

**International Relations in *For Whom the Bell Tolls, the Honorary Consul and  
Shalimar the Clown***

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of  
Tribhuvan University in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

ENGLISH

By

CHANDRA BAHADUR K. C.

PhD Reg. No. 071/07

TU Reg. No. 8569/85

Tribhuvan University

Kathmandu, Nepal

March 2025

## Letter of Recommendation

We certify that this dissertation entitled “International Relations in *For Whom the Bell Tolls, the Honorary Consul and Shalimar the Clown*” was prepared by Chandra Bahadur K. C. under our guidance. We hereby recommend this dissertation for final examinations by the Research Committee of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University, in fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in ENGLISH.

Dissertation Committee

.....  
Prof. Krishna Chandra Sharma, PhD

Supervisor

.....  
Prof. Khadga K.C., PhD

Co-supervisor

Date.....

## **Declaration**

I hereby declare that this dissertation entitled “International Relations in *ForWhomtheBellTolls, The Honorary Consul and Shalimar the Clown*” submitted to the Office of the Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University, is an entirely original work of my own. I have made the due acknowledgments to all ideas and information borrowed from different sources in the course of writing this dissertation. The results presented in this dissertation have not been presented anywhere else for the award of any degree or any other reason. No part of the content of this dissertation has ever been published in any form before. I shall be solely responsible if any evidence is found against my declaration.

.....

Chandra Bahadur K. C.

Date: .....

## Acknowledgments

It is a time of great pleasure in my life to accomplish this academic project that is really invaluable in my life. It is the project that has got its shape by the guidance and suggestions of different scholars and well-wishers along with my constant effort. It is high time I acknowledged them for what I owe to them.

My intense appreciation goes to my supervisor respected Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma for his enduring support and much-appreciated advice throughout my dissertation. Without his invaluable guidance, this dissertation would not have been possible. I am equally indebted to Prof. Dr. Khadga K. C. who co-supervised this dissertation and provided all kinds of supports that were needed in the course of completion of this project.

I would like to extend my thanks to venerable *gurus* Prof. Dr. Shreedhar Lohani, Prof. Dr. Mohan Lohani, Prof. Dr. Abhi Subedi, Prof. Dr. Arun Gupto, and Prof. Dr. Sanjeev Upreti, who inspired and suggested me for my project every time I met them.

Prof. Dr. Dhruva Karki, Head of the Central Department of English also receives my deepest gratitude for his continual help, guidance, and academic support. Similarly, I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Anirudra Thapa, Prof. Dr. Jib Lal Sapkota, and Prof. Dr. Ishwari Pandey for their academic advice and encouragement. My sincere thankfulness goes to Prof. Dr. Ananda Sharma, Prof. Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, Prof. Dr. Shreedhar Gautam, Prof. Dr. Ram Chandra Poudel and Prof. Dr. Sanjay Mishra for their encouragement, help, guidance, and good wishes.

I would like to thank Dean Prof. Dr. Dubi Nanda Dhakal and Assistant Dean Dr. Khom Raj Kharel for accepting my dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English.

I would like to acknowledge all the contributors of the primary and secondary sources that I have received and cited in this dissertation. Their critical insights helped me shape the views that I have inserted into this research project.

I am also indebted to my colleagues who persuaded me to follow this line of inquiry and provided me with a continual course of constructive criticism. It would be difficult to name them all, but I extend my gratitude to everyone who was involved in my project.

I would like to acknowledge my debt to my family- my parents, my wife, my sons, and my daughter-in-law- whose untiring support and encouragement helped me complete this project. Without their constant love and support, I would not be in the position I am today.

Chandra Bahadur K.C.

March 2025

## Abstract

International Relations is a broad area that includes the relations between states, international organizations and non-state organizations. It also includes various issues, such as diplomatic relations of states, international cooperation, conflict and peace. Further, it explicates relations among individuals across states and regions. Diplomatic and international relations can be deliberated in multiple disciplines, such as history, culture, and literature. Literature, mainly narrative works, is rich sources of information for studying International Relations. This dissertation analyzes issues and ideas of International Relations represented in modern novelistic discourses, such as Ernest Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940), Graham Greene's *The Honorary Consul* (1973), and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005).

Applying a multidisciplinary approach, this research posits the contribution of these narratives to an in-depth comprehension of diplomatic and international relations. In that line of thought it addresses some pertinent questions: In what ways do International Relations theories contribute to the study area for literary narratives? How do literary narratives such as novels bolster the understanding and analysis of International Relations? What issues and theories of International Relations do Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Greene's *The Honorary Consul*, and Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* imply? The research objectives of the research are to highlight the importance of issues and theories of International Relations in the study of literature and apply them to study literary narratives; to justify the role of literary narratives in the understanding of relations of different nation-states; and to analyze Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Greene's *The Honorary Consul*, and Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* to explain the issues and theories of International Relations implicit in them. This research claims that literary narratives are great sources to explain International Relations because they deliberate upon issues of

International Relations like war, conflict and peace, friendship and enmity, diplomacy, cross-border transactions, operation of non-state institutes, foreign policy, strategic studies, great powers, and the balance of powers. They also explain other International Relations issues like human rights, international society, violence, democracy, prosperity, treaties, climate change, organized crimes, human security, foreign intervention, and ideas (theories) of International Relations like realism, liberalism (idealism), Constructivism, eco-criticism, Marxism, globalization, and terrorism. This study has followed the methodology of applying realist, idealist, and constructivist traditions of International Relations theories as tools to analyze the selected literary works. In orthodox International Relations study, these theories are solely analyzed to describe the relation between and among nations, but in the post-modern period, these theories have been rethought as tools to analyze the elements of International Relations in cultural artifacts like narrative/fictional works.

Love and diplomacy are intermingling features in the field of International Relations. In all these three novels, activities related to love are linked with diplomatic figures. The Spanish Civil War, an inherent subject of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, was a conflict of power, and it is an issue of Realist International theory. The protagonist Robert Jordan goes after the international alliance for the success of the republican side. It is an issue related to the Idealist International Relations theory. The novel also exposes the clash of ideologies of two opposing sides: fascism and communism. The ideology is an element of Constructivist International Relations theory. The next novel *The Honorary Consul* mentions the cross-border activities that are related to International Relations. Paraguay under the rule of General Stroessner is very much aggressive towards rebel groups. Leon Rivas works selflessly for the sake of good for the people, to make the nation free from the hand of cruel ruler. His

utopian thought is concerned with Idealist International Relations theory. The state creates anarchy that is related to constructivism. The third novel *Shalimar the Clown* includes customs, cultures, beliefs, and diplomacy of different countries. The activities of the US diplomat Maximilian Ophuls are related to Realist International Relations. He is the source of anarchy in Kashmir. The issue of Kashmir, a place once utopia changed into dystopia, is the issue of Idealist International Relations. The novel keeps the ingredients of cultural diplomacy to promote mutual relationships between the nations and their people. Cultural diplomacy is an issue of Constructivist International Relations theory. The novel provides a glimpse of the image of the Cold-War novel. In conclusion, all three novels analyzed in this dissertation include the issues and ideas that are related to International Relations.

*Keywords:* constructivism, cross-border activities, diplomacy, idealism, realism, utopia

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION	i
APPROVAL LETTER	i
DECLARATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> v
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION: INTERDISCIPLINARY NATURE OF	
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	1
Background	1
Statement of the Problem	8
Hypothesis	11
Significance of the Study	12
Delimitation of the Study	12
Methodology of the Study	13
Organization of the Study	14
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE: PERSPECTIVES ON	
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND LITERATURE	17
Historical Overview of International Relations	17
Literature and International Relations	25
Literature Review: <i>For Whom the Bell Tolls</i>	70
Literature Review: <i>The Honorary Consul</i>	78
Literature Review: <i>Shalimar the Clown</i>	89
The Research Gap	98

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY: THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL	
RELATIONS	101
Background	101
Realist International Relations Theory	102
Idealist International Relations Theory	115
Constructivist International Relations Theory	123
CHAPTER IV: INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE CIVIL WAR IN	
HEMINGWAY'S <i>FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS</i>	133
<i>For Whom the Bell Tolls: An Overview</i>	133
Love during Wartime	137
The Spanish Civil War	139
International Independence of the Nations	142
Anarchy, Cause of Destruction	144
The Constructivist Perception	147
Supporting the Republicans, a Utopian Concept	152
Wartime Atrocities	155
Working of International Society and Its International Connection	158
CHAPTER V: EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE TO AUTOCRATIC REGIME IN	
GREENE'S <i>THE HONORARY CONSUL</i>	167
<i>The Honorary Consul: An Overview</i>	167
Cross-border Activities	174
Idealist Concept of Liberty and Equality	180
Love as Sideline Diplomacy	183
International Nature of Religion, Culture and Politics	184
Ideas, Consciousness and Common Understanding	186

Nations, Anarchy, and Power Politics	189
CHAPTER VI: DESTRUCTION OF UTOPIA BY EXTERNAL INTERFERENCE	
IN RUSHDIE'S <i>SHALIMAR THE CLOWN</i>	194
<i>Shalimar the Clown: An Overview</i>	194
Issues of Love and Conflict	201
Cultural Diplomacy	205
The Falling of Cultural Utopia	208
Hegemony and Counter-Hegemony	212
External Interference in Kashmir	214
Commonalities and Specificities from International Relations Perspectives in Novels	218
CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSION: INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN	
NARRATIVE WORKS	221
Contribution to Knowledge	230
A Way Forward	231
Works Cited	233

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION: INTERDISCIPLINARY NATURE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

#### **Background**

International Relations studies the relations between states and non-state institutions. States are central to International Relations, but the role of non-state factors and general people is also of great importance. International Relations prescribe the bases for the relations between peoples, societies, and governments of different nations. It analyses the cross-border transactions and diplomatic relations of nations. The relations may be amicable as well as envious. Of various features of International Relations, war has been a perpetual issue since ancient times. The relationship between nations is very much transitional, and it happens to be amicable for some time and envious for other times because the relations between the nations are conditional, and various factors and national interests affect the relations. So, war, peace, conflict, and cooperation are great influencing factors that determine relations between and among nations. Other significant factors are physical violence and overt conflict between nations. Though most countries aspire to live in peace at large, relations between and among nations may not go ahead smoothly. Nations are independent, but they are also tangled with complex interdependence.

International Relations focus on fairly timeless subjects of war and peace, conflict and cooperation, cross-border transactions, diplomacy, globalization, and the operation of non-state institutions. International Communications, Diplomacy, Diplomatic History, Foreign Policy, International Law, International Economics, International Economic Relations, International Finance, International Organizations, Strategic Studies, War/ Conflict and Peace Studies, international society, great powers, diplomacy, balance of power, and human rights are basic components of International Relations. It also includes the cross-border transactions

of goods, money, information, ideas, and movements of people. There may be cross-border transactions of less-welcoming factors, such as environmental degradation, problems of pollution, arms, drugs, terrorism, and crimes, and they are a threat to society. Though the roots of International Relations go back to ancient times, it got its academic significance in the early twentieth century. Since then, there has been a systematic study of International Relations by applying theories like Realism, Idealism/ Liberalism, Constructivism, Historical materialism, Post-Modernism, Post-colonialism, gender, and globalization.

International Relations is an interdisciplinary field and is related to various disciplines, such as history, economics, and literature. Interdisciplinarity is the integration of the knowledge of different subjects. It is usually defined as demonstrating “the process of how disciplines interact” (Klein 55). It includes activities that involve interaction across disciplines. In Moran’s view interdisciplinarity means “attempting to transcend disciplinary boundaries altogether” (15). It is the interaction between two or more disciplines. In the literature, we learn about the workings of different issues and theories of international relations. The issues and ideas of International Relations transcend disciplinary boundaries and work in literature, too. Working of international society, utopian concepts, cross-border activities, power politics, cultural diplomacy, hegemony, and external interferences are some of the issues and ideas of International Relations, and they are also issues and ideas that can be delved into the novels selected for this study.

International Relations also involves interactions with other disciplines. International Relations “is the study of the relations of states, and that those relations are understood primarily in *diplomatic*, *military* and *strategic* terms” (Brown and Ainsley 3). The definition mainly focuses on the role of diplomats and historians in international relations. Torbjorn Knutsen asserts, “International Relations deals with human behavior in the largest of all social groups: the international society” (30). In his view, International Relations is related to

international society. Knutsen further views, “International Relations theory seeks to explain why international events occur the way they do” (6). He asserts that International Relations theory helps us understand the causes of the occurrence of international events. He mentions the relation between human behavior and international society.

International Relations is the interactions of many actors who participate in international politics. It also studies their behaviors. It is an interdisciplinary area of study that uses ideas and materials from economics, history, anthropology, and political science (Mingst et al. 4). These scholars explain the interdisciplinary nature of International Relations.

International Relations has both narrow and broad definitions. The narrow definition describes the role of the states. It is concerned with countries and their interactions (Steans et al. 9). It poses the central role of states, and their conduct with other states through foreign policy, diplomacy, and war. Keith Shimko believes that in a narrow sense, International Relations is interstate relations, but there are different important actors (e. g. multinational corporations) and issues (e. g. terrorism and globalization) (xvi). Shimko highlights the actors related to International Relations. Likewise, the broad definition explains the human condition in the global scenario. It refers to the human situation across the globe (Steans et al.9). This broad definition emphasizes the worldwide human situation in International Relations.

International Relations theorists of different periods have expressed their views differently. Beate John mentions the social and political life of International Relations. Jahn states “[T]he discipline of International Relations is simply conceived as the study of a specific level or ‘image’ of social and political life” (8). He highlights the socio-political life of people of different nations. Similarly, Peter Sutch and Juanita Elias associate International Relations theory with world politics. They claim:

IR theory is basic to the study of world politics in that it represents a series of attempts to explain or understand the world in ways that frame the debates of foreign policy, law, ethics, and security studies. In other words, International Relations theory attempts to incorporate general principles that can help orientate us in our encounter with the complexities of world politics. (4)

They focus on the importance of International Relations amidst the complexities of world politics.

Paul Sheeran discusses the relevance of literature to understanding International Relations. He views “International Relations as a discipline is an area of study concerned with the relations between states operating on a global landscape uneven in resources and opportunities” (vi). He highlights the pivotal role of the state in the arena of International Relations. Relations between states may be friendly or hostile depending on situations of those countries involved in relations. Sheeran further puts, “Relations between states through the flow of people, money, information and trade create friendships, alliances and antagonisms, which produce various dynamics that necessitate the need for treaties, agreements, and diplomatic needs to reduce conflict and promote cooperation” (vi). He claims that human behavior crosses state boundaries.

Thomas Mathiesen gives a much broader definition of International Relations. According to him, “International Relations embraces all kinds of relations traversing state boundaries, no matter whether they are of an economic, legal, political or any other character, whether they be private or official”, and “all human behavior originating on one side of state boundary and affecting human behavior on the other side of the boundary” (qtd. in Ghosh 3). He emphasizes human relations that cross state boundaries. Taking the line of Mathiesen, Frederick S. Dunn views, “International Relations may be looked upon as the actual relations that take place across national boundaries, or as the body of knowledge which we have of

those relations at any given time” (qtd. in Ghosh 4). This is a comprehensive definition because it does not limit International Relations (IR) only between states and their doings of politics.

Peu Ghosh argues that in this globalized world, International Relations is not only related to political leaders and diplomats but also to every single person. He states:

Apart from political science, IR [International Relations] draws upon such diverse fields as economics, history, law, philosophy, geography, sociology, anthropology, psychology and cultural studies. It involves a diverse range of issues including but not limited to: globalization, state sovereignty, ecological sustainability, nuclear proliferation, nationalism, economic development, global finance, terrorism, organized crime, human security, foreign intervention and human rights. (2)

These are the issues that cross national frontiers, and are subject to International Relations. International Relations is not only attached to international politics; in the sense of the present context it also describes the human relationships across the world. It means its concern is with the activities of both state-actors and non-state actors.

Power is an important matter in International Relations. Richard Devetok et al. assert that International Relations “is a world of friends and enemies where power rather than justice will determine international outcomes and where states make an effort to put their trust or security in them” (4). They affirm that power is central to relations among nations, states and peoples. They further assert that International Relations “refers to external relations among nations, states, and people” (2). They discuss how an external event impacts the international sphere. Similarly, in view of Robert Jackson and George Sorenson, International Relations is “the study of relationships and interactions between countries, including the activities and policies of national governments, international governmental organizations (IGOs), nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and multinational corporations (MNCs)”

(4). They emphasize the role of countries and other international organizations in the relationships of nations.

After surveying the field, Cris Brown and Kristen Ainsley give a number of different definitions of International Relations. They conclude:

For some, international relations means the *diplomatic-strategic* relations of *states*, and the characteristic focus of IR [International Relations] is on issues of war and peace, conflict and cooperation. Others see international relations as being about *cross-border transactions* of all kinds, political, economic and social, and IR is likely to study trade negotiations or the operations of non-state institutions such as Amnesty International as it is conventional peace talks or the workings of the United Nations (UN). Again and with increasing frequency in the twenty-first century, some focus on *globalization*, transport and financial systems, global business corporations and the putative emergence of global society. (1)

This definition covers state actors and non-state actors involved in international relations. It also suggests the importance of cross-border transactions in shaping International Relations.

Paul Wilkinson also gives a broader definition of International Relations. He points out that “International relations is a very broad concept. In modern usage, it includes not only relations between states but also between state and non-state organizations such as churches, humanitarian relief organizations, and multinational corporations, and between states and intergovernmental organizations (IGO), such as the UN and the EU” (1). Wilkinson mainly focuses on the relations between state and non-state organizations, and state and intergovernmental organizations. He highlights the significance of states with other organizations.

Mark V. Kauppi and Paul R. Viotti foreground war as one of the main concerns of International Relations. In their view, International Relations theorists ponder the question,

“Why does the phenomenon persist even though wars are extremely costly in terms of lives and treasure lost” (7)? They assert that International Relations as a field of inquiry addresses questions such as “Why do wars occur? Is nationalism a primary cause? Or the lack of a World government? Or misperception? Or are people innately aggressive? How can stability be achieved? Why is there such tremendous social and economic inequality among the different regions of the world? Is national order incompatible with justice?” (1). Kauppi and Viotti explain the realist nature of International Relations.

The above-mentioned definitions justify that International Relations theory is a broad area that includes state and non-state actors related to international politics. International Relations incorporates various things like wars, revolution, power, violence, democracy, tyranny, prosperity, treaties, international laws, codes and standards, civil unrest, the madness of reason, global gender inequalities, international human rights, religion and secularism, humanitarian intervention, post-conflict state building, migration and refugees, climate change and global environmental politics.

The issues and ideas related to international relations can also be found explained in other fields of knowledge related to politics, sociology, economics, history, and literature. Especially, narrative works, are rich sources of information for studying international relations. This dissertation takes Ernest Hemingway’s *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940), Graham Greene’s *The Honorary Consul* (1973), and Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) as primary texts under scrutiny to explore the issues and ideas of international relations represented in these seminal works and analyze them by using theoretical frameworks of International Relations such as Realism, Idealism, and Constructivism.

Hemingway’s *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, set in the backdrop of the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), describes the involvement of the protagonist American Robert Jordan in a guerilla war in the countryside of Segovia, Spain. It explores the involvement of different

countries, organizations, and independent people in the war supporting either liberals or fascists. The protagonist supports the Republican group for democracy.

Similarly, Greene's *The Honorary Consul*, set in the backdrop of the Cold War in Latin America (Paraguay and Argentina), describes the activities of a revolutionary group led by one of the protagonists Leon Rivas. In Greene's narrative, the Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum, Dr. Edward Plarr, and Leon Rivas get involved in different activities. Precisely, Greene's fiction criticizes the autocratic regime of Paraguayan ruler Alfredo Stroessner supported by democratic America. Likewise, Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*, a post-9/11 novel set in three continents (Asia, Europe, and America), describes the paradise-like Kashmir changed into a war-ridden zone because of external interventions. The protagonist Maximilian Ophuls, the US ambassador to India, misuses his power and causes his death consequently. Rushdie's novel unfolds the terrorist activities supported by different nations and power centers with their vested interests on the post-9/11 global stage.

### **Statement of the Problem**

International Relations is a macro field that needs a comprehensive analysis. It is a branch of knowledge about the relations of different states and their past, present, and future behaviors. It gives the concept of international politics of states and non-state actors and is often taken as a branch of political science, but in the field of academia, it is also considered an interdisciplinary field of study. In conventional definition, International Relations denotes the relations of states primarily in diplomatic, military, and strategic terms. In the past, diplomatic relations were regulated through the channels of embassies and agents, but now different state and non-state actors are contributing to such diplomatic relations.

Ideas are socially constructed, and so are literatures. Literary works have the power to construct reality and tell us what to think. Great literary works are colorful sources of materials to explore developments on contemporary global political issues. They cross the

territorial border lines and often deal with the issues of International Relations. In this light, this field of intellectual debate has basically remained unexplored on the ground that it has to be taken into consideration by researchers of political science and international relations.

Concentrating on some critical opinions expressed in Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, it was found that Sinclair Lewis views that the novel is about life, death, and brotherhood (qtd. in Oliver 146-147). Walter J. Slattof finds that the novel reveals the cause of humanity (142). He explains the humanity in various characters of both Loyalists and Fascist sides.

Commenting on Greene's *The Honorary Consul*, Robert Hoskins observes that Greene makes a self-portrait through the character Saavedra because he expresses Greene's worldview about literary art (221). Similarly, Michael G. Brennan describes the political commitment of a Christian in an unfair society mentioned in the novel. He asserts that Greene's creative focus mainly centers upon the doomed political activism of Father Leon Rivas (131). He compares the novel with political theology.

Reviewing Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* Damian Grant asserts that Rushdie juxtaposes a world of wooden huts and tents with the world of luxury apartments and TV studios (158). He refers to the two uneven worlds mentioned in the novel. In the same line, Andrew Taverson reads the novel as an allegory of America's relationship with the backyards of the world (219). Taverson sees the working of America's new imperialism.

The atmosphere of war, conflict, diplomacy, power, terrorism, culture, foreign intervention, utopia, and geopolitics are represented in the novels, and such novels are subject to the study of international relations. Nevertheless, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul*, and *Shalimar the Clown* are the novels that unpack these issues of international relations. These novels provide the fullest representation of society, and diverse international relations issues which this research is directed to address. They can be valuable media for

understanding and analyzing International Relations because they include various issues and ideas related to different nations, and because they can be interpreted and analyzed from the perspectives of Realist, Idealist, and Constructivist theories of International Relations. These selected primary texts, variously set in Spain, the US, India, and South America, share a common concern. However, existing research works of English studies have almost ignored multiple issues and aspects of International Relations implicit in these novels. Even the war, a most often analyzed subject in narrative analysis, has not been explored and analyzed from the perspective of International Relations.

