nurturing an unsatisfied feelings, pain and hatred.

Pachigam is a peaceful village of Hindus and Muslims sharing a strong bond of fraternity. However, with the arrival American ambassador Max, the representative of Western power and its impact, life does not remain the same in Pachigam in Kashmir. Boonyi, the humble village girl and fiancée to Shalimar, is enticed by Max and, later on is impregnated. When Shalimar knows this the story moves from personal vengeance to communal violence. However, in all these turn

and twists of events, the major characters are in physical and spiritual loss, as well. Based on this notion of pain and suffering of the characters even in the period of violence, the present research takes ‘violence and trauma’ as the tool to analyze *Shalimar the Clown*.

Further, Rao feels that ‘time’ is an important factor in the novel of Rushdie. He writes, “The narratives in the novel move from victimizing history to painful anonymity and disintegration, and finally silence” (23). Rao is justified in saying so because Rushdie presents all the major events related to the rise of communal conflict from pre independence to post independence and in a chronological manner.

He gained international fame and exposure with the publication of *The Satanic Verses* (1988). The novel was adjudged blasphemy to the Islamic sacred book, *Kuran* by the Muslims for, and hence was banned in several Islamic countries. After Iranian leader Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini issued a *fatwa* (Islamic decree), sentencing Rushdie to death, Rushdie went into hiding for several years and remained under constant police protection. In 2007 Rushdie was awarded a Knighthood, by the Queen Elizabeth of Britain, an honor that drew protests from the governments of Iran and Pakistan.

*Shalimar the Clown* follows a simple storyline, which develops from a small village in Kashmir, where a society of various castes and religion live in peace. Until the devilish issue of communalism penetrates. Hindus and Muslims were living in mutual understanding sharing religious tolerance towards each other in Kashmir, one of the most disputed zones of South Asia. Shalimar, a young Muslim boy, falls in love with Boonyi, a Hindu girl. Their parents, with initial tics and bits are ready for their union through their marriage.

However, when Max Ophuls, the powerful and dashing American ambassador to India comes to the village and things start to change. Boonyi is attracted to the rich ambassador and is easily lured to follow him to Delhi. Max, like many of his ex-girlfriends keeps her in a flat illegitimately, until she becomes pregnant and later dies in course of giving birth to a girl child, India, who is taken by Max. As such, Shalimar having known all these vows to revenge Max. However, the story is not so simple, when it comes to presentation. It moves from California to France, England, and above all Kashmir, 'the lost paradise' in Rushdie's term

Rushdie's writings evolve like a mountain river flowing eastward. They evolve and revolve around the issues of religion, fundamentalism, intolerance, and the needs to create a politically democratic and culturally hybrid and, multicultural world. Rao, commenting on Rushdie's way of narration of story, writes:

*Shalimar the Clown* is lavishly interspersed with details of religious tussles, communal hatred, and fundamentalist activities. References to the Nazi atrocities on the Jews during and previous to the World War II, terrorist onsets on Western metropolises, and the more-than-a-half-century-long Indo-Pak conflict in Kashmir make the novel an engaging reading of the plight of the present day world in its personal, political and cultural dimensions. *Shalimar the Clown* presents the picture of turbulent world rife with fundamentalist attitudes and terrorist activities born therefore. (67)

The storyline of the novel moves to and fro, from the eastern part of the world to Europe, and to the U.S., from the communal to global issue. At the same time the

novel paints a picture of turmoil present in the world. In fact, the reality is that no part of the world today is free from disturbances of one or other nature.

As it has been emblematic of Rushdie's writing to defy any sort of extremism and intolerance, the novel *Shalimar the Clown* too is concerned with depicting a world where individual and community lives are unsettled by intolerant and extremist elements. It is largely due to the differences in ideas and values that have existed in all ages and civilizations. In fact, less or more it has been the part of human culture that has grown with the mentality of the every coming generation. The so-called powerful class and race of people assume themselves superior to others. Like the present scenario of American mentality, where every third world Muslim is viewed as another fundamentalist. Mohsin Hamid in his latest literary venture *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* writes:

An American could love the opportunity to emote one's way to understanding. Hyped to the maximum on both sides of the Atlantic as well as on the Indian subcontinent that a bearded Muslim is the offering of an authoritative account of self-styled insider, that he is a Muslim resentment for America. (34)

Conflicts, violence and differences in ideology are a part of human history. However, never in the past there had been so adverse of ideas and feelings among the nations and nationalities, that, too on the basis of religion. The mentality of west upon east that an adherent follower of Islam somewhere has resentment to the west, especially in against the U. S. is the root cause of the growing attacks on the west.

In consideration to the issues raised and discussed above, the present research entitled “Exploration of Cultural Violence in *Shalimar the Clown*” makes a brief survey on violence ridden present world from Pachigam, a small

village in India to various parts of the world. Similarly, the second chapter will be “Violence and Cultural Trauma in *Shalimar the Clown*.” The final chapter “Communal Violence and Justice” depicts the aftermath of violence to conclude the research.

## Chapter II: Violence and Cultural Trauma in Rushdie's

### *Shalimar the Clown*

Twenty first century is stained by violent activities taking place around the world. No nations are aloof to this global scale of violent activities that are claiming the life and property of thousands of innocent. The attack on the twin towers; followed by several such incidents across Europe and in South Asia, have invited never before experienced trauma in the mind of the people. As such, the societies have been marred from communal violence to 9/11 and citizens around the world have been under severe psychological and mental fear. This fear has shown its faces in the forms of violent attacks around the major world cities, especially starting the 9/11.

In this sense, it can be assumed that member of cultural communities of its unique culture is highly sensitive towards it. As when there are threats to the dignity of their community people often take to violent means to restore the so-called communal values. The issue of Shalimar roots from communal sentiment which is threatened when Max, the powerful American comes to the small village of Pachigam in Kashmir. As such, culture and trauma comes hand-to-hand in *Shalimar the Clown*.

Cultural trauma examines the undercurrents of the distorted by contextualizing it in the network of cultural-politics. It is, in this sense, trauma that brings home the limitations of our understanding and at the same time it dislocates the so-called traditional disciplinary boundaries leading us to rethink our notions of experiences and of communication.

Trauma Studies is intrinsically multidisciplinary as such it displaces older paradigms and attends new configuration of cultural knowledge. Major theorists base their ideas on theory of trauma on Freud's psychoanalysis

which speak and argue about the need for ‘acting-out’ or ‘working-through’ of the trauma for leading life as healthy citizens. In regards, trauma has worked or acted out in order to tackle it which is something everything theorists have separate opinion.

The happening of 9/11 has left a deep traumatic feelings and pain in the mind of the people in various communal communities. After the day, the world is no longer the same, and neither are people of various sects and communities. Since 9/11, the world seems to have concerned on two major agendas to deal with: communalism and terrorism. These two terms are so closely linked that, they seem to be synonymous with each other. Terrorism, at least for the west has its root in communalism and communalism is growing because of the rapid globalization. Had there not been global terrorism would not have reached to the height. The incidents in America, or in Madrid, or in a local market in Pakistan and Afghanistan all are linked to each other. No incidents are isolated with each other, as intimidation is intimidation at all excuses. *Shalimar the Clown* is just an example on how far terrorism can go and dominate the mind and the will of people, directly or indirectly.

In the backdrop, *Shalimar the Clown* is an exciting fiction, having its root in the east, from the strikingly beautiful province of Kashmir as far as to the far west of the globe. The plot of the novel has to do with the sentiments of the local people of Kashmir who were undivided until the day when communal violence separated them, at least, in communal sense. The novel covers Asia, Europe and America within its subject matter, that finds its origin in local hatred turned international. The story has its root in the womb of communal feelings and reaches out to leave its impact in the international level.

*Shalimar the Clown* is the story of the intention of the west, through Maximilian Ophuls – chief of the Global Anti-terrorist Squad of the U. S. He

interferes in the local issue personally inviting rage and hatred amongst its people and finally, ending up with global scenario of violence. Political conflicts are the internal parts of the novel, where local issues go like the facets of a coin. In this instance, western interest in Kashmir is ciphered by Maximilian, European-born Jewish-American ambassador to Kashmir.

Max in his younger days was a resistance hero against the Nazis, but who later becomes a secret negotiator for American interests around the globe. His involvement in Kashmir is registered through his impact upon the life of Boonyi, a dancing girl, whom he seduces, impregnates and abandons, and the eponymous Shalimar, her husband, who embittered by the loss of his beloved, becomes involved in guerrilla conflict sponsored by the Islamic fundamentalists.

Shalimar gets his training of a terrorist in Afghanistan. He learns to use weapons that Ophuls has himself provided when the US was covertly arming Islamic terrorists after the Russian invasion in 1979. Shalimar becomes an assassin in Europe and in the US, and finally murders Ophuls on the doorstep of his illicit daughter India's apartment block. The murder has its roots less in intimidation, than personal hatred.

Max's interest in Boonyi is the symbol of west's interest in the east. Here, Max is not self nor is a foreign individual but is the emblem of interest of the west in the east. He represents the hegemony of west and Boonyi is the meek east that easily gets lured by the west and falls in trap. Boonyi is thus a product of America's love for the world, and when she speaks, she speaks in the voice of Kashmir. "I am your handiwork made flesh" (3), she tells Ophuls. She further laments her sufferings after being used and thrown by the west (Max):

You took beauty and created hideousness [. . .] Look at me. I am the meaning of your deeds. I am the meaning of your so-called love,

your destructive, selfish, wanton love. Look at me. Your love looks just like hatred [. . .] I was honest and you turned me into your lie.

This is not me. This is not me. This is you. (3)

A moment later Rushdie removes the moral high-ground from Boonyi by having her revert to another, older line of attack: “I should have known better than to lie with a Jew”, she further says, “The Jews are our enemy and I should have known” (205). Even this, however, is part of Rushdie's argument, for here it becomes apparent that very thing that Ophuls set out to prevent- that is, racial and religious hatred- has become part of what his machinations have created.

The novel has a wide ranging historical perspective and scene. By dwelling on the atrocities of fascism, Rushdie's novel asserts the need to recognize the honorable, even utopian intentions behind the post-war allied efforts to impose a global consensus. Nazi atrocities, as Ophuls argues in conversation with the historian Gaston Zeller, demanded the creation of a new world order. Simultaneously, however, the novel also asserts the need to recognize that those initially honorable intentions have gone sour, or at least been kidnapped and corrupted by forces more pragmatic and cynical which has turned into a hysteric state, all over the world.

In *Studies on Hysteria*, Freud is committed to the view that the “reminiscences that cause hysterical suffering are historical in the sense that they linked to actual traumas in the patient's life” (186). The effect associated with the past trauma cannot be acknowledged and the amnesia that results means that the force of the affect becomes dammed up. The injured person's reaction to the trauma only exercises a completely cathartic effect if it is an adequate reaction, he wrote, the past that continues to wound is the “past originally found no out let” (187).

Hence Max Ophuls, hero of the wartime resistance, whose parents have died in concentration camps, and who started his political career as an idealist and optimist, finds himself, at the height of the Cold War, defending the American idea of a free world by manipulating religious factionalism in unstable regions, and engaging in covert, strategic arms deals with the Taliban and al-Qaeda. Ambassador Max Ophuls, the narrator observes dryly, “These days were supporting terror activities while calling himself an ambassador for counterterrorism” (272).

The transformation of Ophuls from a liberator with unquestionable moral justification into an agent of a new imperial power which, in its turn, presides over the same kind of moral atrocity that he once fought against, is registered most uncomfortably, when he finds himself, suddenly, playing the same kind of role once played by those he despised. He undergoes a conflict himself: “But I'm not a Nazi, he thought. I'm the American ambassador, the guy in the white hat. I'm for God's sake one of the Jews who lived. She swung her hips for him and he thought, and I'm also a married man. She swung her hips again and he ceased to think” (141).

Showing the connection between trauma, violence and political community in “Introduction: Trauma, Violence and Political Community,” Jenny Edkins points out how traumas such as wars or persecutions are inscribed and rein scribed into everyday narratives. She further states, “[. . .] takes place in practices of remembrance, demoralization and witnessing. It also takes place in political action. All these practices are the site of struggle” (15). These lines clearly show that temporality and inexpressibility of trauma makes the role of the witness almost an unbearable one. Similarly, she puts forwards her idea about trauma and posits, “Memory is not straightforward,

especially in case of traumatic memory” (16). Edkins further argues that some forms of remembering can be seen as ways of forgetting: ways of recovering from trauma by putting its lessons to one side, refusing to acknowledge that anything has changed, restoring the pretence. So, after traumatic events, there is struggle over memory. In this regard she points out:

As far as memory is concerned, how we remember a war, for example, and the way in which we acknowledge and describe what we call trauma can be very much influenced by dominant views, that is, by the state [. . .], can be contested and challenged. Forms of statehood in contemporary society, as forms of political community, are themselves produced and reproduced through social practice, including practices of trauma and memory. (11)

In fact, this definition about traumatic memory clarifies that memory is not straightforward, especially traumatic memory. So forms of state hold in contemporary society are produced and reproduced themselves through social practices, including practices of trauma and memory. In this way, the essence of the trauma is precisely that it is too horrible to be remembered, to be integrated in to our symbolic universe. They cannot forget, and some are haunted by nightmares and flashbacks to scene of unimaginable horror.