Realism, Idealism, and Constructivism are three prominent theories of International Relations that have been used to analyze literary works. Realism means that nations have an anarchical nature, and war is permissive. Idealism denotes that there is the possibility of international cooperation in dealing with global issues, whereas constructivism asserts that beliefs, ideas, and identities have great roles in constructing relations between nations. These theories have great potential to analyze narrative works. So this research seeks to explore the issues, aspects, and ideas of International Relations implicit in these literary works. Furthermore, this study investigates these three narrative works to illustrate International Relations issues, such as international diplomacy, war, border conflicts, terrorism, hostility, and friendship.

#### Research Questions

The research questions that this research tries to answer are:

1. In what ways do issues and theories of International Relations contribute to the area of English studies in general and literary narratives in particular?
2. How do literary narratives such as novels bolster the understanding and analysis of relations of different nation-states?

3. To what extent do the issues and theories of International Relations influence the meaning of Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Greene's *The Honorary Consul*, and Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*?

### Research Objectives

The objectives of the research are:

1. To explore the importance of issues and theories of International Relations in the study of literature and apply them to study literary narratives.
2. To analyze the role of literary narratives in the understanding of relations of different nation-states.
3. To scrutinize Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Greene's *The Honorary Consul*, and Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* to explain the issues and theories of International Relations implicit in them.

### Hypothesis

This research claims that International Relations is not the only area of study in political science since it has an inherent link between politics and literature. International Relations issues and theories help understand literary narratives because these issues and ideas of International Relations are implicit in literary narratives, too. This research also claims that narrative works help us understand relations between different nation-states because the fictional description of relations between nations has great importance in the real world. It further claims that literary works, such as *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul*, and *Shalimar the Clown* are not only restricted to literary aesthetics. They are precious sources for searching out and expanding upon International Relations theories like Realism, Idealism, and Constructivism, and dealing with various issues like diplomacy, cross-border transactions, war, conflict, and cooperation. The relationship between literature and International Relations is reciprocal. Nevertheless, the literary works depict fictional

worlds that include ideologies, global issues, and inter-state issues analyzed in the real world of International Relations.

This research claims the literary narratives as great sources for the explication of International Relations since they include multiple issues of international relations, such as conflict and peace, friendship and enmity, diplomacy between and among nations, cross-border transactions, operation of non-state institutes, foreign policy, strategic studies, great powers, and balance of powers. They also incorporate issues like human rights, international society, violence, democracy, prosperity, treaties, civil unrest, migration, refugees, climate change, organized crime, human security, foreign intervention and ideas (theories) of international relations like realism, idealism, constructivism, Marxism, globalization, environmentalism, and terrorism. So, International Relations theory can be the study area for literary works like novels.

### **Significance of the Study**

The research makes a significant contribution to the field of interdisciplinary study because it draws knowledge from International Relations theory to analyze literary texts like novels. This research provides significantly a new pursuit of learning since an “interdisciplinary study allows unprecedented scope for posing new questions” (Correa and Owens 146). It also shows the significance of literature in political science. Lastly, the research significantly erases the prevailing distinction between literature and politics.

### **Delimitation of the Study**

International Relations issues and ideas are represented in many narrative works of different times, but this research has selected three seminal novels of different periods as primary sources. The first text *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940) is set in the Spanish Civil War of the 1930s. Predominantly, issues of Realist International Relations theory are implicit in this novel. But, it also includes issues of Idealism and Constructivism. The second primary

text, *The Honorary Consul* (1973) is set in Latin America and presents mainly issues of Idealist International Relations theory. Similarly, it also includes issues of Realism and Constructivism. The third primary text *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) is set in the aftermath of 9/11 America, Europe, and Asia, and mainly implies Constructivist International Relations theory. Likewise, it also includes issues of Realism and Idealism. These primary texts represent different important periods in history and imply different issues and theories of International Relations.

International Relations includes different approaches related to international affairs like realism, idealism, constructivism, gender studies, globalization, Marxism, modernization, environmentalism, anarchism, cultural study, and postcolonial theory, and needs a comprehensive analysis for its full understanding. But, because of its nature, this research has mainly focused on the realist, idealist, and constructivist aspects of International Relations to analyze the selected literary texts.

This study basically explains the issues and ideas of international relations through the lens of the three seminal novels: *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul*, and *Shalimar the Clown*. The study has also taken references from the historical backdrop of global politics.

### **Methodology of the Study**

The research design of this research is rigorously library-based interpretive and analytical, relying on both primary sources and a rich collection of secondary sources to establish a convincing argument. The primary texts selected for this research represent important periods in history. These works are representative of analysis by applying major theories of International Relations. This research has applied mainly realist, idealist, and constructive theories of International Relations as tools to analyze representative modernist novels, including *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul*, and *Shalimar the Clown*.

The researcher examines and interprets issues and ideas illustrated in these novels. Alexander Wendt's *Social Theory of International Politics* (1999), Hans J. Morgenthau's *Politics among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace* (1948), Nicholas G. Onuf's *Making Sense, Making Worlds: Constructivism in Social Theory and International Relations* (2013), Paul Sheeran's *Literature and International Relations: Stories in the Art of Diplomacy* (2007) and Cynthia Weber's *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction* (2014) are major texts for theoretical concepts. The researcher has analyzed issues and ideas of International Relations theory explained in these texts as well as other relevant texts and used them to analyze the selected three primary fictional texts.

International Relations as a discipline includes various aspects, but this research mainly focuses on the realist, idealist, and constructivist aspects. The relations between the countries that have been mentioned in the three novels have been analyzed in this research. In addition to taking Realist, Idealist, and Constructivist theories as basic tools, the study has also taken references from historical contexts to analyze the selected novels: *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul*, and *Shalimar the Clown*.

### **Organization of the Study**

As per the nature of the study, the dissertation has been divided into seven chapters:

The first chapter introduces the interdisciplinary nature of International Relations theory. Giving short background information on the three novels, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul*, and *Shalimar the Clown*, it states the problem, devises research questions, explains the significance of the research, demarks limitations of the study, discusses the research methodology and, at last, sketches the organization of the study.

The second chapter includes a review of literature that presents, at first, the historical overview of International Relations, then, issues of International Relations in literary works

from ancient times to the present, and, at last, an empirical review of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul* and *Shalimar the Clown*.

The third chapter presents methodology incorporating three theories of International Relations, such as Realism, Idealism, and Constructivism as tools to analyze the literary works selected for the study. It includes the critical insights of these theories and gives features of them, and it also describes their relevance to explain the literary texts.

The fourth chapter discusses international involvement in the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) contextualized in Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. It analyzes the issues of love and war, the sovereign nature of the nations, the clash of ideologies, the workings of international society, and the utopian concept of the Republican government of Spain as represented in the novel.

The fifth chapter examines the external assistance to the autocratic ruling as included in Greene's novel *The Honorary Consul*. It explains cross-border activities between Paraguay and Argentina, diplomacy, love related to diplomatic personality, the international nature of religion and politics, the anarchical nature of the nations, and power politics illustrated in the novel.

The sixth chapter analyzes the destruction of Utopian Kashmir by external interference described in Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*. It incorporates issues of love, conflict and murder, atrocities, hegemony, external intervention, selfish behavior of the diplomat, cultural diplomacy, seeking international cooperation, and friendship incorporated in the novel.

The seventh chapter includes the conclusion of the study. First, it describes the relationship between literature and International Relations concerning the issues of International Relations in literary texts. Then, it concludes the dissertation with remarks that literary texts are suitable sources for understanding International Relations. This study

reflects that Realism, Idealism, and Constructivism are prominent issues of International Relations theory, and are appropriate tools to analyze fictional texts. Lastly, it gives a way forward for further research.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE: PERSPECTIVES ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND LITERATURE

#### **Historical Overview of International Relations**

The origin of International Relations goes back to ancient Greece when philosopher Thucydides wrote the *History of the Peloponnesian War* (431 to 405 BCE), the twenty-seven-year-long war between Athens and Sparta. The next city-state, Corinth, also got its involvement in the war taking the side of Sparta. During the war, truce and resuming occurred occasionally. Though they failed to resolve the dispute after years of fighting, diplomatic efforts had been made. Sparta defeated Athens and became the most powerful city-state in the area. Thucydides is also called the father of international relations. David Welch views, “Thucydides is generally acknowledged to be the earliest, and to this day he is widely considered the father of both International Relations theory and its dominant ‘realist strand’” (175). The historical accounts given by Thucydides show the fact that war is inevitable if nations fail to manage good relations between them. A. J. R. Groom et al. assert that the main elements of International Relations theory “are to be found in Thucydides’ writing, notably lessons which derive from the confrontation of land power and sea power in geographical terms” (3). The concept of Thucydides is related to political realism which “views the relations between states as ultimately mediated by and constructed upon the emotions and fear and self-interest” (Sayamov 31). In his concept, the state can survive only by being powerful. In one of his narratives, talking to his Melian counterpart, an Athenian envoy remarks on the reality of relations between the two countries with unequal power structures. The strong order with its power, whereas the weak follow because of being powerless (Devetak et al. 9). For Thucydides, the state plays a principal role in war and politics (Mingst et al. 73). Thucydides believed in power politics.

Many other ancient philosophers of the ancient times have also mentioned the issues of International Relations. Cynthia Weber reviews, “Other ancient Greek and Roman philosophers like Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero were the antecedents of International Relations theory. Among them, Socrates proclaimed himself to be a citizen of the world” (Groom et al. 3). Plato represented the collective Greek mind of the time and firmly believed war was the prominent characteristic of international life. Though Plato and Aristotle had philosophical differences, both of them recognized that “a consequence of unequal size among city-states was that ‘the strong would normally strive to become stronger and the weak seek to avoid becoming weaker’” (Groom et al. 4). All of them advocated the Idealist concept of international relations. In Sayamov’s view the idealistic philosophers “felt

dissatisfied with the world as they found it, trying to answer the eternal question of what ought to be in internal politics and insisting that there should be some universal moral values on which political life could be based” (33). Given Groom et al., the value of ancient history to modern readers “lies in the descriptions of the negotiations, the policy alternatives, the strategic concepts, the diplomatic skills (or lack of them) exhibited by the plenipotentiaries as Athens tried first to avoid the war and then to win it” (1). Ancient history gives us the idea that relations between nations were crucial and each nation sought power for their existence and dominance over other countries.

Chanakya, an ancient Indian thinker and the writer of *Arthashastra* (4<sup>th</sup> Century BCE), is also one of the forerunners of International Relations. In this treatise, Chanakya, also known as Kautilya, gives an account of statecraft, foreign policy, and strategy. It is a knowledgeable text of grand strategy that formulates policies related to the notion of interrelatedness of the nations. Chanakya described the ‘Mandal Siddhant’ which defined neighbors as natural enemies. Enmity lurks among the neighbors because they contest for the same piece of land. After all, it is the “source of material welfare” (Mate). Highlighting the relevance of Kautilya’s treatise, Medha Bisht points out that, “In the context of *Arthashastra*, philosophical-cultural-intellectual learnings of concepts, which organically evolved from the ancient Hindu political thought become relevant as they underline alternative worldviews for understanding concepts and vocabularies in international relations” (66). Similarly, in the view of Watson, Kautilya “described . . . the relations between one ruler and another, and explained how a prince, whom he called the conqueror, might exploit the pattern to bring all to the Persian type of empire” (qtd. in Groom et al. 4). Kautilya’s *Arthashastra* suggests the realist concept of International Relations. It explains the exploitative and selfish nature of the behavior of a nation with its neighbors.

The Indian Emperor Asoka (268-232 BCE) also had his view on war that has great significance in International Relations theory in the modern sense. In the early part of his rule, he was involved in the bloodiest victories, but after being converted to Buddhism, he began advocating victory by “reason and persuasion.” In his foreign relations, he revealed himself as an idealist and spread his policies i.e. dhamma. To spread his policies, he sent his missions to other countries. Those missions “may be compared to modern goodwill missions helping to create an interest in the ideas and peoples of the countries from which they came” (Foreign Relations of Ashoka). He tried to spread amicable relations among nations.

The Hindu Holy Scripture the *Bhagavad Gita* also talks about war, “persuading a warrior to engage in a battle” (Doniger), and justifies it if the participation takes place with spiritual peace. The greatest Hindu epic the *Mahabharata* “is a deep reflection on the struggle for power among sovereigns, who must resolve multiple strategic and ethical dilemmas” (Mohan). Similarly, the Bible includes literature rich in political insight. Sheeran states, “the literature of the Bible instructs that God institutionalizes authorities to ensure order is maintained and anarchy limited” (8). The Bible as a story has a great impact on global issues. Groom et al. view, “The international relations of the children of Israel rested upon a deep philosophical and religious foundation” (5). The Bible provides insight into international relations relying on philosophy and religion.

Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527), the writer of *The Prince* (1532), and Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), the writer of *Leviathan* (1651), are also the forerunners of International Relations during the Renaissance period. Machiavelli is one of the most prominent scholars to contribute strongly to the advancement of International Relations. His book *The Prince* is a great source for understanding realist international relations theory. According to Machiavelli, the relation between states is anarchical. In his view “the impact that domestic politics have on international relations cannot be ignored”. So, “he views the state of

domestic affairs as being an integral force in shaping international affairs” (Leung 3). The concept developed by him about the international system influenced the Italian Peninsula. Groom et al. opine that “Within the Italian Peninsula, the international system was characterized by diplomatic intrigue, conspiracy, betrayal, and amorality, all conveniently lumped together under the name of ‘Machiavellism’” (6). His concept of international relations is relevant even in the current practices. He “saw the relations among states as based on the quest and struggle for power” (Sayamov 33). In his view, domestic power determines the relationship with other nations.

Similarly, Thomas Hobbes expresses the anarchical nature of international relations. His concept is realist, which is sympathetic to Alexander Wendt’s claim that “anarchy is what states make of it”. Michael C. Williams affirms, “a Hobbesian vision of international politics provides a common rhetorical and analytic touchstone” (“Hobbes” 213). He further views that “Hobbes’s most famous legacy to international relations, the state of nature, is grounded not in an assumption of natural human aggressiveness nor in a ‘security dilemma’ brought about by a ‘logic of anarchy’. Rather, it lies in much deeper questions of knowledge, legitimacy, and social construction of action” (215). Hobbes’s main concern was related to the security dilemma. In his view, a prince was sure to lose his state if he was unable to provide the necessary capacity to defend his state. Highlighting the power of a nation to protect itself, Groom et al. insist, “Since there was no outside force or coercion on which he could rely, he was reduced to self-help, which created a system of relations fraught with danger where power politics reigned supreme” (8). Hobbes, like Machiavelli, believed in the internal strength of a nation to protect it from other nations.

The thinkers Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677) and Jean Jacques Rousseau (1710-1778) treated wars as legitimate. In Spinoza’s view the sovereign “may live entirely as he pleases and is not bound by the will of another” (Groom et al. 9). For Rousseau, Groom et al. view

“War is a social understanding; it is a product of human civilization . . . all other contract thinkers argue that the social contract ends conflict among men, but for Rousseau, it creates the preconditions for war” (10). They have the concept that a state is of an autonomous nature, and war is social production.

Thucydides, Niccolo Machiavelli, and Thomas Hobbes were canonical figures as realists, whereas English philosophers John Locke (1632-1704), Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) are progenitors of the liberal concept of International Relations. Devetak et al. sum up the concept of the liberals:

They tend to emphasize humanity’s capacity to improve: they are committed to ideals of technological and economic as well as moral, legal and political progress. That the world is anarchical and war-prone is as true for liberals as it is for realists, but the former believe it is possible and necessary for humankind to escape the Hobbesian state of war- a condition in which states are insecure and constantly preparing for war. (7)

Though they are conscious of the chances of wars, they believe in the positive and idealist nature of human beings that is helpful for their progress.

Nineteenth-century German philosopher Georg W. Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) asserted that the prime duty of a state is to maintain itself. Charles A. Beard claims that Hegel “gave a kind of an ethical sanction to the promotion by a state for its own interest and advantage against other states, thus defying traditional morality” (33). Hegel emphasizes the supremacy of a state in deciding its policy against other states.

English philosopher Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) first coined the adjective ‘international’ in 1780 to mean relations among nations (Devetak et al. 3). As Fox has put it, “the word is symbolically important because it registers the norm-expectation that the interstate system is becoming and ought to be an inter-nation-state system” (qtd. in Groom et

al. 15). But International Relations first came out as an academic discipline only after World War I when the Department of International Relations was set up at the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth in 1919 with the donation of £ 20,000 by David Davis MP. The original goal was to “herald a new world, freed from the menace of war” (Cox 19). The main intention of establishing the Department was to provide a platform for scholars to identify the causes of existing world’s political problems and to suggest solutions so that politicians could solve them (Baylis et al. 3). The study of International Relations originated with an account of the Great War I (1914-1918) with “the belief that war was the gravest problem facing humanity and that something must be done to ensure that there would be no more ‘lost generations’” (Steans et al. 1). The devastating outcome of World War I gave birth to the idealistic approach of International Relations which focused on “What ought to be done” to avoid the possible disasters. By giving an optimistic view, it believed in making the world a better place.

The idealists of that time believed that it was possible to maintain international order. However, the idealist concept failed as there was an outbreak of the Second World War (WW II) in 1939. Liberal idealism came to be criticized, and a new paradigm-realism-emerged (Ghosh 4-7). Realism tried to see the world as it is. It paid sole importance to states as the principal actors and believed in their interests. Devetek rightly claims, “Realism, at its best, reminds us that the international environment is invariably dangerous and volatile and that in such an environment the use of violence is sometimes necessary to counter the violent intent of others, that sometimes rational debate is not enough to deter this violent intent” (26-27). Realism believed that the human world is not a pleasing place because “human beings are at best selfish and probably much worse. . . . This debate between idealism and realism has continued to the present day, but it is fair to say that realism has tended to have the upper

hand (Baylis et al. 3). World War II gave the bitter reality of the selfish and destructive nature of human beings.

As the USSR emerged into power after World War II, America felt a threat by it, and the major focus of the International Relations theory happened to be the Cold War: states started making the objective of international relations to pursue power for the national interest. Realism and idealism happened to be dominant theories of International Relations for some decades, but since the 1970s scholars started critiquing them because “neither realism nor liberalism had the capacity to deal with the changing nature of an international agenda where questions of poverty, justice, and human rights were increasingly perceived as first-order issues” (Devetek et al. 28). Aftermath of World War II along with realism and liberalism other theories such as constructivism, Marxism, post-structuralism, post-colonialism, world system theory and democratic peace theory (DPT) came into practice in the International Relations field.

Constructivism is a relatively new theory that developed in the late 1980s. It emphasizes human agency and has a great role in international relations. It “argues that we make and remake the social world and so there is much more of a role for human agency than other theories allow” (Baylis et al. 5). It talks about identity, religion, and culture. So everything in world politics is amenable to change through thoughts and ideas. According to Marxist theory, relations between states are determined by the economy. The power is not in the state but in global capitalism. Its main focus is not on states but on classes. The class forces ultimately determine the behavior of all other actors. The next theory, post-structuralism, reached international theory in the mid-1980s. It is also sometimes referred to as postmodernism. One useful definition is by Jean-Francois Lyotard: “Simplifying to the extreme, I define postmodernism as incredulity towards metanarratives” (qtd. in Baylis et al. 6). In the next term it is skepticism on all truth claims. Post-structuralist perspective suspects

the assertion of some fundamental truth about the universe. Michael Foucault's impact is great on international relations. "He argued that power, in fact, produces knowledge. All power requires knowledge and all knowledge relies on and reinforces existing power relations" (Baylis et al. 6). According to this theory international relations is contingent on power relations.

Similarly, post-colonialism questions that all the previously mentioned theories originated in Europe to solve specific European problems cannot really purport to explain international relations. Its significance has grown more in the twenty-first century. It believes that "the identities of the colonizers and the colonized are constantly in flux and mutually constituted. The post-colonialist scholars argue that the dominant theories such as realism and liberalism are not neutral in terms of race, gender, and class, but have helped secure the domination of the Western world over the global south" (Baylis et al. 6-7). Post-colonialism is the theory that advocates for the rights of the margins. Likewise, World System Theory is a greatly political perspective that explains "the historical rise of the West as well as the continued poverty of most of non-Western society (Chirot and Hall 81). It demands the re-allotment of the world's economic wealth and of it a new international economic order is needed. In the same way, Democratic Peace Theory (DPT) came into practice mainly after 1990, and it tries to promote democracy in the name that "liberal democratic states are highly unlikely to go to war with other liberal democratic states (Cox 74). So Democratic Peace Theory (DPT) spreading of democracy will help reduce the chances of war.

The above survey shows that International Relations theory is a wider view. It has a long history since ancient times, and it incorporates various issues and concepts. So in research like this, it is very difficult to analyze all the aspects of international relations. Hence, this research is mainly limited to analyzing the concepts related to realism, liberalism, and constructivism that are pertinent to the novels selected for this research. In the course of

analysis of the selected texts, other issues that happen to be found have also been discussed and analyzed. The research has taken the issues of International Relations like realism, liberalism, and constructivism as the theoretical tools to analyze the selected narrative texts.

### **Literature and International Relations**

Literature tries to fill up the fault lines that divide the states. It can cross the boundaries of state borderlines and discuss international issues. It is helpful to know about the language of diplomacy and the spirit of the age. It has a great impact on world politics, and it influences all cultures and nationalities. We get the nature of politics in literature that creates and destroys various civilizations. The literature discusses the wars between and among different states. Sometimes different nations may have amicable relations, and sometimes confronting relations. All these relations between nations can be the subject of discussion in literature. Literature can bring students of literature to politics and students of politics to literature. It deals with people-based as well as government-based relations between nations.

Stories have great value in giving the meaning of the contradictory nature of international relations. Many of the literary productions can be approached from the perspectives of global affairs. Life and death are common subjects of literature and as well as of International Relations. Great literature always deals with life. Hudson states, "A great book grows directly out of life. . . . Literature is a vital record of what men have seen in life, what they have experienced of it, what they have thought and felt about those aspects of it which have the most immediate and enduring interest for us all" (qtd. in Sheeran xxii). A book is a cultural production that is taken as a means of humanizing international relations. The narratives have a great role in constructing and destroying chances of the actions of international relations (xxii). The plots, characters, and settings of narrative works transgress

the political limits of the borders. Literary fiction as a vehicle to international relations provides various clues that help analyze International Relations.

Literature is a force capable of impending decisions, events, and trends at the international level. Stories that we use to study International Relations help us know the influence of cultural diplomacy in international relations. The relation between literature and politics is reciprocal: literature affects politics and politics affects literature. Issues like conflict, violence, war, friendship, enmity, power, democracy, tyranny, international laws, and civil unrest are related to different nations and can be the subjects of literature. Not only professional politicians but “immigrants, migrants, soldiers, marines, sailors, tourists, travelers, contractors, expatriate workers, traders and entertainers” are also involved in international relations (Sheeran x). These figures also take part in literary works as characters.