Trauma theory is a privileged critical category which includes diverse fields, with its specific focus on psychological, philosophical, ethical, cultural and aesthetic questions about the nature and representation of traumatic events. These concerns of trauma theory “range from the public and historical to the private and memorial” (Luckhurst 497). Sigmund Freud, in “Mourning and Melancholy,” describes two opposite forces that act simultaneously to convert traumatic

experience in all form of writing: “The literary form gets its strength from the struggle between the urge to cry out from the burning core of traumatic experience on the one hand, and the drive to rationally construct the core of the trauma as a symbolic representation molded in language, thus keeping it at a safe distance” (8).

Due to ineffectiveness and reckless behavior of the government towards the local culture they are in peril. A local culture may have a common set of work and kinship relationships that reinforce the practical everyday lived culture which is sediment into taken for granted knowledge and beliefs. Yet the articulation of these beliefs and sense of the particularity of the local place will tend to become sharpened and more well defined when the locality becomes locked into power struggles and elimination contests with its neighbors. In such situations we can see the formation of a local culture in which the particularity of own identity is emphasized.

In some cases 'particularity of own identity' has provoked intensified and extremist nationalist reactions, in against minority race as has occurred in France and in Britain. This can lead to a complete series of reactions on the part of immigrants. For some ethnic groups this entails a retreat in to the culture of origin; or a retreat into fundamentalist religions from he home country. For others this may entail the construction of complex counter ethnicities as with young second generation African and Caribbean's who have developed identities around the symbols and mythologies. For yet others the prospect of a unified single identity may be impossible and illusory as they move between various identities.

Mike Featherstone, one of the prominent critics on localism and globalism, is of the opinion that the conflict between the local and undeveloped nations and

the global world of developed nations is because of 'clashing of plurality' of ideas in defining nationality and communalism. He opines:

Of the globalization process the increasing contact and sense of the finitude of the world, the consciousness that the world is one place – is to lead to a clashing of a plurality of different interpretations of the meaning of the world formulated from the perspective of different national and civilization traditions. (349)

The density and multi-directional talk which takes place on the global stage take up a position as they increasingly find it impossible to silence the other voices or consider opting out. Hence we have a plurality of national responses to the process of globalization which cannot be conceived as reducible to the idea generated by Western modernity. One of the problems entailed in mapping the contemporary global condition is this range of different national cultural blend, syncretize and transform, in various ways, the alleged master processes of modernity.

It is time that culture and violence should be judged from the perspective of sentiments of global citizens. When globalization is making the world a local market to live in, with equal share of opportunities and challenges, it is also inviting problems of international scale. Mike Featherstone opines:

The process of globalization should be regarded as opening up the sense that now the world is single place with increased contact becoming unavoidable, we necessarily have greater dialogue between various nation-states, blocs and civilizations: a dialogical space in which we can expect a good deal of disagreement, clashing of perspectives and conflict, not just working together and consensus. (342)

He opines to say that not only the contact nations are in threat, but none are left far behind. They are bound together in increasing webs of interdependencies and power balances, which partly through their complexity and sensitivity to change, and capacity to transmit information about shifts in fortune, means that it is more difficult to retain lasting and oversimplified images of others. The difficulty of handling increasing levels of cultural complexity, and the doubts and anxieties these often engender, are reasons why localism or the desire to remain in bounded locality or return to some notion of 'home,' becomes an important theme.

Featherstone remarks to say that regardless of whether the home is real or imaginary, or whether it is temporary and synchronized or stimulation, affiliation and community which are attributed to the homes, such as tribal people it is manifest in a fascination with the sense of belonging. What does seem clear is that it is not helpful to regard the global and local as dichotomies separate in space or time; it would seem that the processes of globalization and localization are inextricably bound together in the current phase.

Although most people continue to live as citizens of a single nation, they are culturally, materially, and psychologically engaged with the lives of people in other countries as never before. Distant events often have an immediate and significant impact, blurring the boundaries of our personal worlds. Items common to our everyday lives such as the clothes we wear, the food we eat, and the cars we drive are the products of globalization.

In literature, the impact of globalization has crossed all the frontiers, ever thought of. In words of William Vollmann:

Globalization has both negative and positive aspects. Among the negative aspects are the rapid spread of diseases, illicit drugs, crime, terrorism, and uncontrolled migration. Among

globalization's benefits are a sharing of basic knowledge, technology, investments, resources, and ethical values. (98)

The most dramatic evidence of globalization is the increase in trade and the movement of capital, which has further fuelled terrorism. Probably, the best example is that of Afghanistan, where the U. S. funded the tribal leaders and urged the nationalist to fight against Russian imperialism. Bin Laden, a Saudi born fellow was one of them, engaged in struggle for freedom against the Russians. However, globalization is not free from controversy. Very few people groups, or governments oppose globalization in its entirety. Instead, critics of globalization believe aspects of the way globalization operates should be changed. The debate over globalization is about what the best rules are for governing the global economy so that its advantages can grow while its problems can be solved. However, most governments are not able to address the real issues determining for the rise in communal issues, all over the world.

Rushdie here is not claiming that American neo-imperial activities are identical to the activities of the Nazis in the Second World War though an unsympathetic reading might seek to interpret this episode thus. More subtly, Rushdie is arguing that the US lacks the malignant and programmatic intent of the fascists, it nevertheless, in the name of self-interest, allows, even encourages, things to happen, that are not dissimilar to the things that the Nazis made happen by more direct means. It also tends to look the other way, to willfully forget what it does with its power, and so is surprised when it finds the rest of the world treating it in the way victims treat an oppressor. Whilst such indirection allows it to maintain the illusion that it is "the guy in the white hat", Rushdie implies, the stance is clearly a hollow one, because the US, whether it likes it or not, is now sitting in the seat of power (205).

*Shalimar the Clown* is one of the best of Rushdie's fiction, especially after *Midnight's Children*. He once again comes to the Indian sub-continent scenario, and presents their local issue to highlight the international scenario of conflict and mismanagement of power in the continent, to which the west is taking prey upon.

Shalimar is the next generation kid of Rushdie after *Midnight's Children's* Saleem. Like Saleem, Shalimar too has the power of telepathy. He communicates with Boonyi through this power, and knows her will that she has nothing left to do in life, and he can come for his revenge.

Come if you want I'm waiting. I no longer care.

Everything I do prepare me for you and for him. Every blow I strike, strikes you or him. The people leading us up here are fighting for god or for Pakistan but I am killing because it is what I have become. I have become death.

He said: I'll be there soon enough. (298)

Shalimar resides in the next generation, as was the case in *Midnight's Children*. Kashmir itself may have been annihilated, but the seduction of Kashmir by America has produced a bastard child – India Ophuls also known as Kashmira Noman – a hybrid being, who lives in America and who loves her American father, but who is also in the process of discovering who her father really is, that he has done, and who her mother was. Global politics may be such that old Kashmir no longer exists, Kashmira's story tells us, but globalization has also generated new combinations, new ethnicities, that exist in complex relationships with the power systems that have produced them, and in which the possibility of new forms of political equilibrium reside-neither fully sympathetic to the US, nor in the arms of absolutist militants.

*Shalimar the Clown* gives us a vivid, if not always realistic, picture of Kashmir. At first it appears as a kind of harmony; Hindus and Muslims live in harmony, a tolerant tribalism ensures the marriage of the young lovers: Muslim Shalimar and beautiful Boonyi, the daughter of a Hindu pundit. When destructive, anti-social desires for sex, power and food arise, they are mediated by a ritual folk theatre and the elaborately managed banquets of “Thirty-Six-Courses-Minimum” (104).

All this is undone by the twin forces of nationalism and religious fundamentalism. As usual in Rushdie's novels, these forces are not the enemies of enlightenment as much as they are the enemies of freedom, and that means they are the enemies of the natural. Having shown us the first Kashmir, Rushdie must also destroy it. And when he writes about the destruction of Shalimar's native village of Pachigam in a reprisal action by the Indian Army, the sloppiness that characterizes the rest of the novel disappears into contained, channeled prose:

Who lit that fire? Who burned that orchard? Who shot those brothers? Who laughed their whole lives long? Who killed the Sarpanch (village head)? Who broke his hands? Who broke his arms? Who broke his ancient neck? Who shackled those men? Who made those men disappear? [. . .] Who smashed that house? Who smashed that house? Who smashed that house? (308)

The cause of all the troubles in the life of Shalimar and Boonyi is a Jew, one from the race which has been a perennial adversary of the Muslims. Max Ophuls is aristocratic, impeccably mannered, with a weakness for beautiful women, and he is also a former American ambassador to India who helped arm the Taliban; before that he was an economist and one of the architects of the Briton Woods agreement, and before that, a member of the French Resistance.

Ginny Dougary in his essay “The Incredible Lightness of Salman” defends the novel as an art work that is also a lamentation on the loss of a harmonious and peaceful world. He writes:

*Shalimar the Clown* is not a novel about terrorism. Rather, it is a story of trampled love and innocence, a central personal murder and institutionalized murder on a wider scale, which takes us from modern day California, to wartime France, dropping off in England and always circling back in some of the most direct and moving passages Rushdie has ever written- to the willful destruction of the Eden which was Kashmir. (96)

Thus, Cawley and Dougary emphasize the central concern of the novel, which is the threat by terrorism to world peace. The real life happenings today force every one of us to give a serious thought to this issue: none knows who is going to be blown and by whom and why and when and where and how.

Eric Spanberg, the chief book critic in *Christian Science Monitor* writes:

Evoking a novella by Gabriel Garcia Marquez or a movie by Quentin Tarantino or a tragedy, say, by Shakespeare, *Shalimar the Clown* is a chronicle of an assassination foretold. [. . .] Rushdie defies gravity and dispatches his characters on journeys leading up to the assassination, leading away from the assassination, entertaining and dazzling, but all the while guiding us on an examination of this precarious high wire we find ourselves walking in the 21<sup>st</sup> century [. . .] Rushdie's greatest novel since *The Satanic Verses*. (34)

*The New York Times* book reviewer Michiko Kakutani focuses on Rushdie's politico-cultural determination. Rushdie, as she writes loses sight of the more important issue trying to shed light on politico-cultural issues.

*Shalimar the Clown* is also a book written from the perspective of a person who is worried about the prevalence of communal and religious violence in the world, and that he proposes the doctrine of multiculturalism and tolerance as the remedy of these threats to world peace. For this purpose, this chapter is divided into sub chapters, each explicating the various but finally interrelated issues of tolerance and harmony which is continually besotted by communalism and terrorism.

The rise of conflict between any two parties, whether it be at the individual or societal or national or civilization level, is the confrontation and unwanted interference by one or the other party. When Europeans set sails for the trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific zones, they brought with them the seeds of conflict with the local people of whatever place they settled on. Similarly an extremely popular American ambassador for India, Maximillian Ophuls has to leave the host country in shame and disgrace: he had shown overmuch interest in things (or rather, strictly speaking, people) Indian. Now, that he is the ambassador of the most powerful country in the world, he can dismiss the warning of his conscience and indulges in fantasy of celebrating his adulthood with the killing of beautiful and dangerously ambitious wife of Shalimar Noman, better known as Shalimar the clown for his acrobatic feats on the tight rope. When Boonyi meets Ophuls's eyes for the first time he was "applauding widely and looking piercingly at her" (133). This violent gaze from Shalimar forebodes the fatality awaiting their life. Here follows an excerpt that speaks volume about the mentality and trait of the

ambassador who is going to court his eventual doom at the hands of the cuckolded husband.

When Boonyi Noman danced for him in Pachigam hunting lodge in Kashmir he thought of those feathered dead-eyed show girl wreathed in Nazi cigar smoke, flaunting their gartered things. He could not help from thinking him into the gestures of those old days, as:

The clothes were different but recognized the same hard hunger in her stare, the readiness of the survival to suspend moral judgment in the presence of imagined opportunity. But I am not Nazi he thought. I'm the American Ambassador the guy in the white hat. I'm for the God's sake that lived. She swung her hips for him and he thought, and I'm also a married man. She swung her hips again and he ceased to think. (141)

So, the hunter here is once himself a quarry for the Nazis. Now he enjoys the fruits of power and wealth. "He is brilliant young economist, lawyer and student of international relations, the master forger of the Resistance, the ace pilot, the Jewish survivor, the best selling author and the American ambassador in the house of power" (179). And he knowingly chooses to forget his past. The girl's ambition too precipitates the fatal attraction between the thoughtless dancer and the veteran war and women monger. This highhandedness on his part costs his life after some two decades. The woman too dies a miserable death, having jilted by her lover husband only to be jilted by the manipulator of policies and persons.

Surely, Shalimar, the master entertainer, the man who had never been capable of venting anger, would not have turned so violent a murderer had his private life been not tampered by an outsider. The clown's transformation into a militant and his retaliatory revenge is the result of interference by the American

ambassador and his “idiotic choice” (161). Therefore, before we blame someone for being aggressive and murderous, we need to know why they become so. Let alone and undisturbed, people generally do not have the motivation and cause to turn violent. On the broader perspective, what this thesis holds is that the rise of fundamentalist and aggressive elements within the Muslim world might have been provoked into existence by the western assault on Islam. When insulted, bullied and exploited, the only option save going on putting up with the same is to revolt, to organize sabotage and ambush. This is one of the issues the novelist has frequently raised throughout the novel for the consideration of all.