Literature is a great means to convey relations prevalent at different levels. It expresses “physical, moral, personal, local, national and international relations through narratives emerging from a diversity of voices” (Sheeran 26). Literature is an important tool for understanding international relations since it expresses different ideas by using different opinions of fiction, music and art, and denotes measures that may have substantial effects in the relations between nations (xiv). Serious literature tells the reader something about real life through narratives, events and characters. Sheeran suggests, “Literature has the ability to reveal complex patterns that permeate a range of historic and contemporary settings, the creative device being versatile in recognizing how insignificant acts can have magnificent repercussions” (ix). Study of International Relations is very straightforward to know the friendships, alliances, and antagonisms created between nations through human, monetary, trading, and informational flow (vi). Cultural diplomacy also plays a great role in international relations (vii). Cultural experiences are the subject matters of International

Relations that form and express the relations all over the international society (xiv). In fact, artworks have a significant role in shaping and revealing relations globally.

Literature provides a way to understand cultures and acknowledge the wider range of concerns of international relations. So literature is "a gift to scholars and practitioners of International Relations" (xix). The scholars of International Relations rarely note the Bible on the reading list, but "It is nonetheless, a phenomenally influential story that continues to impact global issues" (5). Though the Bible does not talk directly about global warming, a global issue, it tells us about the future of the world. 2 Peter 3:11 informs us, "But the day of the Lord will come like a thief. The heavens will disappear with a roar; the elements will be destroyed by fire, and the earth and everything done in it will be laid bare" (Bicker). It could mean that the earth gets hotter and hotter until it is destroyed. In fact, it is the process of global warming in the modern sense. Political ideas are not absent in the Bible. The Bible concerns the world and asserts that the whole world lies in wickedness. It is the concept that is akin to the idea of the realist approach in the contemporary International Relations tradition.

Conflict, violence, war, and peace, the key features in international relations, are searched in literature. Great literary writers have incorporated these features in their works since the classical times. Literature provides a valuable reference point to "interpret the rise and fall of power in empires, nations and states" (1). It also reflects national and global concerns. Using the issues of International Relations theory in literary works is not a new phenomenon. Even the ancient classical literary work *The Iliad* by Homer includes the ingredients that are applicable to the study of International Relations. The epic describes a conflict between the Trojans and the Achaeans. The central conflict originates from a duel between the Greek hero Achilles and King Agamemnon. The cause of the conflict is the seizing of Helen, the most beautiful woman in the world, from the Achaean King, Menelaus

by Paris, son of Troy's King. After a fierce war by sea and land the Achaeans get Helen back by force.

The epic includes the basic issues of international relations like causes of war, conflict, revenge, military tactics, and truce. It justifies Alexander Wendt's International Relations myth as "International anarchy is the permissive cause of war". Katherine H. S. posits, "*The Iliad* painted a graphic image of . . . the strategic environment of states: 'many factors that are outside a state's boundary . . . include[ing] a state's geographical environment, its relative position in a region or the whole international system of the absence of allies, allies' strength and weakness, opponents' strength and weakness, etc.'" (144). This epic recounts a conflict between the city of Troy and the Achaeans. Sheeran views that the ancient literary work "*The Iliad*- a noble war poem sublime in its study of conflict- is valuable to the contemporary study of International Relations" (vii). He points out:

*The Iliad* by Homer captivates the modern reader with the scopes of the battles, the organizations of the siege, its consequence, its heroes, gods and pawns being cast in a confusion in the heart of the conflict through mixed loyalties and objectives. The stories that inhabit *The Iliad* are timeless, each is told in simple terms in a manner that recognizes the full scope of human trials. The emphasis on the final days of the siege links the underworld, the Gods, the demi-gods and the living in a rich mosaic that provides guidance in a range of strategic and physical matters. (56-57)

Ancient Greek philosopher Plato's work *Phaedo* describes the amicable relationship of two ancient cities, Athens and Delos. Athenians dispatched "a mission to Delos every year . . . in honour of the god" who had saved the lives of their founder hero Theseus and his companies when they sailed to Crete (Plato1). The Greek dramatist Sophocles' seminal text *Oedipus Rex* (429 BC) raises the International Relations issues of Utopia and cross-border relationships. In the play Oedipus comes from Corinth, another city state, and becomes the

King of Thebes. Oedipus frees the citizens of Thebes from the tyranny of the Sphinx, and takes the reign of the empty throne. It shows that the people at that time wanted the king as their savior no matter what his nationality was. The acceptance of the kingship of Oedipus by the Theban citizens though they know that he is a foreign citizen, shows that the leadership should not be bound by national borderlines. The play presents the platonic idealistic aspect of the ruling system, i.e. a man who can keep his subjects from danger deserves to be the ruler of the state. The appearance of the first messenger in the play from Corinth to inform the death of Corinthian King Polybus indicates the exchange of relations between the two states by the physical presence of the messengers.

The First Old English Epic poem *Beowulf* describes an amicable relationship between the Scandinavian states Geats and Denmark. The protagonist Beowulf, a prince of the Geats of Southern Sweden, goes to the palace of King Hrothgar of Denmark and helps him by defeating the evil monster Grendel and its mother. It shows the unity of people of different countries for the common goodness of the whole community and human civilization. The crossing of the national borderline is to make the world a better place to live for human beings. The poem presents the international community that can ally to fight against the destructive forces of nature. It is the working of the idealistic concept of International Relations. In *Beowulf* triumph defeats fear. The epic is devoted to freeing human habitats from dangerous supernatural creatures. The poem is useful to Kings, Princes, leaders, and rulers.

The works of Geoffrey Chaucer (1340-1400), the father of English literature, are also colored with ingredients of international relations. His masterpiece *The Canterbury Tales* (between 1387 and 1400) includes his experiences as his service in the military and his tenure as a knight. "The representation of the knight and squire, and the role of chivalry, is the enduring theme in the masterpiece" (Sheeran 33-34). In the section "The Knight's Tale" of

*The Canterbury Tales* the knight describes the story of Duke Theseus of Athens, who is exposed in the tale with his wife, Hippolyta, and her sister, Emilie after overthrowing Scythia. When he knows from the lamenting women that their husbands have been killed by cruel king old Creon of Thebes, and are being dishonored by leaving their dead bodies unburied. The duke goes to war against Creon and slays Creon. He takes the city of Thebes under his control and orders the remains of the dead bodies of the husbands of lamenting women to be buried. In this anecdote the sense of revenge causes war. The war waged by the duke can be taken as a just war. It shows that the city-states of the ancient time were autonomous and anarchical. The relation between them depended on power politics. The stronger could attack the weaker at any time. Machiavellian politics was in use, and the use of force was the ultimate means of negotiation. Chaucer's next work *Troilus and Criseyde*, set during the Trojan War, also keeps ingredients to international relations. The epic poem includes the ingredients of treachery during the war between Troy and Greece. The soothsayer Calchas after the defeat of the Trojans goes to a Greek camp deserting the Trojan side. His daughter Criseyde also betrays her lover Troilus, a Trojan prince. She leaves Troy and goes to Greece promising to return, but stays there falling in love with a Greek warrior Diomedes. Troilus fights in the war wooing Criseyde, but is betrayed by her and is killed by Achilles. *Troilus and Criseyde* is the play that first used envoys as characters, who later were commonly called ambassadors.

Various issues about international relations have been included in many modern narrative works. Utopia is a theme of international relations that can be found in literary works. Utopia is an idealistic concept that has an important function in International Relations. The concept of utopia and its discontents can be found in multifaceted ways in literary works. The utopian concept that yearns for a better world without war is the idealistic concept of International Relations. Utopianism works with our hopes and dreams. Though it

aspires for a better world in comparison to our current world, various writers have given different features of utopia in their writings. But one common idea is that “the features common to all utopias is that they are places we may *wish* for rather than *hope* for” (Brincat 582). Utopia is a visionary invention and an idea of a heroic image. In a literal sense, it depicts “an imagined perfect place or state of things.” In Eastern mythology, the state of Lord Rama as mentioned in the *Ramayana* is called utopia (Ram Rajya).

Plato, Sir Thomas More, and H. G. Wells are a few to name, who have given visionary ideas of Utopia in the Western world. In Sheeran’s view, William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* and Aldous Huxley's *Island* are two texts with utopian ingredients that have power and morality as two dominant themes in International Relations. He opines:

Caesar as a literary device is important in understanding the rise of great figures, and the considerable intrigue and jealousies that surround the eminently elevated in political affairs; the internal and external enemies constructing ceaseless plots that unchecked and saps the energy of ruling elite, eroding authority and revealing weaknesses that have been previously cloaked by the office of governing. (17)

Caesar has a great influence on contemporary global issues and foreign policies. He reflects on the contemporary global empire and the shift from state-state conflict to ethnic tensions within states. In Sheeran's opinion, "Shakespeare's work on Caesar suggests that strong leadership is the best safeguard against civil unrest and conflict, the paradoxes being explicit in the unfolding scenes” (18-19). The play "reveals the nature of jealousies present in political leadership and the subtle turns that lead to reproach, reaction and disloyalty" (19). It describes the paranoia of power and the torturous process of replacing a leader. Highlighting the achievement of Caesar, John Buchan states that Caesar “performed the greatest constructive task ever achieved by human hands. He drew the habitable earth into an empire which lasted for five centuries, and he laid the foundations of a fabric of law and government

which is still standing after two thousand years” (qtd. in Sheeran 15). Caesar’s empire-building practice was very remarkable and has had a great influence on present-day foreign policy, too.

Aldous Huxley's *Island*, set on an imaginary island, Pala, keeps Utopia as its central theme. The island presents “the good society, shifting through various stages of a pick and mix set of guidelines taken from Eastern and Western philosophy, towards moral enlightenment” (Sheeran 23). The oil-suffused island, Pala, which had got harmony between humans and nature, perishes after being invaded by a neighboring dictator, Colonel Dipa. Sheeran states, "the central theme of the novel suggests that as long as the island remains detached from the outside world, Utopia will be safe" (23). Huxley by writing this novel means to say the world is wicked and wrong-headed, but in conclusion, he suggests that “human nature is fallible, but not necessarily Hobbesian in a complete sense” (25). In other words, he is not completely pessimistic but negates the Western capitalistic encroachment on an isolated perfect society. It is true that "Utopia should be an important area of study in international relations" (25). The Utopian concept is the idealist International Relations.

Stories of supermen and terrorists related to chivalry and honor are also subjects of International Relations. Chivalry and honor are the topics dealt with in literature since ancient times. Chivalry recalls pictures of grand tournaments, great castles, and the service for glory; whereas honor and duty are well captured in the arts. “Campaigns, battles, conflicts, journeys and related feats of adventure provide the opportunity for chivalry and honor, and invariably conceal the presence of terror and pain” (38). Sheeran points out, "The heroes and villains prevalent in literature provide insight to wider society and relation with outsiders" (31). Literature provides national memories and identities. Through stories, tales, legends, sketches and ballads, the country, nation, state, community, or culture draws its heroes. Power is not only linked to the military, it is also related to psychology and culture. Sheeran posits,

“Literature from the world indicates how strength and power are not simply linked military-might concerning empires, nations, and states, but are wider reflections on the psychology and culture. The theme of power is central to studies of International Relations” (34). He further points out, “Through the consideration of a creative literature, the response discerned in the construction of treaties, international laws, codes and standards can be understood and placed in context” (48). Literature has also a keen interest in the nations. “The struggles in dealing with a powerful neighbor is a common theme in Japanese literature; returning to original sources of strength and power” (34). This type of spirit expressed in literature has had a great influence on Japanese society after World War II. The sense of loss and melancholy is prevalent in Japanese literature in the aftermath of World War II. Women Characters often show courageous roles in Chinese literature. “The role of women is interesting in Chinese literature, most notably in the legendary women warrior, Hua Mulan, fighting bravely in numerous battles and seeking nothing but service to the emperor” (36). Literature has the power for social change and collective subservience. It can best be exemplified with the works of Lu Xun in Chinese literature. Lu Xun once said, “One scalpel only saves one life, one pen can wake up the whole nation” (qtd. in Sheeran 37). He sheds light on the power of literature.

Great literature books on heroes and heroism are common to influential books on international relations. Cervantes's *Don Quixote* “produced an enduring character that reflected the decline of the empire and the influence of the church. Cervantes' life mirrors the exploits of his hero traveling to Italy to fight in the naval battle at Lepanto” (Sheeran 41). Rich sources of literature help people understand contemporary international relations. It also searches for the meanings of words such as democracy, tyranny, and prosperity which are guiding points for the global community and civil society.

Rebellion and martyrdom are the footprints of terrorism, and they are also subjects of international relations. Terrorism is the practice of using violence for political ends and intimidating methods to achieve political ends by causing physical and psychological harm. Kiras characterizes terrorism as first and foremost using violence. "Such violence includes hostage-taking, hijacking, bombing, and other indiscriminate attacks, usually targeting civilians. However, the purpose towards which violence is used, and the motivation behind it, is where most of the disagreements related to terrorism begin" (qtd. in Sheeran 45). The term terrorist is very difficult to define because "a person's terrorist is another's freedom fighter". The field of terrorists and the field of freedom fighters are always overlapping. South African leader Nelson Mandela was labeled as a terrorist by the government while he was struggling for freedom and later on, he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace. Franz Fanon supports the process of decolonization and asserts that it is not possible only by gentlemanly behavior. In his view, decolonization is always a violent phenomenon. He claims, "Decolonization, which sets out to change the order of the world, is, obviously, a program of complete disorder" (36). So a question is always with us whether it is terrorism or a just war. In *The Fundamentalist* (2007), a novel by Pakistani writer Mohsin Hamid reacts to the 9/11 attacks as being "remarkably pleased". In the ending portion of the novel, we find distrust between the American stranger and the Pakistani immigrant Changez. The views on the 9/11 terrorist attack vary between the Pakistani Changez and the American stranger.

Literature is the field that reveals the rise and fall of great powers. In Sheeran's view, "The mistakes, accidents and errors that reveal the impact of human decisions in history have been captured and communicated by the creative instinct" (51). The intentions of the dark forces and their potential horrors are well expressed through literature. "Great art certainly captures and reflects the essence of human conflict and the consequence of war" (51). The great works of literature tell us that the bomb is unreasonable by describing its potential

consequences. "In seeking to avoid the devastation from a nuclear conflict, literature helps shape various sceneries that would result in the use of nuclear weapons" (54). Leo Tolstoy's *War and Peace* (1865) is the most startling text of international war literature that captures the heart of International Relations. Sheeran states, "The text is rich in scope and depth, revealing in grand sweeps of narrative the invasion and countermeasures taken in repelling invading forces of Napoleonic Wars of 1803-15" (57). It describes the most compelling issues facing all human kinds: freedom and power. It achieves a deep understanding of the inclusive psychology of war and peace. In the novel "he painted for us a tremendous canvas of war and peace in which each figure is as pulsatingly alive as a portrait by Rembrandt, and three dimensional rather than two" (Sheeran 58). In the same way, Stephan Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage* (1895) captures the conflict, terror, and menace of the American Civil War.

Sheeran further examines:

The Great War and the Second World War also allowed writers to produce different works that captured the madness of war in terms of engagement and organization. In the former, the scars of war on the combatants are captured by the war poets Wilfred Owen and Siegfried Sassoon, who recognizing the psychological damage on soldiers in creative non-diagnostic form produced incisive disturbing poems well before it was recognized as a medical condition, requiring treatment in a hospital not a firing squad for desertion. (58-59)

Aldington's *Death of a Hero* (1929), Barker Pat's *Life Class* (2007), Barret Andrea's *The Air We Breathe* (2008), and Ernest Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms* (1929) are some of the noted novels about the First World War. Hemingway has also included the experiences of the Spanish Civil War in the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. In the novel the protagonist, Mr. Jordan, goes to Spain from America and takes part in the war, by blowing a bridge, mainly for the cause of democracy. Joseph Heller's *Catch 22* (1961), a slide to international conflict,

expresses the war experience from the perspective of a Corsican bombardier. America dropped two atomic bombs in the interval of three days in Hiroshima and Nagasaki which caused widespread devastation and concluded World War II. This incident heralded the dawn of the nuclear age. "Every citizen on the planet became potentially drawn into the consequence of international conflict" (Sheeran 61). Literary works captured the collective shock of the devastating bombing. A wide ranging literature responds to picturing the nuclear chaos and its aftermath. Many writers have written much about man's inhumanity to man. The novel *Black Rain*(1965) by Masuji Ibuse fictionalized the damage and the shock of violence created by the bomb.

Many films like *Le Jetee*(1962), *The Twelve Monkeys*(1965), and *The Planet of the Apes*(1962) have exposed damage caused by international nuclear exchange on a large scale. With the advent of nuclear weapons, world conflict has not been eradicated, though it has been delayed; the role of literature in International Relations is of great value in conceptualizing the situations. The global stories have great power to limit or accelerate the use of military weapons. Many British playwrights and novelists felt disillusionment as the devastating consequence of World War II and criticized the established traditional organization of society. They are commonly known as 'angry young men'. Like many other novels of that time, John Brian's *Room at the Top* (1957) is set in post-war Britain and depicts socio-economic struggles. After the end of the Cold War, a new threat to the West emerged in Afghanistan and Iraq. America, Britain, and thirty-nine other countries took part in the first Gulf War (1991). The destruction of the World Trade Center on 11 September 2001 urged American and British forces to attack Afghanistan and part of Iraq under the name of "the War on Terror". The emerging threats and responses have been incorporated into fictional works. Andy Macneil's *Bravo Two Zero* (1993), Dave Eggers' *What is the What*(2006), and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) are some examples of novels that respond to

Post Cold War and 9/11 issues by fictionalizing them. These novels reframe the post-Cold War and aftermath of 9/11 reality by incorporating trauma and consequences.

Literature is also a field to present a glamorous world of espionage. James Bond series mostly capture the allure of the secret service. Joseph Conrad's mesmerizing book *The Secret Agent* (1907) is a fine novel in this field. It is a novel "cast amongst anarchist revolutionaries intent on bombing the Greenwich Observatory captures the fascination that often lies hidden, along with the mask of the ideology, which relived reveals the base angst of retribution of hatred" (Sheeran 66). Arthur Conan Doyle (1859-1930), Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936), Somerset Maugham (1874-1965) and Ion Fleming (1908-1964) are some of the writers who wrote some best-selling spy stories in their times.

The importance of home and the loss of it is a great topic and has a big meaning in literature and International Relations. "Literature provides scholars of International Relations with a useful insight into the meaning of home. Home is invariably a contested site. It is somewhere. It is in the nation. It is in the state. Therefore, it cannot escape insecurity" (Sheeran 86-87). It may refer to the micro-landscape as well as the shared planet. Sheeran further views, "Home is repeatedly the untold and silent story of international relations" (71). Security is the key feature of the home. Fears and horror of the outside world are temporarily removed from the home. Hence, it is a powerful place for refuge. Such an impression of home can also be the place for a battleground. So "home is the site of liberation or enslavement, life and death, hope and misery" (70). Sense of homelessness results in struggles and conflicts which may compel them to seek new homes leading to migrations and resettlements. Identity may be formulated as well as crushed at home. Abandoning a home may create great trouble in a person's life. In Shakespeare's *King Lear* home becomes a battleground after the king abandons his home and responsibilities by poor judgment. The good-intentioned decision creates a series of unexpected disasters. He divides his nation

(home) between the first two daughters, severing the last one from her right to property in the name of wordy love. He feels regret after he realizes being flattered by his first two daughters, and plans to get back his power (home) from them. But the sense of recovery later on only creates animosity and retribution. In Jostein Gaarder's novel *Sophie's World* (1991), Sophie Amundsen, the Norwegian girl, gets two letters coming home from school in the mailbox by an unknown with two questions scrawled across the pages "Who are you?" and "Where does the world come from?" The questions of her identity and the world (of her home) drive her to the intellectual journey of learning and discovery. She is taken to the field of philosophy covering Socrates to Sartre and beyond.

The issues of home by birth and ancestral home become contesting in some situations. Because of such duality, the identity of a person may be liminal. In Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*:

Home can be contested by the DNA of the family and the nation. . . . *Kim*, in which the orphan Kim O' Hara is torn between the love of his native Indian and the demands of loyalty to his Irish-English heritage, is a story increasingly familiar in the globalizing world. The tension that operates between Indian and Anglo-Indian societies is palpable when Kim is forced to choose where his allegiances ultimately rest. (72)

It creates complications in the adult world. The nation is the collective home for its inhabitants who defend the attack against it. This type of theme is also noted in many literary works like Bertolt Brecht's *Horatians and Curiatians* (1933-34), Leo Tolstoy's *War and Peace* (1969), and Richard Wagner's *Tristan and Isolde* (2009). The attack on the Twin Towers caused the wounding in the American home which resulted in retaliation in other's homes. "In this sense the global home becomes the battleground noted in Benjamin R. Barber's dramatic book, *Jihad vs. McWorld*" (73). The novel depicts the troubled present and the crisis threatening our future.

Globalization also has a great impact on homes. In the international arena, it describes the flow of people, money, and trade. These are also the subjects of narrative works. The war on terror created disintegration in societies. Anthony Eliot and Charles Lement include such subjects in their book *The New Individualism* (2006). Because of globalization, individuals have lost their definite homes because of their desire for constant change and self-reinvention. The processes of colonization have impacted the residents of the home all over the world since the time of Ancient Empires. In the modern time, the indigenous home was colonized with force and atrocity.

The existing injustices are mentioned in literary texts. The literary texts create social awareness, and, later on, the social injustices are corrected by society or ruling people. During the eighteenth century slavery was in extensive use in Europe, especially in Britain, but in the later part of the century, different figures like Olaudah Equiano, a British abolitionist, raised an "awareness of British public". Toussaint L' Ouverture, James Ramsay, Thomas Clarkson, Mary Prince, Elizabeth Hayrick, and James Stephen are some of the other abolitionists who contributed to the movement. As a result, "The Abolition of the slave Trade Bill passed through both the Commons and the Lords. It received Royal Assent on 25 March 1807" (Sheeran 76). It justifies that literature greatly influences social and political awareness which eventually causes positive changes.

The link between globalization, literature, and international thought is of great consideration. Global issues are also subject to creative interpretations. Sheeran asserts, "Globalization is political, technological and cultural" (98). Creative works may celebrate the demise of government as well as the relations between states. Literature has helped to illuminate the processes of globalization. The human struggle for survival and well-being has been narrated in different literary works. Globalization has affected different major issues like nationalism, violence, and social justice. Arjun Appadurai talks about imagined worlds and

the political possibilities of globalization. Many people in the world live in such imagined worlds. In his view “the central problem of today’s global interactions is the cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization” (31). He proposes a typology of five global cultural flows: *ethnoscapes*, *mediascapes*, *technoscapes*, *financescapes* and *ideoscapes*. He calls them building blocks of imagined worlds. The narrative works related to International Relations also present certain sorts of imagined worlds.

Literature has the ability to make social phenomena clear to help understand International Relations. It helps diplomats to make their minds cultured through reference to fiction and poetry. Literature has great importance in diplomacy. Sheeran puts, "Diplomacy is conveyed through the subtle footwork of negotiation, making possible the impossible" (108). It may present the rise and fall of a character or a nation in a creative way. It helps manage wrong turns by using tactful dialogue and resolution. Fictional works are also relevant to diplomacy. They “may shape views in politics and international relations" (112). The post-modernist fictional works of James Joyce (1882-1941) and Ben Okri (1959- ) are very much relevant to diplomacy. In various works, we find multinational characters that make sense of international relations. The policies, treaties, and directives of international relations are also based on the resources of the territories as mentioned in Joseph Conrad's (1857-1924) novel *Nostromo* (1904) in which the impact and value of resources make the character search more to maximize opportunity. Diplomacy has its own production of narrative. It is, therefore, “noted in a surprisingly wide bank of stories that report on invasions, withdrawal, and occupation: the presence of crimes against humanity and fall of civilization being preserved in the passages of poetry” (116). Both verse and narratives include the issues of international relations.

Many diplomats have used their skills to write novels. Former Estonian Ambassador to Germany Eduard Vilde (1865-1933) has written a novel *The Milkman from Maekula* to

expose social injustices and psychological dramas. Similarly, Shashi Tharur (1956- ) working in the United Nations has written novels from an Indian perspective. In the novel *Riot* he “examines the consequences of the death of an idealistic young American volunteer working in India. The story weaves Indian history and landscapes with challenging narratives that include insight into political and social forces” (118). In the novel *The Comedians* Graham Greene gives insight into the darkness of an autocratic regime in Haiti led by the cruel leader Papa Doc. It gives a cruel picture of a falling state that is a very important issue to anybody interested in international relations. A number of other diplomats who have written literary works connecting literature and diplomacy are the Mexican Octavio Paz, Pablo Neruda, Malawi UN Ambassador David Rubadiri, Kofi Awonoor and Sri Lankan diplomat Ediriweera Sarachchandra, Nina Sibal, Monana Chandran, Natvtej Sarna and Tiru Murti.

The creative literature shows us the misunderstandings and violence between cultures. Sheeran asserts, "Literature and art challenge the perceptions of a country" (130). Some writers use global stories and sketch a multinational set of characters. In the novel *A Life Elsewhere* by Segun Afolabi:

An air traffic controller pauses from his duties to imagine the lives of the passengers on a flight from Hong Kong, characters in transition who originate from Nigeria, Japan, and India and elsewhere. In a novel dealing with departures and arrival, themes are sketched which apply to passengers everywhere, it is an endearingly global and local story that deals in hopes, disappointments and intentions. (Sheeran 134)

Similarly, Bharati Mukharjee's *The Middleman and Other Stories* sketches characters from China, India, Philippines, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Italy and Caribbean countries, "each pursuing high-risk strategies to mould their lives beyond national constraints, which results in struggles and guilt" (134).

From classical literature to the present, the concept of the Orient is dominant in the literature of the West. The orientalist concept is also a great issue in International Relations. Sheeran claims, "The early relations with the Orient produced fabulous stories of mysterious peoples and luxurious landscapes" (138). Ancient Greek plays include the early references of the Orient. The eastern culture of Syria, Egypt, and Mesopotamia had a great influence on Greek thought. Hostilities began in the eleventh century between the East and West as the struggles of religions and occupations lasted for centuries. "In expanding the view of the Orient, the travels of [Venetian] Marco Polo in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were influential in opening routes and contacts that were previously unknown" (139). Venice got the rise of trade in the fourteenth century. "Trade flowed into its ports and merchants buzzed in the offices that formed around the Rialto Bridge, a location and experience that would provide the basis for Shakespeare's play *The Merchant of Venice*" (140). Literature does not only construct the Orient in a negative form, it recounts the richness of culture of the non-west. In the novel *Siddhartha*, Hermann Hesse mentions "the aspects of Buddhism which are authentic in the context that the fundamental features of ideas are not corrupted by an ill-conceived view of culture" (143). In the same way, the book *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance* by Robert Persig "became a cult classic that inspired millions of Westerners to experiment with new ways of living inspired by Tibetan Buddhism and vague oriental philosophy" (143). Similarly, E. M. Foster's classic fiction *A Passage to India* inspired the Westerners to visit India offering a touching critique of both British rule and Western rationalism. But Melanie Philips in *Londonistan* expresses the view that "everyone in the Non-West is a direct threat to the West" (144). Based on the backdrop of the 2005 London suicide bombing, the novel asserts that Londonistan has been the hub for terrorists as a result of the collapse of traditional English identity. This type of concept creates a new facet of contemporary international relations.

International literature raises a range of issues that are related to international relations. Writers of each century have raised the issues in their writings that enslave or liberate people. The fourteenth-century Synlah manuscript *Alf-laylah wa-laylah* and books of *The Thousand Nights and One Night* present the beauty of the magical world of the East. The characters of these works are well-known throughout the world. “The range of multinational characters that appear in numerous works take readers through unique stories, an insight that helps make sense of international relations” (148-149). The Kenyan writer Moyez Vassanji’s collection of stories *The Gunny Sack* (1989) includes multinational characters who reveal the stories of hopes, struggles, and disappointment.

Because of modern development states have been subservient to cities, and as states, cities have great impact on studies in international relations. In the modern world the main focus is on cities rather than states. Mega cities have got great importance beyond the nation-state. "It is posited that literature can play an important part in understanding a city, sharing experiences through the exchange of stories" (151). The shapes of international relations with wider dialogue and policy create great influence on cities. Cities are places of hope for people who seek work, escapism, discovery, adventure and opportunity. So there is an unplanned shift to the cities worldwide. “Nihad Sirees’ novel *The Pastoral Comedy* (Al-komedia Al-fallahiya), highlights the flow of tribes to the city leaving the Syrian dessert to settle in the Bedouin quarter around the city of Aleppo. The spirit of the city and the spirit of the tribe clash in a manner that is familiar in the urban landscape” (152). Michael Moorcock’s novel *Gloriana* (1978) is a crucial book for any student of international relations. “Gloriana rules an Albion whose empire includes America and most of Asia during a period of enlightenment and peace” (153). Cities are also hiding places to take refuge for the creative talent to write stories of experiences.

Ann Frank jotted her experiences in her diary while she was taking refuge for two years in Nazi-occupied Amsterdam which turned out to be the book *The Diary of a Young Girl* (1948). Cities and literature have relevance to international relations. "The city dweller, the student, the visitor and disenfranchised, the harmless and the excluded, occupying various spaces in the city are not ignored, but are presented in a manner that informs the wider flow of citizens active in international relations" (153). Cities have a great role in international relations. Whitefield opines, "Cities are like great theatres, carrying the weight and intensity of past triumphs. Oxford is so different from Rio, and Boston so different from Lhasa, that when we visit these cities we are different: we experience different emotions, we act different roles, and we become mirrors of the city" (qtd. in Sheeran 154). Cities can be the subject matter of International Relations. "Old and modern cities, walled and open cities, coastal and industrial, inner cities and suburbs may contain unique architecture and design, but their influence on citizens and the wider world outside are extensive and influence the content of International Relations" (154). Great cities of the world are visited by the predators of "the investment market, speculating, merging and acquiring the flesh and silver of troubled empires" (157). John Self, in the novel *Money* by Martin Amis, is a self-obsessed consumer of a hedonistic life-style financed by money making deals and spending in New York and London. Hunter S. Thompson's *Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas* and F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* are the novels set in the cities which show "the world of decadence that corrupts the American dream" (157). Great cities have also been the playground of gang membership and the mafia membership. Such mafia groups have multinational chains. "The gang culture in postmodern cities reflects the dystopian nightmare in popular fiction that generates a culture conducive to criminal acts" (160). Guns N' Roses' *Paradise City* and Raymond Chandler's *The Big City* describe the consequences of gang culture.

International illegal drug trade activities have a great impact on cities. Howard Marks gives a picture of multinational citizens detained in an American detention center. He points, "My roommate was a Pakistani, fighting deportation by seeking political asylum. There were almost a thousand inmates of all nationalities: Nigerians, Jamaicans, Nepalese, Pakistanis, Chinese, Indians, Sri Lankans, Vietnamese, Filipinos, Laotians, Spaniards, Italians, Israelis, Palestinians, Egyptians, Canadians, Central and South Americans" (qtd. in Sheeran 160). The masterly book, *The city in Literature* (1983) by Richard Lehan "traces the relationship between literature and city using key figures in literature such as Daniel Defoe, Emile Zola, Bram Stoker, Joseph Conrad, James Joyce, F. S. Fitzgerald, Raymond Chandler and Thomas Pynchon to construct the site of urban life" (161). Literature can note the uniqueness of cities. "Ernest Hemingway's *A Movable Feast* uses Paris as a canvas to sketch characters that are part of the atmosphere of the Left Bank. Nathaniel Hawthorne's poetic *The Marble Faun: The Romance of Monte Beni* is shaped in the city of Rome as a living and vibrant museum" (162). The development of cities has an influence in the structure of literature. Vast amount of stories are produced in the city. "Cities are noted for being the centre for embassies, finance, culture, palaces, theatres, monuments, museums, national parks, including media conglomerates and other empires that manufacture consent" (158). In Sheeran's view, "Cities go through cycles that are shaped by internal and external events. The city can be lost and recovered in a memory: the lost cities of Atlantis Babylon and Troy and found cities of Teotihuacan invoke Literature to imagine and recast" (165).

Literature is also a means to express the culture of a city. Sheeran examines the ways some classical and contemporary novelists include the culture of city. He puts:

Dickens and E. M. Forster set the tone in writing about London in a historical sense. In a contemporary setting Hanif Kureishi's novel *The Buddha of Suburbia*, captures the cultural clash and tension in a coming of age story that places a London

British-Pakistani in a 'foreign' world of sex and punk. Zadie Smith's first novel, *White Teeth* used North London Willesden as a canvas for her story. (168)

The city setting gives cultural characteristics in the writings. For many writers, "the city may be a location both threatening and alluring, menacing and exciting" (Peterson et al. 5). The relationship between the city and literature is unique. The stories related to the city are universal, and "are relevant to the historic and contemporary world of globalization. The world within a city theme connects cultures and nations in international relations. It is clear that the city can be a place that inspires the best and the worst of experiences" (Sheeran 168-169). The city is the place to connect people of many nations.

Since cities are densely populated and noisy, many writers prefer loneliness. "In atmospheric novels, the city is a natural home for the troubled. *Steppenwolf* by Hermann Hesse and J. G. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* are incisive in studying the disconnections in the city" (159). Rejecting the city, the great romantic poet William Wordsworth returns to a different way of life. For him, the city means what he describes in the poem *The Prelude*:

Oh, black confusion! And a type not false/  
Of what the mighty City is itself/ To all  
except a straggle here and there,/ To the whole swarm of its inhabitants;/ An  
undistinguishable world to men,/ The slaves unrespited of low pursuits,/ Living amid  
the same perpetual flow,/ Of trivial objects, melted and reduced/ To one identity, by  
differences/ That have no law, no meaning, and no end. (qtd. in Peterson et al. 4)

For Wordsworth, the city is an indistinguishable world to the man that melts all objects into one identity.

Science-fiction novels are very much relevant to imagine a future landscape of international relations. "Using fantastic settings, weird science, and futuristic technology, science fiction contributes to a substantial literature that engages with the shapes of worlds,

ethereal and realistic, ravaged by the visions that have been formulated by good and evil” (Sheeran 172).

The novels of science-fiction writers like H. G. Wells, Jules Verne, and Robert Hainman present the tenets of international relations in a strange way. The science-fiction novels of Mary Shelley and Jules Verne give the image of the future world. Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*(1818), Jules Verne’s *Twenty Thousand Leagues under the Sea*(1870), H. G. Well’s *The Time Machine*(1895)and *The War of the World*(1898), Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* (1932), Margaret Atwood’s *The Handmaid’s Tale* (1985), O. B. Hardison Jr’s *Disappearing through the Skylight*(1989), and Michael Faber’s *Under the Skin*(2000)are some of the science fiction novels that discuss the futurist world. The science fiction novels of Isaac Asimov (1920-1992) combine science and religion to produce a phenomenal output.

Environmental issues like climate change, deforestation, natural disaster and scarce resources are known as science facts, and the science fiction novels deal with the causes and effects of these issues. John Wyndham's environmental novels "highlighted the potential flaws in using genetic engineering and other scientifically oriented inventions in nature" (184). Similarly, Kazuo Ishiguro’s science fiction novel *Never Let Me Go* (2005) presents the dire futurist world with cloned humans.

The future of international relations proposed by science fiction novels shows many difficulties. Similarly, “The impact of the internet, nanotechnology, genetic engineering and a range of other technological processes are producing unique developments and patterns in international relations, which are not independent of human control but are extremely complex in facilitating positive interventions" (185). The works of science fiction will become an important study of the future impacts of these issues. Sheeran asserts, "International Relations as an area of study requires a reality check; science is a good

beginning. Real science is only part of the story. It is time to listen to the music and get with the dancers at the end of the time" (187).

For practitioners of International Relations, literature provides information on many issues. Many meanings are possible through literature which could otherwise remain closed. In fact, literature gives a chance to see International Relations from different perspectives. It gives an alternative view to those who think of it as a "masculine discipline," which has its own stories. "Literature in International Relations is as valid as fact ~ stories invariably shape the science" (189).

From the beginning of the modern age, about A. D.1500, global politics is divided into two dimensions. The West comprised the states- Britain, France, Spain, Austria, Persia, Germany, The United States, and others. Within Western civilization, various states of the West interacted, competed, and fought wars with each other. They also "expanded, conquered, colonized, or decisively influenced every other civilization" (Huntington 21). The West created a rhetoric about the East that they were weak and subservient, and they needed the support of the West. They started dominating and ruling over them in the name of help. For this process, Rudyard Kipling coined the phrase, "the White man's burden." This historical truth has greatly affected the creation of literary narratives.

The cultural clash is present even within the countries of the West. Henry James's *Daisy Miller*(1878)is a good example of exposing cultural clashes between Europe and America. Daisy Miller, an American girl visiting Europe, is criticized by the people of the American circle in Rome for her innocent and friendly behavior. As Daisy walks in the late evening with Giovanelli, an Italian boy, Mrs Walker, an American expatriate, criticizes her activities as against European convention, and she says that people are talking about her, but Daisy refuses her suggestion and keeps her walking with Giovanelli till the time she catches a Roman fever and dies of it. The next novel, *Americanah* (2013) by Chimamanda Ngozi

Adichie, tells the story of Ifemelu, a Nigerian girl, who grows up in Nigeria and moves to America for her education and stays there long. "The novel follows her journey as she becomes American and then travels back to her home country, where she is no longer considered Nigerian, back in the US, she is not considered American" (Cahuasqui). Being a citizen of two countries, she has an identity crisis. She feels neither perfectly Nigerian nor perfectly American.

Culture and cultural representation (literature, religion, art, and music) have been central to colonialism, war, conflict, and globalization. Literature has power as a shaper of International Relations, and, as such, literature needs to be seen as profoundly political. The role of literature is great in global politics. Edward Said affirms the influence of culture on the exercise of political power. He discusses the concept of imperialism and colonialism by analyzing great literary narratives such as *Robinson Crusoe*, *Mansfield Park* and *Kim*. He extensively analyzes the relationship between imperialism and culture in his genre-forming book *Culture and Imperialism*. In his view, the novels as the cultural form were very significant in the formation of attitudes, references, and experiences to the Western empires of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Novelists can truly say about strange parts of the world. The narratives of the colonial time included the main colonial battle over land. Said puts, "[T]he power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming and emerging, is very important to culture and imperialism. . . . [T]he grand narratives of emancipation and enlightenment mobilized people in the colonial world to rise up and throw off imperial subjection" (*Culture and Imperialism* xiii). He further claims, "Conrad is the precursor of the Western views of the Third World which one finds in the work of novelists as different as Graham Greene, V. S. Naipaul, and Robert Stone" (xix). The novelists can be the beginners of different world views.

Many novelists may have political overtones in their writings. In Said's view, Joseph Conrad's *Nostramo*, as an example, keeps:

[P]aternalistic arrogance of imperialism that it mocks in characters like Gould and Holroyd. Conrad seems to be saying, 'We Westerners will decide who is a good native or a bad because all natives have sufficient existence by virtue of our recognition. We created them, we taught them to speak and think, and when they rebel they simply confirm our view of them as silly children, deputed by some of their Western masters'.

(xx)

In Said's view literature has the power to narrate the nations. Literature does not have only aesthetic aims; it is also something created to serve different "worldly aims". In Said's view literature has international nature. He proposes:

the contrapuntal lines of a global analysis, in which texts and worldly institutions are seen working together, in which Dickens and Thackeray as London authors are read also as writers whose historical influence is informed by the colonial enterprises in India and Australia of which they were aware; and in which the literature of commonwealth is involved in the literature of others. (385)

The political nature of literary writing has been presented even in Said's epoch making volume *Orientalism* through the lens of culture and literature. Many poets and novelists have included the distinction between East and West in their epics and novels. Orientalism is the style of thought that makes a distinction between "the Orient" and "the Occident":

Thus a very large mass of writers, among whom are poets, novelists, philosophers, political theorists, economists, and imperial administrators, have accepted the basic distinction between East and West, the starting point for elaborate theories, epics, social descriptions, and political accounts concerning the Orient, its people, customs,

“mind,” destiny, and so on. *This Orientalism* can accommodate Aeschylus, say, and Victor Hugo, Dante and Karl Marx. (2-3)

Said views that with the discourse of orientalism, "European culture was able to manage –and even produce- the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period" (3). Orientalism is the concept of taking “European identity as a superior one in comparison with all the non-European people and cultures" (7). It is a cultural and political fact. Said asserts, "William Beckford, Byron, Goethe, and Hugo restructured the Orient by their art and made its colours, lights, and people visible through their images, rhythms, and motifs. At most, the 'real' Orient provoked a writer to his vision" (22). Literary texts have also contributed to restructuring Orientalism.

The representation of Orientalism in literature has a long history from the ancient Greek time of Homer’s *Iliad* to the modern literary texts. Homer in the *Iliad* describes the conflict between Greeks and Trojans that comprised Eastern soldiers. The Orientalist ingredients can best be found in the fictional works of the eighteenth century and onward, though some of the texts like *The Moonstone* keep the ambivalent nature of Orientalism. Daniel Bivona states that in narrow sense Orientalism is “a set of self-referential representations of ‘the East’ that only purports to represent the long engagement, both friendly and hostile, between Europe and the Muslim world, the indubitable role of literary fantasy in shaping constructions of the Orient comes to the ground” (101). He further says that “the representation of the Orient in European literature involves the repeated deployment of a recognizable set of tropes and fantasy elements that help to construct the generic category of Orientalist literature” (102). The issue of Orientalism in literature has a long history that shows the perspective of the West to the people of the East.

Nationality, nation-ness and nationalism are cultural artifacts. The issue of nationalism, a subject of International Relations, is also a subject dealt in literary works.

Rabindranath Tagore's *Gora* is a novel on nationalism. "Tagore in *Gora* portrays Gora, as the central character of rising nationalism who voices his concern for the freedom of India from the clutches of the British, a revolutionary making an effort to transform India" (Singh 70). Similarly, G. A. Henty's novel *In the Reign of Terror: The Adventures of a Westminster's Boy* (1888) highlights British nationalism. The main character Harry Sandwith follows British ways of behavior even long after he has left Britain.

Benedict Anderson challenges the common view of nationalism as a European invention. He asserts nationalism as a global phenomenon. In his view, nationalism is "an imagined political community-and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (5-6). Anderson gives an alternative definition for new "imagined communities" of nations. Nations are imagined communities because the communal bonds felt by their members are imagined. He asserts the great role of the novel and the newspaper in helping the readers as well as writers imagine others to be like themselves. Stories related to the nations also help to create an imagined community. So stories also have a political orientation. Ernest Gellner defines nationalism as "a sentiment" (1). Such sentiment can be supported or swayed away by narrative works.

The relationship between literature and nationalism is of great importance. Homi K. Bhabha explores the possibility that the "symbolic structure of the nation . . . works like the plot of a realist novel," and that narration "links together diverse acts and actors on the national stage who are entirely unaware of each other" (308). He compares narratives with nations and asserts that a nation-state generates a specific national literature including peculiar national characteristics. So literature has the ability to be a signifier of national identity, and various literary works include nationalistic ends. He states, "Nations, like

narratives, lose their origins in the myths of time and only fully realize their horizons in the mind's eye" (1). Narratives and discourses signify a sense of "nationness". Even the consummate geniuses such as Homer, Dante, Rabelais, Cervantes, Shakespeare, and Goethe have embodied "a given national spirit". The question of nationalism can best be found in Shakespeare's play *Henry V*. In the play, the character MacMorris asks, "What is my nation?" "Who talks of my nation?" (42). It is the question of nationalism and national identity. Bhaba asserts that literary texts are also means of narrating the nation. The nation may have cultural boundaries that "must be crossed, erased and translated in the process of cultural production" (4). Literature has the "ability to function as a signifier of national identity or heritage" (138). In the construction of national identity literature and politics are closely related to each other. Literature articulates "a shared national experience" (Horton and Baumeister 19). Literature is a great source to express national characteristics.

Literature also has a relationship with political theory, and international relations theory is a branch of political theory. Modern political theory can be enriched through an engagement with works of literature. Imaginative literature also has a contribution to political theorizing. The plays of Aeschylus, Euripides, and Sophocles also illuminate the moral and political theory. Sophocles's play *Oedipus Rex* presents the idealistic theory of ruling a nation. The protagonist King Oedipus tries to keep his people out of trouble at any cost.

Traditionally, political philosophy was separated from imaginative literature in the name that it does not have anything to do with morality. The suspicion between political philosophy and literature is not new. Imaginative literature may play a valuable role in understanding political deliberation. Imaginative literature is also a veritable resource to explore issues such as nationalism, liberal philosophy, and utopianism. "In stressing the fact that philosophy and literature are both kinds of writing, and, therefore, share important features in common" (Horton and Baumeister 8). By referring to the birth of the tradition of

Western philosophy, they refer to Plato's concept of banishment to the "poets from the world of *Republic*" mainly for two reasons: first, their works are "false and illusory" which cannot "offer any insights into the 'real' world," and second, such imaginative literary works are "harmful and morally confusing" (9). Plato thought in this line because the poets and dramatists of his time claimed to provide moral illumination.

In contrast to the view of Plato, "some thinkers who have made significant contributions as both literary artists and philosophical theorists: Milton, Godwin, Shelley, Rousseau, Tolstoy are only a few of the names that come to mind" (10). The distinctive qualities and insight in the imaginative literature are very much helpful in enriching politics. It is fruitful to interchange "between political philosophy and imaginative literature" (10). Giving the reference to Rorty, they claim "the superiority of imaginative literature, to philosophical argument both as a way of gaining a richer understanding of human life and as a more effective means of persuading people to adopt more attractive principles and practices" (11). Of different genres, "Novels and plays . . . seem much better at exhibiting the complexities and political experience and the open-textured and necessarily incomplete character of real political arguments" (13). The philosophical ideas like deconstruction and cultural studies have attended to break down the disciplinary boundaries (divisions between literary and political analysis). The narrative has a great role in putting literature and political theory together, and "story-telling has played a significant role in the presentation of many political theories" (15). The seventeenth-century philosophers John Locke and Thomas Hobbes also used the form of storytelling to cast their political theories.