The ambassador does not fail to notice the carnal and mortal attractions that the teen-age dancer holds for males. He would arrange a thanks giving party for the Pachigami performers who had entertained his visit to Kashmir. And with the help of his aide Edgar Wood, Max Ophuls “arranges a private meeting with Boonyi Kaul” (184), who has come to him with her entourage. Boonyi, the ever aspiring and recklessly ambitious dancer also thinks she finds a gateway to her dream for world in the form of Maximilian Ophuls the American ambassador. Therefore, they reach a pact soon enough. The ambassador would help her in climbing higher in her profession, in having access to the metropolitan centers in the world, and in return she would offer her very body to him. She tells him that he has access to her body whenever he wants: “My body will be yours to command and it will be my joy to obey” (192).

But she is ill-at-ease at the thought of having duped, actually cuckolded, lover husband Shalimar the Clown. Instinctively even so ambitious a girl as Boonyi can perceive what is morally and practically right and wrong in the long run. She thinks of her husband Shalimar the Clown and is horrified again by the ease with which she had abandoned him. It is really difficult to get away without

guilty conscience sometimes for having duped the people who put much trust upon us. Boonyi too is nagged on by the same state of conscience, as.

When she left Pachigam none of her closest people guessed what she was doing. *I reach out to you and touch you without touching you as on the riverbank in the old days. I know you are following your dream but that dream will always bring you back to me. If the American is of assistance will and good, people always talk lies but I know your heart is true. I sit with folded hands and await your loving return . . .* (sic) and tore the letter into smaller and smaller pieces. They were the letters that humiliated both their author and their recipient, letters that had no business existing. (195)

Her guilty conscience falls heavy upon her. But the catalyst who abets her ambition is Max Ophuls. His lust for her gives her the courage and the impudence to use her sexual charms for worldly advancement despite the fact that her unsuspecting husband in the village waits for her return home. The real culprit here is the ambassador whose irresistible magnetism of personal charm and international power easily attracts Boonyi and misleads her into believing that he has come to liberate her from her clown husband and backward village, she wants “a good place to live [. . .] and hear from his own lips that he will keep her safe” (192).

Max Ophuls is not unaware of the possible problems the woman might bring to him. The first would be the disgrace of having sired an issue from a local *nautch* (dancer) girl. Therefore as a precaution he has Boonyi take some contraceptive pills everyday in the presence of Edgar Wood, his assistant. But Boonyi outwits them and “does not swallow the pills” (205). As a result, she gets pregnant and wants to see her ravisher who has by now stopped visiting her.

When he comes to see her, she vehemently pours out her dissatisfaction for her wronged state. Her accusation is justifiable: she had deserted her village and people in pursuit of some great achievement. But she has ended as a mere concubine to the ambassador. She also makes it clear that though he has destroyed her life, her heart is not a whit tormented by his negligence of her- for she had never bestowed her heart upon him, had never made the mistake of calling him her love. She is the victim at the hand of the Jew who was a victim himself:

The wheel had turned. In this moment of his story he was not the victim. In this moment she, not he, had the right to claim kinship with the lost. I never spoke of love, she was saying. I kept my love for my husband though my body served you, Jew. Look what you have made of the body I gave you. But my heart is still my own.

(205)

Ophuls's seduction of Boonyi proves costly for his political and diplomatic career. His assault on the native girl is seen as an assault on the honor and the sovereignty of the nation. It also is equated with the American invasion in Vietnam. Consequently, Ophuls loses his ambassadorship and in America becomes an object of hatred.

The Vietnam War was at its height and so was American unpopularity in Asia. Draft cards were burned in Central Park and Martin Luther King led a protest march to the United Nations and in India the goddamn American Ambassador was apparently fucking the local peasantry. So war-torn America turned on Max as well, his alleged oppression of Boonyi becoming a sort of allegory of Vietnam.

Allegory of Boonyi became destroyed, deserted and stripped of her dignity, she is dead for her villagers, her father and husband included. When she

returns her village on chilly day, she knows through her childhood mate Zoon that she has been given up as dead. The morning she arrives there it has been snowing stormily. When the villagers first saw her, standing still at the bus stop with snow on her shoulders and snowdrifts pushing up against her legs, they thought they had seen a ghost. The sight of a dead woman who had somehow materialized at the edge of town with her bedroll and bag beside her brought the whole village out of doors, snow or no snow.

Everyone was mesmerized by the sight of this stationary corpse that looked as if it had done nothing in the afterlife but eat. It looked like a snow-woman such as a child might build a snow-woman with the body of the deceased Boonyi inside it. Taking her to be the ghost, the villagers held themselves back from speaking to her. “Nobody spoke to the snow-woman. It could be bad luck to speak to ghost. But the whole village also knew that somebody would have to do some talking sooner or later, because Boonyi didn't know she was dead” (222). But Zoon, her true friend, finally comes to her friend in need and reports how the villagers unanimously killed the jilt after what she did to shame her people. Now Boonyi cannot return to her village, for she has been “mourned properly for forty days with all correct religious and social observance . . . [her] life has been ended. It's official” (223).

The ostracizing crime Boonyi had committed was to shamelessly desert her fanatically loving husband to be the concubine of an aged man whom she wanted to use just as a means of opening a world of opportunities. As it has already been discussed in the earlier sections, the western discourse on Islam has done much is presenting a bloody picture of the same in the minds of those who do not have an in-depth knowledge of the western domination of the east. The westerners, it seems, take it as their obligation to know the orient and speak for it.

But, interestingly enough, the easterners are not in a position owing to historical factor of European colonialism to comment and describe the occident and occidentals.

Max Ophuls's ambassadorship to India has authorized him to speak on Kashmir. Now having lived a relatively secluded life for years, the onetime resistance veteran is tempted to share his idea regarding the embattled paradise of Kashmir. A talk show host is more than ready and happy to take in the ex-diplomat for sharing his war exploits and what not. But Ophuls, contrary to the host's expectation speaks only on Kashmir, the place which is inextricably linked to his life. The novel, as such, is the depiction of fall of paradise to earth.

The occasion is the mounting threat on the existence of the whole of Kashmir and its inhabitants: the Indian and the Pakistani armies are at alert for any degree of action to protect the land which each of them claims belongs to them. It is easy here to see why Max is so much agitated at the fall of the heaven on earth: India, originally named Kashmira by her mother, Boonyi Kaul - wife to Shalimar Noman, his only and illegitimate daughter, has Kashmiri parentage.