Imaginative literature has been taken as a good means to speculate about political possibilities, such as Utopian theorizing. Thomas More's book entitled *Utopia* "is considered both a work of imaginative literature and political theory" (22). The political theorists who are critical of the real political world favor imaginative Utopian literature because it is a form

to transcend the limitations of the real world. One genre of writing opposition to Utopianism is Dystopia. "George Orwell was a writer who explored the dystopian novel with maximum political effect in his *Nineteen Eighty-Four*"(23). *Animal Farm* was his next dystopian novel that expresses the totalitarian vision.

The literary work may have a political undertone which the reader must decipher to grasp the meaning of the work. Robert Boyers claims, "If we understand the significance of politics in the given novel as central or marginal, that understanding has much to do with our sense that we have been invited to read that novel in a particular way" (4). He examines the role of the political imagination in shaping the works of important contemporary writers. Politics and the novel have an intersection that "was once described by Lionel Trilling as a 'bloody crossroads', where matters of life and death are taken up and the fate of 'society' hangs always in balance" (1). This intersection has been attractive to writers. It is sometimes said that the novels without political issues are deficient and their writers are blamed by the critics as being "timid" or "dishonest". Harper Lee's novel *To Kill a Mockingbird* (1960) is a political novel that presents American social hierarchy and racial prejudices.

With the end of the Cold War it was claimed by some critics that there would be the end of ideology, but it did not happen to be so. Ideology is prevalent. Various writers write novels using characters fighting for or against certain ideologies. In such novels the writers consistently associate with a stance. Political novels take either national politics or international politics as issues. Philip Roth's *American Pastoral* builds "about the political turmoil of the 1960s" (Boyers 3). Similarly, "Politics determines the fate of characters in persistent way" in V. S. Naipaul's *A Bend in the River* (4). Anita Desai's *Baumgartner's Bombay* and Nadine Gordimer's *A Guest of Honour* are some other examples of novels with political issues.

Diplomacy, a significant element of international relations, has a long history. In a modern sense, it came into account as the embassy emerged at the end of the medieval period. During that time ad hoc communication and negotiation were two main characteristics of diplomacy. It went into great change during the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries as an important element in state-craft. The diplomatic practice of that time also helped to formulate modern international law. The writers of the early modern period described diplomatic action through the imagery of narrative and drama. However, diplomatic ingredients can be found even in the literary works of ancient classical times. In *Phaedo* Plato refers to the Athenian mission to Delos every year to keep the harmonious situation between these two states. Negotiation, friendship networks, trading practices, the culture of gift giving, transaction, exchange, art, jewelry, and book collecting were some practices of diplomacy of early modern times. Diplomatic channels were used to disseminate news of discovery and experimentation.

Negotiation, mediation, and representation are three forms of action in diplomatic activity. Timothy Hampton views, “By focusing on the representation of negotiation we can explore the generic and rhetorical frames deployed by writers to represent and give meaning to this most fragile of political encounters” (7). In the same way the role of mediation “is particularly widespread in sixteenth-century humanist literature on diplomacy,” and the notion of representation “is one of the challenges of reading the language of diplomacy” (8). The resident embassies that Europe adopted gave rise to three major genres: the essay, the epic, and tragedy. European Renaissance culture had a unique literary-diplomatic strategy.

Literary works have been very useful sources for understanding the diplomacy of the past. Robyn Adams and Rossana Cox give some ideas about diplomacy in the early modern period by analyzing the works of that time. They point out that "the texts and contexts surrounding the ambassador have been brought into closer focus; the textured background to

the early modern embassy has begun to be revealed" (7). By examining dramatic literature, letters, and other texts, it has been known how the embassy was viewed by various areas of the social spectrum. Giving her view about literary and diplomatic representation, Joanna Craigwood points out that "Literature is also an art and practice of representation- and the parallel was not lost in early modern diplomatic theorists. Their understanding of the ambassador as a faithful and persuasive representative of his sovereign, in word and deed, placed diplomatic theory in conversation with theories of rhetorical, poetic and dramatic representation" (Adams and Cox 82). She also asserts that the interrelation of early modern literature and diplomacy has recently begun to attract critical attention. She uses, "poetics of embassy to indicate both a theory of literature informed by diplomatic ideas and a theory of diplomacy informed by literary-theoretical concerns" (83). It is generally accepted that the poet is sovereign and poetic creativity is similar to the creation of new legislation.

The early modern poet-diplomat, Sir Philip Sydney used his poetic treatise as " an equipment protestant platonic model to understand poetic mimesis, which [he] places under the implied trope of embassy" (84). The poetry of that time was a medium to express diplomatic ideas. "Sidney's poetic treatise, *The Defense of Poesy* (1582), uses an equivalent protestant platonic model to understand poetic mimesis, which Sidney places under the implied trope of the embassy" (84). His writings express religious, political, and cultural concerns related to diplomatic interests. He "places this ambassadorial poetics under the implied trope of the embassy. He introduces the *Defense of Poesy* with an anecdote from his 1574 stay with Edward Wotton, secretary to the English Embassy at Maximilian II's Court in Vienna" (93). For Sydney, poetry is "analogous to embassy: words are ambassadorial representatives that faithfully represent the author's reason" (9). So "poetry, then, could be ambassadorial in representing the poet, or his or her reason, or divine and philosophical truths- or all of these things" (84). Skilful use of words was common in early modern

diplomatic treaties. Such use of language had also influenced the literature and poetics of that time. Literary writers of that time clearly showed these crossovers between literature and diplomacy. Many European writers of that time “drew analogies between literary and diplomatic representation” (82). The relationship between diplomatic theory and literary theory expresses concern about the art of representation. Through this process, diplomacy comes into conversation with philosophical and literary–critical ideas. When diplomacy is brought to literature it can be described as a mimetic art. In Timothy Hampton's view, “He has in mind both a way of reading literature that is attuned to its diplomatic complications and a way of reading diplomacy that would take into account its fictional and linguistic dimensions” (83). We might seek diplomatic poetics.

The interconnection between the history of diplomacy and the history of literature is intertwined. Timothy Hampton sees the relationship between the rise of modern secular literary culture and diplomacy, and they shape each other in important ways. Hampton’s “*Fictions of Embassy* inspired in a ‘diplomatic poetics’ ‘a way of reading literature that acknowledges its role in negotiating the relationship between politics and a way of reading diplomacy that takes account its fictional and linguistic dimensions’” (Sowerby and Craigwood 6). Hampton observes the interrelationship between the history of diplomacy and the history of literature. There can be an impact of international order on literature; it can also shape its theme as well as form. Conversely, since literature dramatizes political crisis, close analysis of it can help people trace the psychological and moral implications of large political reorientation. In his view, “Diplomacy and its rituals offered a storehouse of stock figures, scenarios, and problems, which were appropriated by influential writers of plays, poems, and essays” (Hampton 1-2). With the rise of diplomatic practices, new figures appeared in the stage of European literature. He points out that “the new political tool of diplomacy and the emerging culture of secular literature shape each other in important ways.

Literary texts provide a unique and privileged terrain for studying the languages of diplomacy. In turn, diplomatic culture plays a dynamic role in literary history, in the conventions, and genres" (2). Literature is a cultural form that both represents and helps shape diplomatic practices. European literary history is taken as a series of national narratives that also includes the stories of diplomacy. Literature dramatizes political crisis concisely and it also represents psychological and moral uses of larger political orientations. "Thus the rise of diplomacy affects new types of imaginative writing in ways that are formal, as well as thematic" (6). Aesthetic representation of the text often depicts diplomatic activity. On the other hand, diplomatic consciousness perches on the literary tradition. "Diplomatic theory and reporting turn frequently to classical epic and historiography and employ tropes and conventions associated with fiction writing" (6). Diplomatic writing and literature represent the relationship between actions and the world in a similar way, and the ambassador can highlight the relationship between literature and political power. "Literature gives voice to the unspoken anxieties and tensions within diplomacy" (12). The diplomatic scenes of literature have great importance in literary works. Hampton rightly claims that "in works of imaginative literature scenes of diplomatic negotiation are not merely thematic material. They help to shape literary form as well" (17). Thus, to trace the history of diplomatic representation in literary texts is also to trace the cultural pre-history of what would come to be called, in the eighteenth century, "international relations". In his view "this involves tracking the shifting points of contact between literary fiction-making, on the one hand, and the discourses of political theory, intelligence gathering, diplomatic theory, and international law, on the other hand" (3). The relationship between literary fiction-making and international relations goes back to the eighteenth century.

He further posits, "The representation of diplomatic negotiation in a literary text is the moment that dramatizes the limits of public rhetoric, the language of royal authority, national

interest, and power politics" (10). Diplomacy is akin to literature in the matter of sense-making. They are also analogous in the sense that both have a practice of communication and semiotic exchange. Literature depicts diplomatic action in condensed and dramatic form. Literary diplomacy helps us "decipher the nuanced language of diplomacy" in imaginative literature. "Literature may help us to discern the tensions and constraints within diplomatic action, highlighting the implications of that action for the history of the subject, the movement of bodies, the dynamics of narration" (10).

The project of reading foreign policy in literature speaks to the reinvention of European literary tradition. "As new forms of European identity emerge to displace or attenuate conventional national identities, the diplomatic dimensions of literature will take on new importance" (13). The role of an ambassador is key in the dramas of state-building and national consolidation. William Shakespeare's play *Hamlet* is a literary example to explore the connection between diplomacy and state power. Diplomacy plays a great role in linking domestic policy and foreign policy. The play insists on the negotiating relationship with foreign monarchs. In *Hamlet*, diplomatic themes play a vital role in the development of dramatic action which link domestic policy and foreign policy. Hampton views:

*Hamlet* gives us a modern prince who seizes power through the use of the new political tool of diplomacy. Thus the play is both a mediation of the relationship between diplomacy and state power and a consideration of the tensions between literary convention and diplomatic action. *Hamlet* features one of the few successful gestures of diplomatic dispatch and negotiation in early modern literature. (144)

In the play, Claudius sends two Danes aristocrats on a mission to carry letters to the king of Norway to rein his nephew Fortinbras. The international politics of Claudius affects domestic policy, too, "Through the diplomatic overture Claudius aims both to deflect the danger from abroad and assert the unity of his own state" (146). In fact, his aim is to rejoin and reframe

Denmark. The play includes thematic elements of diplomacy like, spying, representing and negotiating.

Literature and diplomacy had a relationship with Renaissance writers. Many Renaissance diplomats like Niccolo Machiavelli, Bernando de Mendoza and Thomas Wyatt were writers, too. For Gentili, “Literary writing and political service were not mutually exclusive spheres of activity, but could be meaningfully interwoven” (Sowerby and Craighwood 1). The diplomatic commentators of that time thought that the tropes of literary language helped the diplomats to make sense of diplomacy itself. Some ambassadors found vocabulary drawn from literature and drama useful for diplomacy. During that time, “literary composition was embedded within diplomatic culture in many parts of the early modern world” (4). In the Renaissance period, “the cross-cultural exposure of embassies influenced national poetic traditions, diplomatic agendas and sources shed new light on poems, and poetic form and expression helped negotiate diplomatic difficulties” (7). Similarly, “The importance of oratory, performance, poetic composition, wide reading and writerly skill to diplomatic work made the diplomacy and manipulation of literary abilities crucial to both the projected prestige and habitual practices of early modern diplomats” (12). Diplomacy and literature are the issues of study in the present time, too. Many diplomats have been contributing to the field of literature. Some of the diplomats have also won the Nobel Prize for literature.

Politics cannot be separated from society, both of them go ahead simultaneously. E. H. Carr appreciates fully the social roots of the Utopian and realist modes of thought, the social conditioning of all political thinking. He is quite right, as against Orthodox Marxists, who have been shockingly obtuse in the matter, to emphasize the national factor, the struggle between nations. He has his own form of utopianism. He thinks that the satisfied powers should have made concessions to the dissatisfied. There is a frank admission that

international law cannot stand alone and can function only as a branch of an effectively organized world society; and that a better moral basis must be found for any new, enduring world order. He emphasizes power politics. For him "Power is a necessary ingredient of every political order. Historically every approach in the past to a world society has been the product of the ascendancy of a single power" (232). Carr is a great proponent of realist concepts in the field of international relations. He vividly analyzes the political scenario of the world after the First World War. We get many literary narratives that expose power politics among nations. William Faulkner, Ernest Hemingway, Ezra Pound, F. Scott Fitzgerald, James Henley, and Joanna Cannon are some of the novelists who wrote novels revealing wartime scenarios of the world.

While analyzing world politics some thinkers have given their views about the end of world politics. The concept of the end of history related to the neoliberal theories of globalization can also be the subject of the narrative works. Francis Fukuyama views that with the end of the Cold War, Western liberal democracy has been victorious. He claims, "What we may be witnessing is not just the end of the Cold War, or the passing of a particular period of post-war history, but end of history as such that is, the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government" (4). Supporting the concept of Fukuyama, Joel A. Johnson views, "liberal democracy is not for all peoples of all times, and it would be arrogant to assume otherwise. However, it does have a shot at being the best possible regime. The genre of literature most characteristic of the regime-novels-will help us determine that" (22).

Culture is a popular and powerful idea in International Relations. It is a fundamental conceptual tool to link events, issues, and problems in international relations. It has been important throughout the discipline's history. Julie Reeves claims, "The idea of culture has been and continues to be a fundamental conceptual tool enabling scholars to link events,

issues and problems, at the international level; it is the concept informing the narrative that links the events in international relations" (Reeves 10). Cultural relations are a worldwide conspectus of international affairs. Cultural relations have become an intrinsic part of the way governments and nations relate to one another. Literature performs the role of a bridge between nations.

Literary culture transcends national borderlines. T. M. Mitchel posits, "Writers are among the most rewarding participants in intellectual encounters, which often appear to score the greatest successes when the dialogue is between writers on opposite sides of a political barrier" (208). Through the works of the writers, we can enter and recognize a nation other than the birth nation. Translation of literary works also arouses concerns about cultural relations. In fact, "Cultural relations are . . . the best means devised by civilization for preventing international affairs from being governed by politics alone" (230). By using creative expression and exchanges of ideas, information, and people, cultural diplomacy increases mutual understanding. Cultural diplomacy is of great importance because diplomacy is related to official relations that the independent states show to each other. Such diplomacy cannot touch the lives of most people. Hence, the significance of cultural diplomacy can be taken as an alternative form of international relations. In Cynthia P. Schneider's view:

Cultural diplomacy emerges at times of crisis. But this should be a process of building bridges, not a one way street. Developing respect for others and their way of thinking- this is what cultural diplomacy does. . . . Cultural diplomacy saw its heyday during the Cold War, when The United States armed itself with Jazz, abstract expressionism, and modern literature.(192)

Cultural diplomacy is a key instrument to developing honour for others and their way of thinking. In that sense, it is a great means to respond to a crisis between two nations. He

further points out, "Artists, actors, musicians, and writers in any culture act as the national conscience, reflecting, often critically, of society" (193). The creative artifacts like film, music, and literature can bridge the cultural gaps. The power of art and the potential power of cultural diplomacy is the appeal to emotions. Artists and writers in any culture are the sources to work to express national conscience in society. The power of art, the power of cultural diplomacy is very much important in "building understanding, respect, and trust to alleviate [the] feeling of humiliation. (201). Cultural diplomacy helps with humility which can help build bridges between nations. Cultural diplomacy helps bring forward differences between cultures and it helps people of different nations to understand one another as well. In Schneider's view "During moments of tension and conflict . . . cultural diplomacy can emerge as an effective –and sometimes the only viable- means of communication. Creative expression crosses cultures, helping people from diverse backgrounds to find common ground" (196). Cultural diplomacy has great importance. In Pulitzer-prize-winning novelist Wole Soyanka's opinion, "art humanizes while politics demonizes" (quoted in Schneider 196). Art as a cultural artifact makes people more civilized.

Fukuyama presents evidence to suggest that there are two powerful forces at work in human history. He calls the one "the logic of modern science" and the other "the struggle for recognition". Over time, the economic "logic of modern science" together with the "struggle for recognition" led to the eventful collapse of tyrannies. He asserts, "The notion of the end of history is not an original one. Its best-known propagator was Karl Marx, who believed that the direction of historical development was a purposeful one determined by the interplay of material forces, and would come to an end only with the achievement of a communist Utopia that would finally resolve all prior contradictions" (4). He talks about fascism, communism and liberalism which are the topics related to International Relations. He searches for the implications of the end of history for international relations, and he predicts that the Third

World will be a terrain of conflict for many years to come. He further stresses, "Many of the wars and revolutions fought . . . in the name of ideologies . . . have a significant effect on the overall character of international relations" (14). These issues are best illustrated in literary narratives. The period between the end of the Cold War and the War on Terror is dubbed as a holiday from history. Writers like Michael Crichton, Alice Walker, Sue Townshend, Jonathan Coe, and dozens of others tried to paint that time with words.

Novels are essential tools to re-imagine a certain time period. Stuart Scheingold re-imagines the twentieth century with the help of the novel. He says the novel empowers "to reimagine the twentieth century and help us to anticipate the twenty-first" (1). In other words, they help us to reimagine the past and to remember the future. The novel is the "product of, and a window into the dispiriting calamities" of the time. Novels are literary imagination, and "the literary imagination has long been recognized as capturing the spirit and soul of the times" (2). Political novels have great significance in society because they tell the political story. Many of the political novelists in the twentieth century were revolutionary and they used their novels as a search for an authentic politics. We find the wedding of any ideology to literature in the political novel. It includes the dilemma of the political agency. He claims, "They focus on political actors and political regimes and privilege a politics of hope and struggle" (2). By referring to Irving Howe, the distinguished literary critic and public intellectual, Scheingold asserts that "the dual mission of a political novel is to illuminate the shortcomings of prevailing political order and to identify how best to transcend them" (8). Observing the significance of political novels, he claims that "novels of political estrangement thus constitute a new genre." He rightly says. "These novels raise questions about political legitimacy and social, cultural and economic foundations of the state and are of widely recognized literary merit" (24). The novels of literary merits may have political legitimacy.

The political novel is a wide-ranging study. Anti-war, holocaust, post-Nazi German situation, and the contradictions of liberal democracy are some of the chief subjects of the political novel of the twentieth century. It is an interdisciplinary study that can potentially pull together disparate scholarly audiences for the benefit of all. It puts literary, historical, and political modes of inquiry with one another, and has built the bridge. It reimagines the collective catastrophe of the twentieth century, the destabilization of democracies, the rise of totalitarianism, and our shaken faith in the promise of modernity. It illuminates the impact of political processes and shifting images of political agency on ordinary people. It helps us understand the past century and maybe the one ahead.

The relationship between politics and the novel is of great importance. Irving Howe makes a profound and original contribution to the understanding of the forces, creative and political, which have shaped the consciousness of twentieth century man. He says, "By a political novel I mean a novel in which the political milieu is the dominant setting" (17). In the political novel, the relation between politics and the novel is interesting enough to warrant investigation. In his view, "the political novel comes to be written-the kind in which the idea of society, as distinct from the mere unquestioned workings of society, has penetrated the consciousness of the characters in all of its profoundly problematic aspects, so that there is to be observed in their behavior, and they are themselves often aware of, some coherent identification" (19). The political novel is peculiarly a work of internal tensions. It includes human behavior and feeling and insoluble pallets of modern ideology. The conflict is inescapable. Yet it is precisely from this conflict that the political novel gains its interest and takes on the aura of high drama. Ernest Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms*, Joseph Heller's *Catch 22*, Russell Banks's *Continental Drift*, Imre Kertesz's *Fateless*, Sigfried Lenz's *The German Lesson*, Primo Levi's *If Not Now, When?*, Ralph Ellison's *The Invisible Man*, and Zadie Smith's *White Teeth* are to name a few the novels with political contents.

Language has great power which disguises politics. It plays a crucial function in world politics. In fact, language and writing style are inherently linked to politics. Orthodox International Relations (IR) theory has been dissented by post-modern International Relations thinkers who highlight the interrelationship between language, writing style, and politics. Instead of exploring many stylistic forms of dissent, Ronald Bleiker emphasizes the importance of poetry in re-conceptualizing world politics and International Relations (IR). He puts, "Poetry has the potential of subverting and unsettling the encroachment of dominant IR practices because, arguably, it is the most radical way of stretching, even violating the stylistic, syntactic and grammatical rules of linguistic conventions" (74). The form of poetry remains in its self-conscious existence by stretching language games. He mentions "A poem is a conscious transgression of existing linguistic conventions –a protest against an established language game and the system of exclusion that are embedded in it" (74). He mentions the power of poetry to describe reality because it provides different ways of perceiving what we already know. In his view "Poetry remains the most underrated and unexplored approach to re-conceptualizing world politics" (76). It helps us reconstruct the world with words. He claims, "Poetry can bring about a slow transformation of discursive and linguistic practices that gradually open spaces for more inclusive ways of perceiving and practicing IR" (76). He further argues, "Poetry, disenchanted concepts, aphorisms, and dialogue are only examples of stylistic devices that can be employed to forget, to resist the discursive domination of orthodox IR theory" (77). Poetry has the role of making International Relations more inclusive.

In the post-modern period, orthodox International Relations theory has been rethought through culture, ideology, mythology, and popular culture. International Relations theory depends on International Relations myths, and those International Relations myths can be investigated in the "other world" that are offered by films, architecture, photographs, poems,

novels and travel writings. International Relations describes our world (real world); popular culture (films, poems, novels, travel writing, photographs, and architecture) describes other worlds that are almost akin to our world. The International Relations myths help to describe how the world is, and how it ought to be. The major traditions and myths of International Relations theory are best narrated by Cynthia Weber in *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction*. She asserts that "different International Relations traditions rely upon very different International Relations myths in order to appear to be true" (xxiv). She mainly focuses on the major International Relations traditions (theories) of realism, idealism, constructivism, historical materialism, postmodernism, gender, and globalization. International Relations myths are the slogans of international politics, such as, "international anarchy is the permissive cause of war." International Relations myths help International Relations traditions to appear to be true. In Weber's view, "IR theory relies upon IR myths in order to transform its culturally produced stories about the world into common sense about the world that we take for granted" (4). Through International Relations myths, particular International Relations traditions appear to be universal, natural, and empirical. In other words, the myth function in International Relations theory is making a fact out of an interpretation (7). Weber thinks about International Relations theory in relation to "other worlds" to critically read the myth in them.

The cinematic world of the films also helps the International Relations theorists to critically read the "other worlds" and the myths in them. Weber argues, "Accessing visual culture through popular films allows us to consider the connections between IR theory and our everyday lives" (9). She further claims, "Popular films are not the only "other worlds" that can be used to interrogate IR mythmaking. Indeed, popular culture offers a wide range of additional "other worlds"- from video games to television shows to architecture and design to exhibitions to sporting events to photographs, poems, novels, and even travel writings" (12).

The use of popular films helps to show the everyday connection between the "popular" and "the political". Weber analyzes different trends and myths of International Relations theory through popular films like *Lord of the Flies*, *The Independence Day*, *Wag the Dog*, *Fatal Attraction*, *The Truman Show*, *Memento*, *East is East*, *WALL-E*, and *The Hunger Games*.

Each of these films selected illustrates the myth function in a particular International Relations myth. Weber puts:

*Lord of the Flies* reconsiders the realist/neorealist myth 'international anarchy is the permissive cause of war;' *Independence Day* looks at the idealist myth, 'there is an international society;' *Wag the Dog* offers insights into the constructivist myth 'Anarchy is what states make of it' and introduces us to the social constructivist/ post-structuralist debate; *Fatal Attraction* illustrates and critiques the gender myth 'gender is a variable' while exploring the gender/feminist debate; *The Truman Show* demonstrates how the neoliberal myth 'it is the end of history' makes neoliberal theories of globalization function at the expense of historical materialist theories of globalization; *Memento* explores how the neo-Marxist myth 'empire is the new world order' selectively remembers the neo-Marxist/ postmodernist debate; *East is East* questions the notion of "civilizations" upon which the myth 'there is a clash of civilizations' depends; *WALL-E* explores just how convenient or inconvenient combating human made climate change is, for whom, and with what environmental (and environmentalist) consequences; and *The Hunger Games* reconsiders the new anarchist understanding of debt and its new myth 'we are the 99 percent' (9-10).

Video games, television shows, architecture and design, art exhibitions, sporting events, photographs, poems, novels, and travel writings are also "the other worlds" that can be used to interrogate International Relations myth-making. "Like films, these works can offer us unique worlds that are close enough to our own to make sense to us, while different

enough from our own to allow us to think critically about how the myths they produce and circulate make their worlds and our worlds function” (12).

Weber describes International Relations traditions as ideologies and divides these ideologies into conscious ideologies and unconscious ideologies. Conscious ideologies are International Relations traditions and unconscious ideologies are International Relations myths. Conscious ideologies are realism, idealism, constructivism, socialism, feminism, ecologism, and vegetarianism and unconscious ideologies are "our common sense" ideologies that "go without saying," and are much less questioned. They are similar to cultural habits. Conscious and unconscious ideologies are circulated through stories. International Relations traditions are those stories that we recognize consciously whereas International Relations myths are those stories that we recognize unconsciously (6).

### **Literature Review: *For Whom the Bell Tolls***

*For Whom the Bell Tolls* provides a firsthand account of the Spanish Civil War which Hemingway experienced by serving as a war correspondent. In Sean Hemingway’s view, “His accounts both fictional and journalistic, represent an extraordinarily rich depiction of war as it evolved into the modern era” (2). He describes Ernest Hemingway’s rich depiction of the modern time. He asserts that war is the great theme of Ernest Hemingway. It is a main theme in the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, too. In Sean Hemingway’s view *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is a “story of loyalty and courage, love and defeat, and the tragic death of an ideal” (18). Sean Hemingway asserts various themes in the novel.

The novel has also been explained as a love story. Sinclair Lewis also views this novel as a “great love story” (qtd. in Oliver 146). He argues that the novel “might just possibly be a masterpiece, a classic, because here was a crystallization of world revolution that began long ago” (qtd. in Oliver 146-147). Lewis claims “When the reader actually smells the fighting, then freedom may become an activity to live for, to die for, and brotherhood

may become inevitable” (qtd. in Oliver 147). In Lewis’s view, the novel is about love, death, and brotherhood. Charles Oliver points out the lively life of the protagonist Jordan just before he dies. In Oliver’s view, the three days of the story help Jordan learn a great deal and he is intensely alive when he gets closer to death.

Hemingway’s *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is a great war novel that is performe an anti-war novel. Various critics have analyzed and explained different artistic and thematic issues and perspectives in the novel. Walter J. Slatoff views that Hemingway in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* supports the Loyalist side mainly “to call the cause of humanity” (142). He says that “Hemingway has achieved a high degree of honesty and artistic neutrality by emphasizing Loyalist as well as Fascist authorities and showing the humanity of various characters on the Fascist side” (142).

The novel has also been commented as “an over-expanded short story”. Philip Young says, “It is Hemingway’s inability to . . . convince his readers of the full and attentive sincerity of the hero’s ideals, that primarily keeps this novel from greatness” (qtd. in Moynihan 127). But William T. Moynihan asserts that the novel’s plot has so craftily been constructed that it depicts “a distinct type of human being, a man willing to die for a course, and from this specific type of character stems the ‘mighty theme’ of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, the oneness of mankind” (127). The hero overcomes all the obstacles on his way.

Jeffrey Meyers claims that the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* was attacked by communist critics for portraying the atrocities of the Left as well as Rights after its publication. In view of Alvah Bessie, a veteran of the Lincoln Brigade, “Hemingway had maligned the popular leader La Pasionaria, slandered the political commissar Andre Marty, and misrepresented Russia’s attitude toward Spain” (qtd. in Meyers 22). Bessie views, “He is found bad company in the company of his enemies, and the people’s enemies who will fawn upon him and use him, his great talents and his passion for the people’s cause, to traduce and

betray those talents and those people” (qtd. in Meyers 22). Hemingway’s depiction of the Spanish Civil War was not only praiseworthy, some of the critics of the time were blaming him for misguiding and manipulating the people of that time by misrepresenting the ideas related to the war.

Edmund Wilson views that “There is in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* an imagination for social and political phenomena such as he has hardly given evidence of before . . . what Hemingway presents us with in this study of the Spanish war is not so much a social analysis as a criticism of moral qualities” (qtd. in Meyers 22). Wilson mainly focuses on the moral qualities of the war.

Karen Engle thinks that *For Whom the Bell Tolls* considers “sexual violence in war to demonstrate that women’s role in war extends far beyond that of victim” (942). Two Women play important role in the guerrilla operations. These two women characters “play significant role in the story, and they express sexual and political power in war, including those told by many feminists” (945). He discusses sexual violence in war.

Linda Wagner-Martin expresses her view that the image of Robert Jordan depicted in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* changed American writing from 1940 to the Vietnam conflict. Though Robert Jordan remains with the members of the guerrilla band for three days, they become like a family to him and he lives as their member. Linda asserts that the novel is a tale of love and war. She claims “The Spanish Civil War often has since been characterized as representing democracy’s last chance to oppose European fascism so as to avert World War II” (163). The novel highlights the significance of the Spanish Civil War that occurred at the onset of World War II.

Linda Wagner Welshimer explains several themes in the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, “(1) the qualities of the common soldier, and of the Spanish peasant, (2) the relationship of the soldier to the military powers, and the peasant to his rulers; (3) the milieu

of war, and the acts it causes; (4) the conflict between private lives and public duty; and (5) Hemingway's most enduring theme, that of love, whether it be for person or for country" (545). In her view, there are three distinct stories that express these thematic interests: the stories of Robert Jordan and Maria, the story of Pilar and Pablo, and the story of Russians. The first story is of the lovers, Jordan and Maria; the second story is of the Spanish people, and the third story is of the political and military machine. The second story is of great importance because "in that story, Hemingway captures the spirit of the country trying to free itself through the conflict" (545).

Taking Arturo Baren as reference, John J. Teunissen asserts that the novel is unreal and untruthful. To justify the claim, he makes several important points:

First, that persons like Pablo and Pilar would never have emerged as the leaders of a band of guerrillas; second, that the scenes of mass murder and rape are grossly exaggerated and 'contrary to Spanish psychology'; third, that the love encounter between Robert and Maria is 'pure romanticizing', primarily because Hemingway does not understand the psychology of a Spanish girl of the rural middle class; and fourth that rendering of the language of the Spanish peasants into English is a 'curious translation, which is no real translation' at all. (53)

This romanticizing element places the novel in an old tradition having mythic element.

Teunissen calls the novel as an anti-historical novel. In the novel "topography becomes...topocosm" (54). Like so many mythical narratives, the novel begins and ends in the same place. In his view "the basic theme of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is not a political one; it is contained in the lyrics of the song gypsy sings early in the narrative: 'I had an inheritance from my father.' So has Robert Jordan" (56).

Gail D. Sinclair analyzes the novel from women's perspective and asserts that Pilar and Maria are two complex women in the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. In her view,

“Hemingway’s Iceberg principle applies to them as profoundly as it does to any other character” (94). Pilar is an aged unattractive woman who “stands in the difficult middle ground occupied by the very few Hemingway women” (94). On the other hand, Maria is an undeveloped selfless woman who fulfills male sexual fantasy. In Sinclair’s view, Maria is “Hemingway’s typically submissive female if only looking at the exposed tip of the iceberg” (95). Both Women represent endurance. Maria’s physical relationship with Robert Jordan furthers her healing process, and “Pilar is particularly instrumental in staging [the second] encounter, both through sexual instrument she offers Maria, and by providing a chance for intimacy after leaving them alone in the mountain heather” (110). In the mountain both of them experience the earth move beneath them and at that time they enter the realm of the mythical. Sinclair opines that “both women contribute significantly to Jordan’s achieved heroic status by novel’s end” (104). The activity of them justify that “Gender is not so oppositional or limiting, and even works to align these women with male counterparts in the code paradigm” (104). The androgynous quality of these three characters helps establish their similar states.

Natali Carter opines that Hemingway’s *For Whom the Bell Tolls* gives the picture of Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) that attracted both men and women who fought for various shades of fascism, anti-fascism, Marxism and Communism. Robert Jordan fights for anti-fascism who realizes that “the arbitrary butchery of war is not limited to one side, and that truly, there are no absolutes of good or bad, or right or wrong . . . in war” (6). Carter examines the war-time trauma. Many critics have depicted Maria as a submissive character, but Carter interprets Maria with trauma theory. She claims that Maria is one of Hemingway’s icebergs. On the surface “she is . . . docile, meek, and infuriatingly subservient. However . . . there is a much more interesting and complex identity under the surface . . . [She] is not obedient; she is an active fighter in a guerilla army. She is not silent, but she is consistently

silenced by those around her” (7). Mainly male combatants force her to take place the woman’s role as a domestic caretaker. But “she is most certainly not meek-she is a resilient survivor of multiple horrifying traumas” (7). In a real sense, she is a fighter. Carter opines, “Maria is associated with a unique combination of sexuality, the domestic sphere, and wartime trauma” (9). Her sheared hair is the visible marker of the trauma.

The damage to Maria is not only a personal one. Carter claims that “Maria is Hemingway’s clearest metaphor for the damage done to Spain during the nation’s civil war. Her viciously shaved head is symbolic of the violence done to the landscape of the nation, but the real injury lurks beneath the surface, in the psyches of Spanish citizens traumatized by the atrocities of war” (17). Maria represents virgin Spain; and her rape is the rape of virgin Spain itself. She survives the war, and she epitomizes the spirit of Spanish people. Carter says, “Even though she has been wounded by the war, still remains both her fighting spirit and her integrity, and thus represents what Hemingway saw as the best qualities of the Spanish people” (18). Like other survivors, she cannot recover all her own. So she needs the help of others. Pilar helps her earlier, and later she realizes that Jordan is the person who can help her. She “simply is victim pleading for understanding and assistance in overcoming the shame of her trauma” (27). So she easily falls in love with Jordan for her shelter.

Unlike in other novels, Hemingway in this novel uses the machinery of the epic mode. Brenner claims, “... his scant catalogue of the characteristics- timelessness, heroic allusions, heightened language and characterization-in-depth offers little beyond the subjective impression that Hemingway flirted casually with a few epic traits. A more rigorous analysis finds him superimposing camouflages, numerous epic traits” (592). The novel follows epic convention by incorporating different epic characteristics. The extended simile is a particular epic characteristic of the novel. Epic-sized extended periodicity is another epic characteristic of the novel. The next epic feature, in Brenner’s view, is *in medias res*. He comments,

“Robert Jordan’s reconnoitering of the road at the mountain pass which opens the novel is subsequent to past events revealed through flashback, Hemingway immediately flashbacks two nights earlier to Golz and Jordan’s discussion of the mission” (494). A single action that is whole and complete having a beginning, middle, and end like a single integrated organism is another epic dictum that the novel incorporates.

The use of Spanish and its formal translations elevates language to a heroic meter. Branner asserts, “Hemingway’s Stylistic play of using Spanish and rendering its formal translations is further consonant with epic characteristics. It adds the diversity, solemnity, and strangeness expected of epics, and it elevates language to a heroic meter” (495).

Improbability is an epic quality sought out by Aristotle. “Among other improbabilities in the novel, the most objectionable has been the character of Maria, her love at first sight romance with Jordan, and then ability to share in the near-mystical experience of making ‘the earth move’” (595). The theme of ‘universal concern’ is another epic feature that is found in the novel. Robert Jordan sacrifices his life for abstract beliefs and for the future of the race. The next epic quality is that “the hero be of heroic stature, of national and international importance and great historical or legendary significance” (497). Robert Jordan approximates such a hero. After analyzing epic features in the novel, Brenner concludes that the novel “leaves an adventuresome author’s modern experiment in an ancient mode” (504).

Hemingway in modern times uses the mode of ancient epic.

The recapitulation of the critical studies reviewed above justifies that the critics have mainly focused their studies on different themes of the novel like war, love, gender, loyalty, courage, brotherhood, trauma, and causes of humanity. The critic Sean Hemingway, a grandson of Ernest Hemingway, asserts war as the main theme of the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. He views it is a story of “loyalty and courage, love and defeat, and the tragic death of an ideal” (18). Sinclair Lewis views that the novel is about love, death, and brotherhood.

He also asserts that the fighting in the novel is for freedom. In Charles Oliver's opinion, the novel is about the lively life of the protagonist Robert Jordan. Walter J. Slatoff claims that the novel calls for the cause of humanity. He provides some evidence from the novel and points out that Hemingway agrees in killing others in necessary. William T. Moynihan talks about the plot that has craftily been constructed that expresses the mighty theme of oneness of mankind in the novel. He praises the idealistic purpose of the protagonist Jordan. Garry Bernner claims Hemingway as an experimental writer who used the machinery of the epic mode. Jeremy Meyers claims that the novel portrays atrocities of the Rights and Lefts during the Civil War. Alvah Bessie views that the novel misrepresents some of the leaders during the Spanish Civil War. He also views that the love between Jordan and Maria is highly romanticized. Edmund Wilson argues that Hemingway in this novel gives his imagination for social and political phenomena instead of extensive social analysis. Linda Martin Wagner reads the novel as a tale of love and war. She highlights the image of Robert Jordan created in the novel that affected American writing from 1940 to the Vietnam War. Linda Welshimer Wagner discusses the themes of the novel. Linda talks about various themes in the novel like war, duty, and love. She also focuses on distinct stories that express different themes of the novel. Karen Engle discusses sexual violence in war. He asserts that the two female characters, Pilar and Maria, express sexual and political power in war. Gail D. Sinclair who focuses his study on two female characters Pilar and Maria, says that the iceberg principle applies to them profoundly. Natali Carter agrees that the novel gives the picture of the Spanish Civil War. She examines the war-time trauma and interprets Maria with trauma theory. Gerry Bernner comments that Hemingway is an experimental writer, and he takes the novel as an example of experimentation. He makes extensive study of the use of the machinery of epic mode. He analyses different epic characteristics and features developed by Aristotle that are found in the novel. John J. Teunissen asserts that the novel is unreal, untruth

and exaggerating. He argues that the romanticizing element places the novel in an old tradition having mythic element. After reviewing these previously done studies on the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* it is justified that the questions raised for this research have not been answered and further research in this novel is justifiable.

### **Literature Review: *The Honorary Consul***

Different critics have analyzed different aspects of *The Honorary Consul*. Beatriz Valverde claims that the novel intends political change with the help of armed conflicts and revolution. In his view, the novel treats “the role of revolution and armed conflict in the process of political change in society” (128). Valverde finds that “Greene rewards topia in his narrative” (128). In the novel, Leon Rivas shows his disloyalty towards a corrupt society and goes in search of a more equal society.

In Robert Hoskins’s view, *The Honorary Consul* is a novel with a serious tone ending excitedly with suspense and violent action. It is the novel that presents an elusive borderline between fiction and reality that shows negative images of the author. Hoskins also discusses the role of some of the characters in the novel. The protagonist doctor Eduardo Plarr has a good reading habit. Hoskins observes, “As a young reader he was like ‘foreigners’ in substituting fiction for reality by viewing contemporary England through the perspective of Dickens’s novels” (215). When he becomes mature he reads a novel written by Jorge Julio Saavedra, one of his patients. He finds the book heavily loaded with melancholy style and “full of the spirit of machismo.” In Hoskins’s view the novelist Saavedra is a substantial character in the novel “who in certain superficial ways is rather like Greene himself but on the whole is quite different aesthetically and philosophically” (217). In other words, Saavedra is the anti-self of Greene, the artist. He further puts, “If there is something resembling a self-portrait in Consul, however, it arises only indirectly, through a character, who, superficial resemblances to the author notwithstanding, seems intended to reminders of what the author

is not” (218). Through the mouth of Saavedra the novelist expresses his own world view. Hoskins claims, “Saavedra’s judgments about literary art and methods reflect ironically upon Greene’s” (221). Hoskins also expresses, “*The Honorary Consul* is often referred to as a ‘political novel’, and while that description is not a misnomer, it is equally correct to describe the work as a mature expression of Greene’s continuing concern with the nature of love” (222). The novel presents “a serious consideration of love that is conducted primarily through the consciousness of Eduardo Plarr” (224). Eduardo has skepticism about the nature of love. Hoskins puts “Plarr has had affairs but has never loved; to say that he stands in relationship to love as an atheist does to religion would not distort the emphasis of the narrative, for Greene presents Plarr’s inability to love as a problem of belief” (224). In contrast to Eduardo’s love, Charlie Fortnum’s is characterized by charity, sympathy, kindness and affection. His love is also “distinguished by the absence of the obsessive jealousy” (228). Hoskins concludes, “Upon discovering that he has been cuckolded by Plarr, Charley would like to hate his friend but finds that he cannot; even in his anger and hurt he regards the younger man as something like a son. Instead of hatred he displays, to his friend and especially to his errant wife, the kind of loyalty” (228). His unselfish love provides perfection in the love between Clara and Plarr.

Michael G. Brennan compares the novel with political theology. He describes the political commitment of a Christian in an unjust society mentioned in the novel. He asserts that Greene’s “creative focus increasingly centers upon the doomed political activism of Father Leon Rivas” (131). He claims that Rivas is a Catholic priest, “But through the injustices of the political system in Paraguay Rivas is now alienated from the traditional securities of his Catholic faith” (131). Now he is an ex-priest. He rejects joyful lifestyle of archbishop because he is greatly affected by the sufferings of the poor from malnutrition and starvation. He believes that “communion wine seeks an unobtainable luxury in Paraguay and

Rivas concludes ‘Why could we not use water in the sacraments? He used it at Cana’” (132). The poor in Paraguay were as poor as they ever were and the rich were unchallenged. Greene accuses religion and politics of this situation. He claims, “Contemporary religious and secular philosophies seem to have portrayed the common people and Rivas bitterly concludes that he is now no more interested in the Catholic Church than in Marxism: ‘The Bible is as unreasonable to me as *Das Kapital*’” (133). Rivas has been alienated from his Catholic faith because of the injustices of the political system in Paraguay. Analyzing the transformed condition of Rivas Brennan puts, “Emphasizing that a priest is no more than a witness at a marriage, Rivas explains to Plarr how he and his wife Marta had merely made [their] vows to each other and that he had decided to marry when he lost his faith since a man must have something to guard” (132). His strong Christian-Socialist compassion is for his fellow citizens and the poor. Rivas finds wrong with the Gospels mainly in Paraguay. Brennan concludes that Rivas believes “they no longer make sense . . . anyway not in Paraguay. He denounces the luxurious lifestyle of the archbishop when the poor suffer from malnutrition and wonders what use a Communion host can be to a starving child who desperately needs a nourishing chipa” (132). Brennan presumes that Mother Church has abandoned Rivas. He claims, “From Rivas’s perspective, his mother Church has abandoned him and the poor of this blighted country” (133). Brennan asserts “Contemporary religious and secular philosophies seem to have betrayed the common people and Rivas bitterly concludes that he is now no more interested in the Catholic church than in Marxism” (133). In Brennan’s thinking the great influence in the thought is “Thomas Hardy who supplies the title page epigraph for *The Honorary Consul*: ‘All things merge into one another- good into evil, generosity into justice, religion into politics’” (133). Brennan concludes the idea by quoting Mark Bosco:

The end of the novel emphasizes two places in which the religious and the political imagination intersect; hope and love. Human hope can ground political belief only when it is experienced in a personal commitment to others, and human love has a stake not only in creating communities of commitment but also in the evolutionary union of humanity with God. Instead, love is the transcendent signifier in the novel that keeps human action focused on correct practice. (135)

*The Honorary Consul* exposes the political evils of the time. At that time Paraguay was under the cruel ruling of General Stroessner. With American support, Stroessner was ruling the nation tyrannically. He was full of greed and lust for power. His ruling was suppressing Paraguayan people brutally and denying their basic human rights. Eduardo Galeano precisely gives a vignette about Stroessner's cruelty:

Paraguay, or the little that is left of Paraguay after so much war and plunder, belongs to General Alfredo Stroessner. Every five years this veteran colleague of Somoza and Franco holds elections to confirm his power. So that people can vote, he suspends for twenty-four hours Paraguay's eternal state of siege. Stroessner believes himself invulnerable because he loves no more. The state is him. Every day, at precisely 6:00 pm, he phones the president of the Central Bank and asks him: 'How much did we make today?' (qtd. in Gordon 27)

Political writers feel anger towards the tyrannical rules of despotic rulers, but they express their anger in abstraction. Ernest Hemingway was angry for the despotic ruling of General Franco of Spain in 1930s, so he forcefully condemned the bad works of Franco and expressed his desire for democracy and freedom by taking the side of revolutionary groups of Spain in the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, and he also appeals the reader to join in the fight against fascism. Similarly, Graham Greene expresses his desire for democracy and freedom by taking the side of revolutionary groups in the novel *The Honorary Consul*. Though he does not

directly mention the name of the despotic ruler Alfredo Stroessner, he condemns his cruel ruling in Paraguay.