While talking about how the west has described and dominated the east, we come across the notion of orientalism which Edward Said has discussed at some length in his book of the same title. The west has always treated the east as its surrogate, its inferior. As Rushdie also writes in *Imaginary Homelands*, orientalism “[. . .] Provided justification for the supremacist ideology of imperialism” and to justify the western occupation of the east, the myth of oriental simplicity, backwardness and savagery has been perpetuated (66). In the present context, the west has continued to disparage the east for having Islam as the major religion there. Islam, formerly condemned as a perverse religion, is now critiqued for being intolerant and aggressive to other system of faiths. This grand

practice of describing and re-describing, this orientalist discourse, may be at work in a very subtle level even in the novel *Shalimar the Clown*. Rushdie's discontents with the mandatory and strictly binding teachings of Islam might have given birth to a deep rooted aversion inside him. In that case, it comes as no surprise that Rushdie leaves no chance to portray Islam in a very negative, debased way. May be Rushdie, the renegade on Islam, is yet another writer who is adding more engaging literary commentaries to the repertoire of orientalist, in this case anti-Islamic discourse.

One of the warnings enunciated in the novel *Shalimar the Clown* is that the world as a single entity is extremely vulnerable to vicious onslaughts of terrorism. Now no place or person is entirely safe from planned and massively worked out terrorist attacks. As a diplomat and a member of Nazi resistance movement during the World War, Max Ophuls knows no place is adequately fortified to be safe from bombs, explosions and gun shots. The following lines from the text illustrate things to the same effect:

Like any other professional in this field, Max knew that there were no such things as complete security. The video tapes of the shooting of President Reagan were the illustrative tool that based demonstrated this. Here was the president moving from building to car. These were the position of the security details. All of the positions were ideals. [ . . . ] But the President had been shot. Potus was down. The most powerful man in the world, surrounded by the planet's security elite, was not secured between the door of the secured building and the door of the armored car. Security was percentages. Nothing was ever one hundred percent. (39-40)

The rise of terrorism in Kashmir can be traced back to the division, on religious grounds, of India into two nation states of India and Pakistan. For some technical reason, the state of Kashmir was not annexed to India and Pakistan. The Muslim majority there led Pakistan to claim the cool land should be annexed to the Islamic republic, while Indian leaders were fully assured of their obligation to look after the same. This issue has not been resolved yet, and has taken a heavy toll on the people there. Many Kashmiris want to remain a separate state, confirming their allegiance neither to Pakistan nor to India. The novel gives an account of the formation of such a nationalist organization which opposes Indian presence in Kashmir. Its motto is to maintain an “Azad Kashmir” -- an independent, free Kashmir:

Two nationalist leaders Amanullah Khan and Maqbool Butt, has formed an armed group called the Jammu and Kashmir National Liberation front and had crossed the cases-fire line what they called Azad Kashmir into the Indian sector to launch a number of surprise raids on army positions and personnel. (230)

The Indian and Pakistani governments tried to settle the issue through the means of dialogues at the initiative of Maximilian. He invents and circulates several acronyms finding that the two neighbors have a “common fondness for alphabet soup” (188), such as BALT for back channel arms limitations talks, HAIP for hydro electric and irrigation projects, and TPC for Tashkent Peace Conference, to name only a few from the nauseating repertoire of such acronyms. The novelist sums up the failure of Indo-Pak peace efforts: “Euphoria over the Islamabad accords proved short lived” (188).

Shalimar, along with his two brothers, enlists the Jammu Kashmir National Liberation Front but he soon deserts that to join another organization which

would help him in getting to the “last enemy” of his, Maximilian Ophuls (248). When he visits his mother at night after years, he tells of his final mission: “That last enemy, the invisible in the invisible room in the foreign country far away: that's the one I want to face, and if I have to work my way through all the others to get to him then that is what I'll do” (248).

Shalimar's hatred for his wife is extreme and so is his hatred towards her seducer. He would do anything in the world to have his revenge without which he cannot have rest for a moment. His only mission in life is to murder Boonyi as soon as his father and mother die, and then to murder Max Ophuls. The following authorial comment explains how fanatic he has grown in his revenge motive:

Sooner or later he would find his way to the American ambassador as well and his honor would be avenged. What happened after that was unimportant. Honor ranked above everything else, above the sacred vows of matrimony, above the divine injunction against cold blooded murder, above decency, above culture, above life itself.  
(258)

The pain Shalimar undergoes from a clown into a veteran murderer can be understood in terms of his broken heart at the infidelity of his young wife. What added fuel to his instinct was the advent of terrorism in Kashmir? May be without the companionship of the terrorists he would not have been able to follow the path of revenge and murder. Life, for him, is meaningless if his honor is at all attacked.

Pyarelal Kaul visits his daughter Boonyi at night on the top of the hill. One day Boonyi tells her father about what has been communicated to her by Shalimar Noman, her husband who has been instructed by the iron mullah Maulana Bulbul Fakh. As she reports to her father, the mullah has been preaching the religion of violence and suppression:

The Iron mullah says that the question of religion can only be answered by looking at the condition of the world. When the world is in disarray then God does not send a religion of love. At such time he sends a martial religion, he asks that we sing battle hymns and cross the infidel. [. . .] Religion demands austerity and self-denial, says Bulbul Fakh. It has little time for the softness of pleasure or the weakness of love. (262)

The ubiquity of the preachers of violent religiosity has come as big hurdle in the way of people trying to instruct people on the path of peaceful and all-loving religion. No place is now safe enough and danger free. All human beings are interrelated and consequently as the novelist comments, “Everyone's story [is] a part of everyone else's” (269). Shalimar the Clown at “forward camp 22” befriended to luminous little man who had fought with Afghans and al-Qaeda against the Soviet Union, who had accepted US arms and backing but loathe the United States because American soldiers had historically backed the settlement of Catholics in Mindanao against the wishes of local Muslims (269).

The Taliban mullah who is in the same company that Shalimar has joined for achieving his very personal revenge sees through the youth's pretension of being a true *jihadist*. The Afghan chides the actor for pretension and goes on delivering a harangue on what Islam does not tolerate. He rebukes the actor for taking on the path of entertainment. Dancing, singing and acting are deplorable and punishable in Islam. He is vehement on this point:

God spits on entertainment. I would also order the execution of the dentists, professors, sportsmen and whores. God spits on intellectualism and licentiousness and games. If you hold the rocket

launcher like that it will break your shoulder. This is the way to do it. (272)

Then in the summer of 1987, the LeP (Lashkar-e-Pak) posters appeared in Shirmal. The tracts effectively tried to and finally intimidated the Kashmiri villagers into accepting the unnatural barrier between the Hindus and the Muslims on the one hand, and men and women on the other. That the novelist mocks upon this demarcating and communal decree ordained by the iron mullah led fanatic coterie: “Men and women were not to sit together and watch television together. That was a licentious and obscene practice. Hindus were not to sit among Muslims. And of course all women must instantly put on the veil” (277).