J. P. Kulshrestha asserts that the novel is full of political views and actions. It deals with various themes. In his view:

[The novel] deals with human dilemmas, conflicts, and contradictions that are not confined to a particular period of history. Once again Greene raises the questions of good and evil, power and justice, religion and politics. These themes are suggested by the epigraph taken from Thomas Hardy; men who are good are led to do evils, those who are generous are driven to destroy others in their relentless pursuit of justice, and those who are religious are forced into political action. (169)

In the novel, Greene invents an Argentinian novelist Jorge Julio Saavedra who has certain views on writing novels that reverse to the concepts of Greene expressed in the novel *The Honorary Consul*. The novel deals with the subject of politics and is set in the immediate past. Kulshrestha views, “novelists generally fight shy of a subject so strictly placed in the present, but Greene’s novel emphasizes the relation of his art to contemporary social and political phenomena” (168). Greene’s novel refutes Saavedra’s criticism. Kulshrestha concludes:

He proposes to write a political novel for which he would not like to use the material which might date soon. . . . He wants to write a novel of ‘lasting value’, so that he would be read by the readers in the twenty-first century. The writer must stand at some distance from his subject. Saavedra says: ‘Assassinations, kidnappings, the torturers of prisoners- these belong to our decade. But I do not want to write for the seventies.’ And he goes on: ‘A poet-the true novelist must always be in his way a poet- a poet deals in absolutes. Shakespeare avoided the politics of his time, the minute of politics. . . . A novelist today who wants to represent tyranny should not

describe the activities of General Stroessner in Paraguay-that is journalism not literature.’ (169)

Saavedra is not interested on what Greene has done in the novel because it deals with the current activities happening in the decade. In spite of its topicality, Kulshrestha views that this novel is the novel Saavedra would have wished to write because, “It deals with human dilemmas, conflicts and contradictions that are not confined to a particular period of writing” (169).

Maria Couto highlights two issues in *The Honorary Consul*: Religion and politics. In her view though they are traditionally antagonistic, they are combined together in the novel. Couto claims, “Greene’s work integrates religious, social and political elements to create a composite view of life in the world in which freedom, justice and a spiritual dimension to life are imperatives” (67). Freedom, justice and a spiritual dimension are in balance in his writing.

Murray Roston describes the narrative strategies used by Greene in *The Honorary Consul*. Roston analyzes the filial relationship in the novel. In his opinion, the father-child relations theme functions entirely differently. He opines:

. . . the relationship is examined here not from the father’s angle but from the offspring’s- not as an impulse to act paternally but in terms of a son’s antipathy, affection, or contempt for an absent father, for a parent remembered only from the period of childhood, yet whose memory continues well into adulthood to exert a powerful influence on the son’s character and way of life. (126)

The theme is broadened here in secular terms. In the novel, almost all characters are obsessed with the filial relationship. Roston analyzes the rejected paternity in the novel. The main characters’ activities are affected by their unconscious longing to their fathers. To justify this longing, he refers to a saying of Plarr “we all of us seem to live with dead fathers” (134).

Roston confirms that the catholic theme is also great in the novel. He observes, “It emerges

very late in the novel, but its effect is to produce retrospective reverberations, revealing religious aspects of a work that had seemed entirely secular” (134). He clarifies it referring to the condition of Leon Rivas who leaves the career of priesthood and is involved in marriage, but his religious calling “emerges into prominence towards the close of the novel” (134). Roston concludes, “. . . it is not Christianity itself that Leon has left; he has only deserted the version of Christianity represented by the established Church of his day” (136). Leon Rivas criticizes the religious practice that was in use at that time.

Neil McEwan gives his view about writing style of Graham Greene. He claims, “Greene has said that in drawing from life one must always change something” (19). He further refers, “Greene has complained that real-life models for fiction cramp his imagination” (29). His mouth speak Saavedra “defends his neglect of current affairs with the argument that Shakespeare did not deal with political events of his own time. . . . Saavedra is afraid to write about the 1970s because, like Shakespeare, he aims at posterity” (19). McEwan also explains the nature of the novel. By analyzing the role of one of the central characters Father Leon Rivas, he concludes that the book appears to be a tragi-comedy in the story of Father Leon Rivas. He lives in two desperate, incompatible faiths of politics and religion. McEwan observes Father Leon Rivas:

Unwilling to preach the virtues of poverty to parishioners even poorer than he is, or to serve Mass before people who cannot afford to drink wine, he has become a ‘*politico*’. Suspended from his ‘faculties’ as a priest, he has married himself to a simple, pious girl called Marta, and he now leads a terrorist gang which has crossed into northern Argentina planning to kidnap the American Ambassador and ‘exchange’ him for political prisoners in Paraguay. (105)

He gets into a ridiculous predicament as a priest guerilla after he has realized the poor condition of parishioners.

McEwan also talks about the setting of the novel. He refers to the hut where the Consul is held as a central stage. He asserts, “Greene has commented on this as the ‘logical conclusion’ of an impulse in all his novels to ‘escape the vast liquidity of the novel’ and direct the characters as though in a play” (106). Though there are various other places elsewhere in which various actions take place, the conversations in the hut are of great importance because they dramatize the ironic center of the novel.

Critics call Graham Greene a ‘Catholic novelist’. Mark Bosco analyses Graham Greene’s Catholic imagination developed in *The Honorary Consul*. Commenting on Greene’s faith on God expressed in his novels Bosco asserts, “Indeed Greene illustrates that one’s faith and belief in god is as treacherous a place as the world of politics and espionage” (“The Power” 52). Greene’s novels have been criticized by both secularist as well as catholic critics. Bosco concludes, “Critics who show a secularist prejudice have claimed that Greene’s Catholic novels show little originality and rely on religious dogmas as a device merely to heighten the melodramatic effects of his stories into a contrived seriousness” (52). Bosco views, “Catholic critics were hesitant to accept Greene’s Catholic imagination during his most ‘catholic’ period of his career” (52). Bosco believes that the catholic imagination in the later novels of Greene is deviated from the catholic imagination that he uses in his earlier novels. He observes:

Greene’s ironic stance toward the use of theological categories in these later novels does not remove the issues of faith and belief from them, but transposes them into political and social concerns in which justice, salvation, even the mystery of divine grace might be manifested. Where Catholicism was more monolithic in his earlier novels, it now becomes part of a dialogue with the contemporary situations of his texts. (55)

After a sincere observation, Bosco gives his argument for Greene's catholic imagination. He asserts, "In effect, Greene found in Catholicism a doctrinal and imaginative discourse that was compatible with his earliest experiences and gave him some critical objectivity in crafting the contours of his own creativity. Whether as a novelist, playwright, journalist or essayist, Greene demonstrates that Catholicism gave him a point of view throughout his long career" (57). In *The Honorary Consul* Greene returns to the thematic material- religious faith- of his earlier novels. The character Plarr "is Greene's incarnation of the doubting thrust into conversation from unbelief to tentative belief" (*Catholic Imagination* 110). On the other hand next character "Leon is a militant revolutionary who preaches a gospel of freedom from both the tyranny of institutional church as well as from her alliance with capitalism and despotic regimes" ("The Power" 67). Despairing of his own reflectiveness as a priest, he leaves it, marries a peasant woman and becomes an amateur rebel. Greene captures in Father Leon "the religious upheaval in Latin America and the development of liberation theology that occurred after the Vatican council" (67). Bosco finds doctrine of Christ in the novel, but he views, it "is rendered more in terms of the human struggle for justice" (*Catholic Imagination* 115). He further confirms, "The theological and political vision of the novel is most clearly expressed in the formalized dialogue between Father Leon and Dr. Plarr. Leon explains to Plarr that he followed his conscience against the outright hypocrisy and complicity of the institutional church, and left its trappings of privilege and social position" ("The Power" 69). He also observes that according to Leon, "Since god . . . has a 'day side' of goodness and 'night side' of evil, God needs humanity in order for God to evolve into complete goodness" (*Catholic Imagination* 116). Bosco argues that hope and love are two places where religious and political imagination intersect each other. Bosco points out, "Greene weaves together Catholicism and Marxism as interpretive discourses to understand the human factor in the struggle for liberation" (117). The novel in this way expresses the ongoing development of

Greene's religious imagination. Theology and politics are in continuous dialogue in the imaginative world created by Greene in *The Honorary Consul*.

Judith Adamson analyses the activities of a once-religious figure Leon Rivas who leaves church to carry out his liberationist ideas. She gives justification on why Rivas left his religious practice. She views, "He argued that since the church had lost touch with the world as it is by allying itself with murderous leaders, he had been forced to take political action involving technically sinful acts in order to behave morally" (173-74). But Judith claims, "Leon's cause is just, yet he is a political failure" (174). He fails through political indecision. He is a revolutionary, but he has failed. By studying the condition of Rivas, Judith gives her view about Greene's intention of writing. She claims "Though he has always been sympathetic to the underdog, he has never given us a full blown revolutionary. Moreover, those revolutionaries he has created have all failed" (175). In the novel Rivas becomes failure. He happens to be muddled between religion and politics. Neither he totally respects the church nor can he leave it entirely and make a human-centered social organization. Though the novel seems to be revolutionary, Adamson asserts, "The narrative equation breaks down in *The Honorary Consul* as the Christian part of the balance overrides the Marxist" (177). In Adamson's assumption, the novel is not about revolutionaries. She claims, "If the revolutionaries fail in their immediate political goal, however, the book is not really about them. It is about the passing on of the spirit of revolution Greene takes to be Christian" (178). The novel mentions the revolutionary spirit in the Christians and describes the mixing between religion and politics.

Elliot Malamet judges the nature of *The Honorary Consul*. In his view it is not only a popular or serious art, Greene uses meta-fictional methods in this work. He also asserts the novel as a post-modern artifact. Self-reflectivity and overtly parodic intertextuality are the features that help us to characterize this novel as a post-modern work. He sums up, "*The*

*Honorary Consul* is a model case of Greene's method of integrating various hybrids of mystery writing while maintaining an underlying self-commentary of the value of those materials" (110). In Malamet's view, the novel is a detective story that incorporates the violent tale of machismo as a symbol. He opines, "As a literary tradition, the tale of machismo surfaces in *The Honorary Consul* as a kind of stereotypical thriller or detective story manque, a violent genre subject to formulaic repetition, with predictable narrative twists and simplified characterizations" (115). The tale of machismo also categorizes the novel as a kind of stereotypical thriller.

The recounting of the critical studies mentioned above confirms that the critics have mainly concentrated their studies on the religiopolitical nature of the novel, the role of the characters, and the themes of conflict, revolution, machismo, love, human dilemma, filial relationship and search for a more equal society. The critic Beartiz Valvade claims that the novel intends the political change and tries to make the world a virtuoso one. Next critic Robert Hoskin examines that the novel presents an elusive borderline between fiction and reality. Michael G. Brenham takes the novel as a political theology in which the religious and the political imagination intersect. J. P. Kulshrestha also asserts that the novel is full of political views and actions. Maria Cuto observes that religion and politics are combined in the novel. Murray Roston mentions the filial relationship in the novel. In his observation, almost all characters are obsessed with the filial relationship. He also asserts the Catholic theme as a great theme. Another critic Neil McEvan mentions the real-life model of writing style used by Greene in the novel. Mark Bosco calls Greene a Catholic novelist because the novel asserts Greene's faith in God. He further claims that Greene weaves together Catholicism and Marxism as interpretive discourses to understand the human factor in the struggle for liberation. Judith Adamson analyzes the protagonist character Leon Rivas as a political failure. She also talks about revolutionary ingredients in the novel. Elliot Malamet

discusses the nature of the novel and observes it as a meta-fiction. Malamet also claims that the novel is detective fiction that incorporates the violent tale of Machismo as a symbol. After observing these previously done studies on the novel *The Honorary Consul*, it is justifiable that the questions raised for this research have not been answered. Hence, here remains the justification for further research.

### **Literature Review: *Shalimar the Clown***

*Shalimar the Clown* is a great postmodern novel written after the 9/11 events by Salman Rushdie, an Indian-born British-American novelist. Many of his novels are set on the Indian subcontinent. Magic realism, historical accounts, connections, disruptions, and migrations are some of the issues that his writings deal with. Many critics have commented on this veritable artwork from different perspectives.

Damian Grant views, “*Shalimar the Clown* returns to a more recognizable fictional formula for Rushdie, with a mixture of myth, magic, documentary record and historical concoction (including imaginary conversations with historical figures) served up with some postmodern panache in order to portray the ‘rape of Kashmir’ in the second half of the twentieth century” (158). Grant talks about the reason that inspired Rushdie to write this novel. He asserts, “[the] overlaying of ancient Kashmir with modern America allows Rushdie to juxtapose a world of wooden huts and tents and the first TV in town with the world of luxury apartments, Bentleys and TV studios; and the further flashback to Max Ophuls’ past in war-torn Europe links the Nazi experiment and the concentration camp, to the Madrasa, the terrorist training camps across the Kashmiri border” (158-159). In Grant’s view, Rushdie portrays two worlds: one advanced and the next lagging behind.

The novel keeps Rusdie’s childhood memories about Kashmir. The fact is that he is of Kashmiri descent, his maternal grandparents lived there and as a child, he spent many a summer there with his family. In Sreyoshi Sarkar’s observation the novel “is primarily a

political thriller that shows how its protagonist Shalimar metamorphoses from the local theater clown to a trained terrorist” (25). It also includes “stories of the socio-political tensions pervading Kashmir and Pachigam” (25). Sarkar finds the processes of ‘worlding’ in *Shalimar the Clown*. It includes seminal sites of ‘worlding.’ According to Sarkar:

The conflict violence is discussed in more nuanced ways in the novel’s ‘worlding’ of the three acts of genocide it describes. The first is the Jewish Holocaust which takes away the lives of Max’s parents in 1940s Stresborg. The second is the terrorizing, murder and forced exodus of the Hindu Kashmiri pandits by Islamic terrorizing organizations backed by the Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) in 1989. The third is the harassment and incarceration of local Kashmiri Muslim population by Indian army personnel under orders of the Indian political echelon. (28-29)

He concludes, “Rushdie’s strategies of ‘worlding’ produce compelling political elegy of Kashmir and powerfully confront post-9/11 Islamophobia across the world” (32).

Kavita Daiya points out that the novel does two different things, “First, it prefers a crucial intervention in normative narratives of nationalist accounts of the Kashmir conflict by witnessing and protesting against the often erased episode of the forced exodus of Kashmiri pandits. Second, it makes visible relentlessly the Indian state’s failure and apathy towards protection and rehabilitation of displaced Kashmiris” (qtd. in Sarkar 29). Daiya highlights the normative narrative of national accounts of the Kashmir conflict and the Indian state’s failure towards protection and rehabilitation of displaced Kashmiris.

The novel is rich in the workings of different cultures as well as the insights into foreign cultures. According to Andrew Traverson, the novel “suggests a new development to the extent that it fuses the interest in US-led globalization . . . with the sustained focus on a South Asian national experience . . .” (207). Rushdie takes the state of Kashmir as his principle subject matter, and presents two Kashmir protagonists, Shalimar Noman and

Boonyi Kaul, as mirrors of a post-independence Kashmir. Traverson thinks that the novel is “the symbol of the inherent weakness of the US-led efforts to establish a global political and economic consensus in the wake of the Second World War” (218). It shows the failure of American diplomacy. After the Cold War, some Western intellectuals like Samuel Huntington formed the belief in the triumph of capitalist liberal democracy over a centrally controlled ruling system. But Teverson asserts “US machinations against Russia during the Cold War have also brought new forms of history into being that were now bearing fruit in regions such as Afghanistan and Kashmir” (218). It puts forward the evolution of new ideologies of conflict in South Asian politics. He further says that the novel “can clearly be read as an allegory of America’s relationship with what Rushdie calls... ‘the back yards of the world’” (219). Traverson also ponders over Rushdie’s intention of writing the novel *Shalimar the Clown*. He views “By dwelling on the atrocities of fascism, Rushdie’s novel asserts the need to recognize the honourable, even utopian, intentions behind the postwar allied efforts to impose a global consensus” (220). Nazi atrocities demanded the creation of a ‘new world order’, various international organizations were also established for the betterment of the world. But Traverson views “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 and by forces more pragmatic and cynical” (220). He claims “More subtly Rushdie is arguing that, while the US lacks 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” (221). Traverson sees the working of America’s new-imperial activities in the novel.

Traverson also talks about the magic realist aspect of the novel. He claims, “the novel also features its share of magic realist whimsies: the man who can hear colours, the preacher

who is made of iron, giant marmot-like treasure-hunting ants, and (and at again) telepaths who can read each other's minds (222). He also gives ideas about the effects of globalization. According to him, globalization has "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" (222-223). He asserts that the most striking feature of the novel is "the effectiveness with which Rushdie conveys his sense of outrage at the systematic slaughter carried out in Pachtigam by both Islamic insurgents and the Indian army" (224). He further says the novel is "a plea to the Indian army not to exploit the situation in Kashmir, a plea to moderate Muslims to seek to reform their religion, and a plea to European and North American politicians to create a global political context that helps rather hinders their progress" (225). The novel is a plea for correction of the activities done in Kashmir by concerned authorities.

In *Shalimar the Clown* a controversial postmodern writer Salman Rushdie subverts the historiography of Kashmir. Singh et al. view that Rushdie has "focused on Kashmir and narrated its history of the hardline clique of a brand separatist politics that sees the 'Kashmir Issue' as an unfinished agenda of petition in the Post-independent era" (502). In the novel Rushdie discusses the ambiguous gender role of a woman in Kashmir issue. Singh et al. assert:

With the face of a woman, the gem for the power scramble between India, Pakistan and vested foreign interests, Rushdie beneath the historiography, played a different politics of representing the feminist issues and tried to show Kashmir within a lens of a woman struggling for self-empowerment and freedom. Thus in the narrative the protagonist Boonyi Kaul becomes the mouthpiece of Kashmir's struggle to retain the ingenuity of the land and people. (503)

Singh et al. re-narrates the history of Kashmir. They opine, “In this novel Rushdie changed his course of writing and determinately focused on Kashmir and narrated its history of the headline clique of a brand of separatist politics that sees the ‘Kashmir Issue’ as an unfinished agenda of partition in the post-independent era” (502). The loss of the paradise position of Kashmir is symbolically mixed with the loss of freedom and autonomy of women. In the novel resolute women like Boonyi Kaul, India, Firdas Noman, Hasina Yambarzal defy their constructions by society to achieve their own achievements.

Yuma Siddiqu asserts, “Rushdie uses elements of the crime thriller, sensation fiction, and noir, to explore the bloodier dimensions of globalization: new-imperialism, genocidal violence, Islamic militancy, global discourses, and practices of terrorism and anti-terrorism” (295). This novel is very much helpful “to Islamic terrorism, and the United States’ exercise of global power” (295). In an interview the writer Salman Rushdie puts it, “This is a book about a person who starts out sweet and ends up ferocious. And the question is not only why but how. How, in an individual life, can someone begin as a person who would not hurt a fly and end up being someone who cheerfully slits people’s throats and cuts their heads off? And the book tries to answer that question” (qtd. in Siddiqu 295). In an interview with Grades Rushdie says, “the character Shalimar picks up the gun not just because his heart gets broken, but because his pride and honour by losing the woman he loves to a worldly man of greater consequence and power. That is what leads him down the path to slashing an American ambassador” (quoted in Siddiqu 303). The killing is a ‘gendered politics of wounded masculinity’. The novel’s allegorical relationship to politics refers to “the Indian Subcontinent’s past and present relationship to the West, and specifically to the hegemony of the colonial British and global American empires” (304). Siddiqu views: “In *Shalimar the Clown* Rushdie maps some of the possibilities of cosmopolitanism. Kashmiriyat, for example, serves as the basis for vernacular cosmopolitanism. The name Max Ophuls represents a

European model of cosmopolitanism” (304). He is an allegorical figure of Western power broker-ship.

Pei-Chen Liao mentions the aesthetics of the uncanny in *Shalimar the Clown*. He points out that the novel “depicts the world full of and the transformation of Muslim clown into a terrorist” (23). He claims that the novel depicts the post-9/11 world vividly. He views, “[A] close reading of *Shalimar the Clown* reveals that 9/11 in fact exists in the novel almost without really existing” (25). Shalimar in America is uncanny when he kills Max. Liao points out that familiarity can also create uncanny situations. He says, “In the novel, like the US counterterrorism and the holocaust, the communal violence in Kashmir arouses the feeling of the uncanny in the sense that the enemy is not a complete stranger but someone whom one knows and has been familiar with” (40). Liao also claims the novel as political. He asserts, “The novel represents [. . .] a world political history of violence in the West and East, including the World Trade Centre bombings, the Cold War, the Holocaust, and the post-partisan turmoil in Kashmir. These events may seem irrelevant to each other on the surface, but, in Rushdie’s novel, they uncannily provide a reflection on and of terrorism in its various forms and contexts” (41). Liao also claims that uncanny terror is aroused by not only the narrative of political events but also the personal stories of the characters. This type of uncanny terror indicates a rethinking of the question of violence and identity.

Sucheta M. Choudhuri claims that *Shalimar the Clown* highlights the unrest in Kashmir with the Holocaust history. He also points out the personal and political resentment of the protagonist Shalimar. He asserts “Shalimar’s personal resentments launches his quest of Max Ophuls, the resistance hero who seduces his wife Boonyi. However, Shalimar’s quest is magnified into his involvement with the larger political project of the insurgents demanding independent Kashmir” (1). He further posits that the narrative of the novel “continually blurs the dividing between the personal and the political” (2). In his view it is

done by Shalimar who “merges his hunt for Maximillion Ophuls- the American Ambassador to India in the late sixties who had seduced and carried off his wife Boonyi-with the larger project of the liberation of Kashmir, to which end he becomes an initiate in Pan-Islamic insurgent groups” (2). In other words, his personal resentment is magnified by his involvement with the Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front. Choudhuri further asserts, “The resentment that fuels the regressive narrative of *Shalimar the Clown*, however, is entirely personal, and its connection to the unfolding of the historical narrative in the nature of history itself” (6). He concludes, “the novel is an ironic and somewhat flippant restatement of the cliché of history repeating itself” (6).

Annabella Pitkin reviews the significance of the prose style of Rushdie in *Shalimar the Clown*. She mentions, “Rushdie’s prose is usually over the top, jammed with adjectives, clauses, asides, and puns, the flow sometimes serving to obscure the character’s lack of a conventional novelistic inner life” (257). She uses inward gazing style; it has also power for social commentary. He further puts, “the writing begins to feel, in fact, like reportage, like bulletins from a front. Perhaps this exactly what Rushdie intends” (257). The novel also seems to be a sort of war bulletin. Pitkin claims that real interest of Rushdie “is reserved in this book for the descent of Kashmir into international and state-sponsored violence” (257). She also gives her view about Rushdie’s depiction of the lost Kashmir. She says, “The lost Kashmir of *Shalimar the Clown* can also be seen as a model for the ordinary yet remarkable capacities of human societies to include and accommodate many historical strands and varieties of people and to handle conflicts (mostly) without violence” (259). Pitkin also talks about the universal nature of geopolitical consequences that causes Rushdie “to include a long section of the Nazi destruction of the Jews of Alsace and the saga of Max Ophuls’s actions in the French Resistance” (261).