The mullah's company comes to Shirmal at the Yabarzals' seeking lodging and fooding for a night while Shalimar visits his parent's grave at Pachigam. The very night the Indian army makes a clean finish raid upon the iron commandos and kills them to the man including the leader Maulana Bulbul Fakh. Shalimar knows about the raid and escapes away. Then he joins Abu Sayaaf Group – the Philippino group. This he does to have access to his final victim Maximilian Ophuls. Before crossing the border he is done with his wife who knows his activities through a curious method of telepathy. A channel of communication had been opened then, and though their love had died the channel was still functioning, held open now by a kind of anti-love, a force fuelled by strong emotions that were love's dark opposites: her fear, his wrath, their belief that their story was not over, that they were each other's destiny, and that they both knew how it would end.

So, Shalimar has become death himself. The organizations he works for kill people for the sake of Islam. But he does so as to reach his prey the ex-ambassador. Terrorism has become for him the channel through which he would

be able to accomplish his personal goals in the cloak of Islamic holy war, the *jihad*.

Prior to the separation of Pakistan from India as a nation state, Hindus and Muslims lived a relatively peaceful life. Their custom and rituals were distinct but there was an underlying harmony between them. The Kashmiris, specially the Pachigamians, made it a point to demonstrate and maintain harmony among them. They are so free to communal prejudice that evens the marriage between Shalimar Noman and Booni Kaul, a Muslim boy and a Hindu girl is finally sanctioned by the both communities. The following reflection in the mind of Shalimar Noman shows that in Kashmir Hindus and Muslims are not antithetical to each other:

Now all his thoughts were coiling around this girl, Boonyi, to whom he planned to bring good luck for all the days of their lives. The words *Hindu* and *Muslim* (sic) had no place in their story, he told himself. In the valley these words were merely descriptions, not divisions. The frontiers between the words, their hard edges, had grown smudged and blurred. This was how things had to be. This was Kashmir. (57)

The marriage was possible largely owing to the bi-cultural (in modern terminology, multicultural) characteristics. The Hindus and Muslims are settlers who have by now forgotten their ancestry except that their ancestors were Kashmiris. The communal line between the two has been blurred by hundreds of years of co-mingling and neighboring. They both understand that the other side is very much like themselves. This is once again true of the village of Pachigam:

Pachigam was a mixture, with families of pundit background, the Kauls, the Misris, and the baritone singer's long-noses kin-Sharga being a local nickname for the nasally elongated even one family

dancing Jews. So we have not only Kashmirians to protect but Pachigaminess as well. We are all brothers and sisters here, said Abdullah. There is no Hindu Muslim Issue. Two Kashmiri-two Pachigami-youngsters which to marry, that's all. A love match is acceptable to both families and so a marriage there will be; both Hindu and Muslim custom will be observed. (110)

The Pachigamians are able to come to a compromise as not to break off the love of their sons and daughters. They find a very practical and satisfactory way for both Hindus and Muslims: the rites and rituals of both sides would be duly observed. Nothing could be a more apt case of communal harmony and peace than this, one is forced to concede.

At the beginning, the Kashmiris tried to uphold their free status without using violent methods. But the terrorist elements soon got in and the whole liberation movement came to be designated as a terrorist and separatist one. In those days before the crazies got into the act the liberation front was reasonably popular and *azadi* was the universal cry. Freedom was what a tiny valley of no more than five million souls wanted most. Its inhabitant had come to the conclusion that they didn't much like India and didn't care for the sound of Pakistan. As the novel so characteristically records, free Kashmir is the dream of the Kashmiris: "So: freedom! . . . Freedom to choose folly over greatness but to be nobody's fools. *Azadi!* Paradise wanted to be free" (253).

Had the fundamentalist Islamic elements supported by Pakistan not infiltrated Kashmir and had the Indian army too not crushed the innocent locals with the invaders, the Kashmiris would have kept their state sound and harmonious. They prize freedom over the questions of proving themselves Muslims or Hindus.

As Rushdie himself once said, terrorism is not a bad means for a good cause. The use of terror and violence cannot easily be justified. The writer holds similar views about this issue. “Freedom is not a tea party [. . .] Freedom is a war” (17). Max Ophuls at first thinks it every bit proper and justifiable to take recourse to violence to counter balance the violence inflicted by the Nazis upon the French people. But his perception gets changed immediately after his first bombing feat. Violence becomes revolting to him, as he comments:

The explosion, the gigantic excitement of the moment of the power, followed almost immediately by the violent involuntary physical reaction, a parallel explosion of vomit, taught him two lessons he never forgot: that terrorism was thrilling, and that no matter how profoundly justified it's cause, he personally could not get over the moral hurdles required to perform such acts on a regular basis.

(162)

Human nature is and should be inclined toward the nobler motives of love, compassion and understanding. Use of relational power and logical thinking is what differentiates human beings from other animals. But owing to some or other weakness in their character, human beings do not always follow the proper path. They more often than not fall into the ditch of greed, vanity and sadism. They want to kill or suppress others, forgetting that others too might turn aggressive in self-defense. This comes true in the character of political and administrative level too. Hundreds and thousands of innocent Jews were brutally murdered in the eve of Second World War by the Nazis, which could not be justified in any sense. They invaded other nations and decreed barbarous rules upon the occupied territories. It was in this content that we need to understand Max's guerilla style bombing attempt. His cause was noble.

The counter terrorist activist of action of the Indian army is no less responsible in inflicting death and devastation upon the Pachigamis. When the novelist comes to the point of describing the scene of destruction he no longer can maintain a detached position. He is too disturbed by the wreckage to perform the role of an objective or journalistic reporter. The disturbed psyche of the novelist while at the same time presenting a gruesome picture of the violence perpetrated by the warring sides who are less concerned about the will and opinion of the Kashmir is but claim to be working for the villagers.

Here Rushdie is not damning of the idea that the west created its vision of world order on everybody else, though. Through Max, a French Jewish survivor of World War II, Rushdie shows us what the western world feared the gravity of the battle they just fought. Its vision of order was indeed one sided, but it also meant well in that it was trying to avoid another event as catastrophic of WW II. The west's identity was fragmented due to the nationalism that results from war. Identity became fluid in the west as Europe's borders became fluid. This is represented by Max's work during WW II forging passports and papers to get people out of the battle zone. The west's vision of order sought to reaffirm and re-solidify those identities.

Here, Max represents the west that acted on the eastern world. The eastern world is represented by Boonyi and Shalimar. The two live in small village, which boasts of mixed population of both Hindus and Muslims. However, after the partition the politics and tussle of power by the giant nations: India and Pakistan started to have its toll on the innocent Kashmiris. They were to choose which side they were, and obviously the Hindus have their larger part of emotion to India and Muslim have their part to Pakistan.

The novelist uses interrogative sentences in volume to depict the nonplussed state of the villagers as well as that of the novelist himself whose very life was condemned to a continual threat for a decade though for a very different reason. He had a raised voice for the freedom to believe and not to believe, to lead the life the way one wanted to but without interfering or intimidating others, as:

A woman, my mother, died for the crime of loving you, Kashmirira wrote. A man, my father, died for taking her in. You murdered two human beings because of your egotism, your amazing egotism that valued your honor more highly than their lives. You bathed your honor in their blood but you did not wash it clean, it's bloody now. You wanted to wipe them out but you failed, you killed nobody. Here I stand. I am my mother and my father I am Maximilian Ophuls and Boonyi Kaul. You achieved nothing that they are not dead not gone not forgotten. They live on in me. (379)

Kashimira's claim of having her parents metaphorically alive in her person is worthy of attention. Violence may wipe out some particular people and life but the fundamental human urge for life remains intact. One should and always would endorse life whatever the words and oddities against it may face them.

At the end of the book, Shalimar is taken into the legal framework of American Justice System. It is not sure whether Shalimar's sentiments would be heard by the toughened American legal system and its officials; however, the case Rushdie makes here is the voice of east and its cultural and sentimental values are being heard by the west. It has to be noted that Shalimar's case is being sensitized by his community and hence, his trauma is no more individual but has been transformed into cultural trauma. This is probably the beginning of rise of collective sense towards violence and trauma.

Thus, the novel ends with showing chances of more vulnerable chances of culture violence in the offing from an individual level to collective notion. This is a real picture of the global scenario where violence is in rise. However, in the form of India (Kashmira), daughter of west (Max) and east (Boonyi), Rushdie hints towards a cultural reconciliation. The bridge between east and west is woven by India as she is sympathetic to the eastern values and at the same time understanding to the western mannerism as well.

### III. Communal Violence and Justice in *Shalimar the Clown*

Culture is associated with values and ethics. When people are challenged of this deep rooted ideology, it is most likely that they take arms for resistance and protection of their values. Shalimar is one such character who finds violence as the only way to restore, to some extent, the lost glory and find solace to his aching heart by revenge on Max. Thus, the notion of justice both to Shalimar and the present America seems to be within the idea of 'revenge.' However, nobody knows how far this notion will invite disaster to the world citizens.

This revenge is set with a deep rooted hatred prevailing within the justice system of east and west. The communal feelings and violence begins in Kashmir - the battle fields of two South Asian giants: Pakistan and India since their independence in 1947. Rushdie presents the story of Pachigam – a small village in Kashmir, where the Hindus and Muslims live together in harmony, until, the communal feeling entered, more through a personal issue; failed relationship of a Hindu girl – Boonyi and a Muslim boy – Shalimar. It is Max, the American Ambassador to India, or the west as the cause for enmity. However, Rushdie displays Max – the representative of west, as the cause of souring relationship between Boonyi and Shalimar. As such Shalimar vows for revenge and kills Boonyi and chases Max up to the States and stabs him in front of his illicit daughter – India.

However, the philosophy of the story is not so straight forward. In between there enters how a simple and family loving boy was trained to be a ruthless killer and, he escapes the war torn Kashmir to as far as America – the so-called safe haven. In all these process Rushdie is hinting two most significant issues: globalization and terrorism. He also blames globalization as one of the root causes for the rise of terrorism.

However, in a deeper level, Rushdie further says that it is personal bias and enmity that is inviting chaos and disorder around the world and which has less to do with cultural biasness. The west has to know that terrorism is not born from the womb of a mother, and east has to realize that sheer vengeance is the not only option. Influenced by the notion of vengeance, Shalimar becomes a terror because he wanted to avenge Boonyi and Max. He also wants to kill India – the illegitimate daughter of Max born of Boonyi. He gets trained by the extremists of Kashmir valley and becomes a deadly weapon of terror. However, deep within Shalimar, there is a tender heart that beats for love and he is less a terrorist and more a lover, in seek of revenge.

As such, communal issues are amongst the chief reasons for global terrorism, which is more confined to communities or nations which enjoy more freedom and rights. Democracy has been the most fertile land for terrorism, in against to the traditionally close nations. Concept of freedom and human rights, of course, has provided people with awareness but, at the same time also have invited worldwide reign of terror.

## Works Cited

- Alexander, Jefferey C. "Towards a Theory of Cultural Trauma." *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*. Eds. J. Alexander, et al. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004: 1-30.
- Benjamin, Daniel and Steven Simon. *The Age of Sacred Terror*. New York: Random House, 2002.
- Berten, Hans. *Literary Theory: The Basics of London*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Cawley and Dougary. *The Incredible Lightness of Salman Rushdie*. New York: MacMillan, 2006.
- Dougary, Ginny. "The Incredible Light of Salman." *Readings into Salman Rushdie*. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2006: 92-99.
- Durian, Pierre Jean. *Common Wealth Fiction*. London: MacMillan, 1996.
- Edkins, Jenny. "Introduction: Trauma, Violence and Political Community." *Wartime Memories 1* (May 2003): 13-16.
- Eyreman, Ron. "Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity." *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*. Eds. J. Alexander, et al. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004: 60-111.
- Featherstone, Mike. *Undoing Culture*. London: Sage, 1995.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Mourning and Melancholy," *The Essentials of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. James Strachey. London: 1986: 7-12.
- - -. *Studies on Hysteria*. London: Penguin Books, 1978.
- Fuller, Bruce. "Strong States, Strong Teachers." *The Globalization Teacher*. Ed 2nd. Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2001: 126-33.
- Hamid, Mohsin. *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*. New Delhi: Penguin, 2007.
- Hartman, Geoffrey, James Berger and et al. "Theory of Trauma and Psychoanalysis." *The New York Times Review* 16.3 (Fall 1985): 262-

69.

Hoffman, Bruce. *Terrorism*. New York: Microsoft Corporation, 2008.

Kapadia, Novy. "Taslima Nasrin – A Victim of Politics." *Times Weekly* 37.8

(2004): 84-88.

LaCarpa, Dominick. *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory and Trauma*. London: Sage, 1982.

Leela Rao, M. Madhusudan. *Rhetoric in Shalimar the Clown*. New Delhi: Blackwell, 2007.

Luckhurst, Roger. "Mixing Memory and Desire: Psychoanalysis, Psychology and Trauma Theory." *Literary Review* 29.7 (1986): 493-98.

Mohsin, Hamid. *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*. New Delhi: Penguin, 2007.

Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*. London: Vintage, 1991.

---. *Shalimar the Clown*. London: Vintage, 2005.

Spanberg, Eric. "Rushdie and Shalimar the Clown." *Christian Science Monitor* 128 (2006): 14.

Vollmann, William. "Shalimar the Clown." *Publishers Weekly* 252.99 (2005): 3-5.

Young, Robert J. C. "Globalization from a Postcolonial Perspective." *Post colonialism: A Short Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: OUP, 2006: 121-37.