Maurice O'Conner gives a way to how paradise-like Kashmir changed into an unrest place, a playground for terrorists. He views that it was the intention of the colonial administration to leave Kashmir in indecisive condition "to counteract the growing influence of the Indian Congress" (211). He talks about Kashmiriyat which was in use in Kashmir once in the past. But it becomes a victim because of the decision of the society due to the external forces. He asserts "This forced move from a categorical identity formation by both the Hindu and Muslim population of the valley results in the exclusion of the 'other' from their constructed collective identity" (215-216). The inter-communal cooperation collapses. O'Conner puts it, "Shalimar, in this respect, brings to life the unavoidable inclusion of Kashmir within a violent geopolitical struggle and the subsequent collapse of this military strategy of inter-communal co-operations" (216). The Kashmiriyat at last becomes a communal tragedy. In O'Conner's view, "The tragic irony is that Shalimar, the former personification of Kashmiriyat, becomes a pawn within the trans-geographical space of mujahadin, and unable to forgive, takes away Boonyi's life and (because of his assassin to Ophuls) has his own taken away from him in a double act of futility" (217). The novel is not only the personal tragedy of Boonyi and Shalimar, but also a communal tragedy. The novel "reaches beyond the frontiers of nation to show the local transgresses the structures of the nation state and is interconnected with the global" (218) O'Conner further asserts that "new global realities offer Shalimar access to transnational Jihad movement which he uses as a refuge from where we suppose he attempts to reconstruct his manhood having seen both his marriage and his homeland smashed up in front of his own eyes" (218). Shalimar at last becomes a terrorist and he is the outcome of personal as well as communal tragedy.

In her review Patricia Fernandez Kelly claims that the novel is very significant to political sociology. She claims that Rushdie in the novel tries to justify that the idea of terrorism is not only rooted on unified movement of organized groups; personal grief may

also be the cause for a man that drives him towards terrorism. She asserts, “Rushdie’s point about the convergence of personal grief, local injustice, and violent activism is of monumental significance to political sociology; an insight often drowned amid the rhetoric of politicians and pandits who, for more than a decade, have promoted the idea of terrorism as a unified movement of planetary proportions” (473). He observes, “Implicit in his novel is a condemnation of military intrusions that threaten to obliterate local differences and unify Muslims throughout the world in opposition to Western arrogance” (473). Kelly gives his idea about Rushdie’s implicit condemnation of military intrusions to unify Muslims in opposition to Western egotism.

The critics have given diverse views on Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown*. The comments put forward by them on the novel affirm that they have mainly focused on certain features of the novel like myth, magic realism, historical concoction, post-modern panache, processes of worlding, globalization, new imperialism, terrorism and anti-terrorism. The critic Damian Grant claims that in the novel Rushdie used recognizable fictional formula with the mixture of myth, magic, documentary record and historical concoction. Sreyoshi Sarkar observes that the novel is a political thriller. He discusses the processes of worlding. Kavita Daiya detects two aspects in the novel: the normative narrative of national accounts of the Kashmir conflict and the Indian state’s failure and apathy towards the protection and rehabilitation of displaced Kashmiris. Andrew Traverson finds out fusion between the US-led globalization and the South Asian national experience. He further asserts that the novel points out the failure of American diplomacy. He mainly focuses on America’s relations with India. Singh et al. believe that the novel narrates the separatist politics that sees the Kashmir issue as an unfinished agenda of the petition in the post-independent era. They also mention the feminist issue that Boonyi Kaul becomes the mouthpiece of Kashmir’s struggle. Yuma Siddiqui reiterates that the novel includes international networks of diplomacy, Islamic

terrorism, and the repressive forces of the Indian States. Pei-Chen Liao states that the novel reveals the 9/11 events almost without existing in the novel. He points out that the novel presents uncanny terror and a political history of violence. Sucheta M. Choudhuri points out the personal and political resentment of the protagonist Shalimar. Annabella Pitkin mentions the toughness of the prose style of Rushdie which has power for social commentary. She also highlights the universal nature of geopolitical consequences. Maurice O'Connor mentions the novel as a personal tragedy as well as a communal tragedy. He also asserts that the novel shows how the local transgresses the structures of the nation and is interconnected with the global. Patricia Fernandez Kelly claims that the novel is very significant to political sociology. She mentions that the idea of terrorism is not only related to organized groups; it is also the cause of personal grief. The above-mentioned reviews show that some of the reviewers have talked about issues like terrorism, anti-terrorism, globalization, and geopolitics that are related to international relations, but the questions raised for this research have been unanswered, so further research is reasonable.

### **The Research Gap**

The three novels selected for this research were landmarks of their times. Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* narrates the Spanish Civil War of the 1930s in an extensive way including the three-day activities of protagonist Robert Jordan. It describes the involvement of people of different nations in the war. The novel also exposes the clash of ideologies of two opposing sides: fascism and communism. Similarly, Greene's *The Honorary Consul* exposes the revolutionary activities that occurred in Latin America. The novel involves the characters and events related to America, Paraguay, Argentina, and England. It mentions the cross-border activities as well as the cruel ruling of General Stroessner. In the same way, Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* narrates the customs, cultures,

beliefs, and diplomacy of different countries. Set in America, Europe, and India, the novel describes the atrocities that occurred due to the narrow and selfish desires of authorities.

Numerous critics of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* have varying critical responses on multiple issues, such as love and war, courage and heroism, brotherhood and humanity, and gender and masculinity. The critics of *The Honorary Consul* have concentrated their studies on the political undertone of the novel. At the same time, they have also explored various themes, such as conflict and revolution, love and filial piety. Some of them have taken the novel as a political theology in which religion and politics are combined. Some critics have also mentioned this novel as a Catholic novel that shows the writer's faith in God. Some others have also referred the novel to be a political failure. The critics have given varied views on *Shalimar the Clown*, too. They have focused on certain features of novel like myth, magic realism, historical concoction, post-modern panache, processes of worlding, globalization, new imperialism, terrorism, and anti-terrorism. Some critics have asserted the Indian State's failure and apathy towards the protection and rehabilitation of displaced Kashmiris; whereas some of the critics have shown the failure of American diplomacy. Some others have asserted that includes international networks of diplomacy, Islamic terrorism, and the repressive forces of Indian States.

After getting knowledge about the reviews written on these three novels, the researcher comes to the generalization that these novels include the ingredients of International Relations. However, the reviewers and critics have referred to only a few elements of International Relations, though extensive research has occurred on other issues of these seminal novels. The reviews and criticisms written on these novels have not discussed the significance of issues and theories of International Relations in the study of these novels, and they have not shown the relations between literature and International Relations. Anyway, they provide some insights and starting points for the extensive study of these

novels from the perspectives of International Relations. This study is an interdisciplinary study that explores the significance of International Relations in narrative works. There has not been any substantial work in this field. Hence, this research work is of great relevance.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY: THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

#### **Background**

International Relations has a long history that goes back to ancient times. But in the modern sense, it got its development in the form of systematic study during the twentieth century with the establishment of the Department of International Relations at the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth in 1919 with the donation of £ 20,000 by David Davis MP. The original goal was to “herald a new world, freed from the menace of war” (Cox 20). The main intention of establishing the Department was to provide a platform for scholars to identify the causes of existing world’s political problems and to suggest solutions so that politicians could solve them (Baylis et al. 3). During the twentieth-century political thinkers have analyzed various theories of International Relations, such as Realism, Idealism/Liberalism, Constructivism, Historical Materialism, Marxism, Feminism, Postmodernism, Post-colonialism, and globalization. Many political thinkers have defined these theories by analyzing the inherent qualities in them. In orthodox International Relations study, these theories are analyzed solely to describe the relations between and among nations, but in the post-modern period, these theories have been rethought as tools to analyze the elements of international relations in cultural artifacts like narrative works and films. Among them, the current trends are Realist, Idealist, and Constructivist International Relations theories because Realism and Idealism cover long historical periods, and Constructivism is related to the construction of ideas and beliefs, and literary works are also the sources of the construction of ideas and beliefs. This study aims to apply them as perspectives to analyze the selected literary works: *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul* and *Shalimar the Clown*. So only these three theories have been analyzed in the section below.

## **Realist International Relations Theory**

Realism is a widely used well-established theoretical concept in International Relations that emerged in the United States in the wake of the Second World War and at the dawn of the Cold War. But it can trace its roots back the earliest historical writings, such as Thucydides' *History of Peloponnesian War* in the fifth century B.C. By referring to the war, Thucydides demonstrates how the power politics that characterized inter-state relations and conflict, rather than higher moral principles guiding co-operation or action. He argued that “the cause of the war between the Athenians and the Spartans was an increase in Athenian military power and insecurity that it created among the Spartans” (Griffiths 266). It indicates that Thucydides began one of the main trends in international relations. “Thucydides notes in a speech attributed to the Athenians in the Melian dialogue that ‘right, as the world goes, is only in question between equals in power while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must’” (11). Though the concept of realism was not in existence during that time because it happened to be in use only in the twentieth century, the theorists found similarities between the two worlds.

Similarly, Niccolo Machiavelli in *The Prince* and Thomas Hobbes in *Leviathan* gave their concepts of realism focusing on the role of a leader on national security. They mainly described a realistic balance of power politics. “By assuming the uncooperative and egoistic nature of humankind and absence of hierarchy in the state system, realists encourage leaders to act in ways based on suspicion, power and force” (Antunes and Camisao 2). Machiavelli offered “practical advice to the statesmen which would ensure that they remained in power and achieved their objectives” (Steans et al. 55). Hobbes’ work has also had a key influence on realist thinkers. He is the first to talk about the nature of secular power and authority. He thought “it was man’s nature to try and dominate and oppress others” (55). Men can be persuaded to give up their natural liberty for the sake of the state’s sovereignty, which

essentially creates a 'war of all against all.' Until the twentieth century, the rulers all over the world since the classical time, ruled on the basis of power politics. Though it was used in the field of international relations since World War II, Machiavelli is counted as one of its forefathers. In view of Michael Jackson and Moore "Machiavelli as the Progenitor of modern realism advanced a scientific account of both national and international history" (453). Realism believes in the malignant nature of human beings. As Machiavelli simply puts it, in politics, "it must be taken for granted that all men are wicked and that they will always give vent to the malignity that is in their minds when opportunity offers" (qtd. in Donnelly 9). The realists like Niccolo Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes "assumed that human beings were fundamentally motivated by their own self-interests and appetites and that the most widespread and potentially dangerous of all these appetites is their lust for power" (Wilkinson 2). They view that a sovereign who rules has sole power. So, international politics is a constant struggle for power, and the sovereign state is always ready to go to war. Hence, there is a continual state of anarchy. The link between realism and international relations became vigorous and strong in the twentieth century.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1722-1778) are two other progenitors of Realism. Hobbes talks about the anarchic state of nature. The individuals are constantly in the state of war for their self-preservation since "everyone is presumed to do all things in order to his own benefit" (Hobbes 78). This interpersonal state of nature has been adopted to define anarchic international state system. Rousseau believes in inevitability of war. He treats war as legitimate. Michael C. Williams asserts that Rousseau analyzes "the eternal verities of power politics" (*Realist Tradition* 52). He is known as the theorist of anarchy. He confirms, "The existence of perpetual state of war at the international level" (55). He imagines a Confederacy to avoid the perpetual state of war, but it is unattainable because of self-interested sovereign states. The Christian bishop and philosopher Saint

Augustine (354-430 AD) also put on a fundamental assumption of realism, claiming that humanity is flawed, egoistic, and selfish. The war in his view is the outcome of these elementary characteristics of humanity (Mingst et al. 74). The inevitably flawed nature of human beings goes back to the Biblical story of Genesis in which the original sin involves humankind's fall from grace with God in the Garden of Eden. This flawed nature of human beings has been described in the opening lines of John Milton's epic *Paradise Lost*, "Of Man's First disobedience, and the Fruit/ Of that Forbidden Tree, Whose mortal taste/ Brought Death into the World, and all our woe" (5). The flawed nature caused death and awe in human beings.

Realism believes that power is of great importance to determine political relations among nations. Power politics is a distinguishing element of international politics. "Power is the key to understanding international behavior and state motivation. For realists, the main form of power is military or physical power" (Steans et al. 57). Realists refer to the balance of power which means "a mechanism which operates to prevent the dominance of any one state in the international system" (59). Its primary use is to preserve the security of the state, if necessary, by means of war. Realism defines power as an objective category but that is not fixed for all and sovereign states struggle for power.

For realists, international relations are constantly in conflict between and among states. To the realists, most usually, conflict is of a violent nature. Conflict and competition are two main characteristics of international relations and war is inevitable and ultimately unavoidable. "It is necessary, therefore, to accept the inevitability of war and pursue the necessary preparations for conflict" (Steans et al. 54). Because of the inevitable nature of conflict, war may not be in action, and the chance of real or potential aggression always lurks between nations. Realism refuses the moral aspirations of a particular country. Colin Elman views, "According to classical realism, because the desire for more power is rooted in the

flawed nature of humanity, states are continuously engaged in a struggle to increase their capability. The absence of the international equivalent of a state's government is a permissive condition that gives human appetites a free reign" (12). Mingst et al. explain, "Realism posits that states exist in an anarchic international system; that is, there is no overarching hierarchical authority. Each state bases its politics on an interpretation of its national interest defined in terms of power" (5). To increase power, a state may form alliances with other states. States that are assumed to be unitary and rational actors can depend on themselves to protect against any form of coercion from other states. For this reason, they are interested in increasing their power to protect themselves. States are also naturally dangerous. Peughosh asserts states are "inherently aggressive" (26). The realist concept of International Relations is thus not connected in harmony with the interest but in power politics. Power politics is the main issue of realism. Searching for power, international actors always try to enhance their power position at any cost. In their thinking power is the instrument that is used to control others. They use power for the ruling of the international system. Power gives the capacity to control others without their consent (Guzzini 113-116).

Realism asserts the pessimistic view of human nature, that is, human beings are the same everywhere preoccupied with their own well-being. Human nature plays a vital role in establishing the nature of the state, so the state is also occupied with its own well-being in its competitive relation with other states. In view of realists, international relations is the struggle among the great powers for domination and security. This lust for power dictates people to be free from others. In Bishnu Satapathy's view, "Realism considers the state as a protector of its territory, its population, and of their distinctive and valued way of life" (9). This concept surely places immense emphasis on the state, which may create turmoil and conflict between states. So even the settled treaties and agreements are violated if national interest confronts them. This type of perpetual sense of competition leads to international

anarchy and conflict. It presumes that forming a global state or global government is impossible.

Statism, survival, and self-help are three fundamental ideas of Realism. Statism is a system in which the state has substantial centralized control over social and economic affairs. “The reason for this single-minded focus on state actors is rooted in Realism’s organizing principle: non-state actors lack the military capacity to threaten state actors and are, therefore, dependent on their home state for security in the anarchic international system” (Cox 108). Survival, the second fundamental idea of Realism, is the main goal of any state on the international stage. This idea believes that there is no supreme ruler to settle international disputes. “Realism maintains that only power can ensure a state’s survival in the international system” (Cox 108). Self-help, the third fundamental system of Realism, allows the states to defend themselves against another state’s aggression. The self-help concept makes the states think that there are no permanent alliances over a long time. In view of the Realists “no alliance [is] permanent and every state [has] to look to its own power for a true guarantee of its survival in a Hobbesian world” (Cox 108-109). So the state has to create its own capacity for its survival.

E. H. Carr, Raymond Aron, Hans J. Morgenthau, John Herz, Reinhold Niebuhr, Arnold Wolfers, and George Kennan are some distinguished realist thinkers of the twentieth century. Modern realists accept the assumption of the classical realists that there is a presence of constant struggle. So they stress the necessity of alliance-building to maintain the balance of power. E. H. Carr (1892-1982) is a realist who vehemently criticized the idealist concept of international relations in his polemical book *Twenty Years’ Crisis: 1919-1939*. In his view, the idealist doctrine of “harmony of interests” is only a moral device. The reality is that national policies are based on the national interest of a particular time.

Carr analyzes the realist philosophy of Machiavelli and identifies the three essential tenets as the foundation stones. He claims:

In the first place, history is a sequence of cause and effect, whose course can be analyzed and understood by intellectual effort, but not (as the utopians believe) directed by “imagination”. Secondly, theory does not (as the utopians assume) create practice, but practice theory. In Machiavelli’s words, “good counsels, whensoever they come are born of the wisdom of the prince and not the wisdom of the prince from good counsels”. Thirdly, politics are not (as the utopians pretend) a function of ethics, but ethics of politics. (63-64)

Carr analyzes the realistic explanation of Machiavelli.

In the mid-twentieth century, Hans J. Morgenthau (1904-1980) explained realism in *Politics among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace*. A milestone for realistic aspects of international relations, Morgenthau’s book detects “the forces which determine political relations among nations, and to comprehend the ways in which those forces act upon each other and upon international political relations and institutions” (3). It explains international relations in terms of power politics. He asserts, “International politics, like politics, is a struggle for power. Whatever the ultimate aims of international politics, power is always the immediate aim” (13). Struggle for power is perpetual in the international system. So states manage power balance internally and externally. Morgenthau asserts, “Both domestic and international power policies as a struggle for power, modified only by the different conditions under which this struggle takes place in domestic and in the international spheres” (17). In his view, in international politics national interests are resolved on the basis of diplomacy of war. He upholds that “The concept of national interest presupposes neither a naturally harmonious, peaceful world nor the inevitability of war as a consequence of the pursuit by all nations of their interests. Quite to the contrary, it assumes continuous conflict and threat of war to be

minimized through the continuous adjustment of conflicting interest by diplomatic action” (qtd. in Ghosh 27). According to Hans Morgenthau, “It is the ubiquity of the desire for power which . . . constitutes the ubiquity of evil in all human action. Here is the element of corruption and sin which injects itself into the best of intentions at least a drop of evil and thus spoils it” (qtd. in Shimpko 41).

Realism was the most influential International Relations theory during the second half of the twentieth century “when the United States and the Soviet Union were in a more or less permanent state of war from around 1948 to around 1991” (Cox 108). After the Second World War it “emerged as accepted wisdom in international relations because of the clear lessons that the conflict appeared to reiterate” (Steans et al. 54). The realist concept of International Relations believes that the international relation of a nation is affected by its domestic politics. It also believes in power politics, which believes in “might is right.”

In realist International Relations theory, the state is considered free to conduct behavior with other nations. The brooding shadow of violence is always lurking with it. Kenneth Waltz (1924-2013) views, “the state of nature is a state of war” (*Theory* 102). Because of the presence of anarchy, the occurrence of violence is always possible. In Waltz’s view “International politics is the realm of power, of struggle, and of accommodation. . . . The international politics is preeminently a political one” (113). Giving their view on the concept of Waltz, Steans et al. claim, “Waltz argued that while the units in the domestic order (citizens) were subjected to law, the units in the international order (states) were at best interdependent, autonomous entities. International order was, therefore, mechanistic rather than organic. The international order was also anarchic” (57). Waltz views states as autonomous and anarchical.

Anarchy is an essential condition of realism that necessitates power for the state to survive. In Waltz’s view “International politics is the realm of power, of struggle, and of

accommodation. . . . The international politics is preeminently a political one” (113). Cox claims, “Anarchy is an inherently unstable condition that requires international actors to guarantee their own survival through the accumulation of power” (Cox 106). The states follow certain rules, norms and practices, but they can violate them as soon as they find them inconvenient to their pursuit of power. Because of the lack of global government, nobody can force them to abide by international law. So the relationship between the states depends on the relative power balance between constituent states. It indicates that in such an anarchic system of International Relations, the chance of the persistence of war is always looming around. The prevalence of anarchy is a reality because there is no sovereign authority that can enforce the rule of law and ensure the punishment of wrongdoers. Stean et al. view that anarchy “is a condition in which there exists no centralized sovereign authority that enforces the rule of law. Realists are concerned with anarchy at the international level where there is no authority higher than the state” (54).

The realist tradition of International Relations accepts Kenneth Waltz’s anarchy myth, ‘international anarchy is the permissive cause of war.’ It is the most well-known and the most widely accepted myth of realism. The first claim of anarchy myth is that “international politics is anarchical” (Weber 16). Anarchy denotes lack of order and lack of orderer, too, so that there is always a chance of civil war as well as war between states. It is true that there is no world government to control the nations, and they are free to be anarchical.

Realism believes that the working of a state within results in its relation with other countries. It is related to the power and its exercise by states. Realism accepts three basic assumptions- "first, that the world is composed of sovereign nation-states; second, that there is no world government which means there is no international orderer, and third, that the absence of world government or an international orderer by definition means that international politics is anarchical" (Weber 17). These three elements claim that international

anarchy insinuates the nation-state to behave conflictually. Sovereign states are independent of each other and people are liable to conflict. Therefore, the world government is unachievable. So conflict always lurks with states. The realists pay attention to human nature and assert that world politics depends on human nature. Realists like Hans Morgenthau claim that humans are originally flawed. It is tainted by fundamental sin. Similarly, international relations is also based on human nature. It will certainly remain conflictual and anarchical.

Cynthia Weber builds up the concept of realism based on Kenneth Waltz's myth "international anarchy is the permissive cause of war". She states that sovereign nation-states behave conflictually, and war cannot be transcended. Referring to Kenneth Waltz, Weber claims that "the organization of social relations rather than the nature of man is what determines whether or not we have war" (18). War is a great element of the realist International Relations theory. Hence, the question arises: Why do wars occur? The three images/levels play vital roles in war: the individual, the state, and the state system. The major cause of war is found at each of these levels. According to Waltz, "the locus of the important cause of war is found in the nature and behavior of man. War results from selfishness, from misdirected aggressive impulses, from stupidity" (Weber 19). This definition explains the nature of individuals. This explanation assumes that "man behaves badly because he is bad by nature" (19). This type of concept is invoked by Realist International Relations scholars. But all humans do not always behave badly. So human nature itself is not sufficient to tell about the presence or absence of war.

In the second stage the organization of the states or societies becomes the cause of war. The organization of states or societies may be good or bad. States that behave badly make war, and those states that act well preserve peace (20). In investigating why wars occur, Waltz describes the third image as, "with many sovereign states with no system of law enforceable among them, with each state judging its grievances and ambitions according to

the dictates of its own reason or desire- conflict, sometimes leading to war, is found to occur” (qtd. in Weber 20). In Waltz’s view “war occurs because there is nothing to prevent it” (20). Waltz’s main emphasis is on social relations. People go to war mainly because of bad social organization, and that bad social organization creates international anarchy which is a permissive cause of war.

Cynthia Weber asserts that Realism believes that there is "no higher power than that of a nation-state" (16). So all states have international independence and there is no world government. In this sense, international politics is anarchical, which means a lack of order. This kind of anarchy is the cause of war. So Kenneth Waltz says "International anarchy is the permissive cause of war" (qtd. in Weber 16).

Human nature also affects international relations. Human nature, which is fundamentally flawed, is very much helpful to create wars among nations. Weber also assures, "At its root. . . international politics will remain anarchical and conflictual because of the nature of man" (18). Man is bad by nature. In anarchy myth, fear is a necessary element because it helps anarchy myth to function. "Anarchy requires fear to differentiate the behavior of those acting within it from their behavior within hierarchy" (33). The myth suggests that conflict is an essential element of international affairs as long as anarchy exists.

Realism is the theory that is related to the attitudes of mind. Jack Donnelly opines, "Realism is an approach to international relations that has emerged gradually through the work of a series of analysts who have situated themselves within, and thus delimited, a distinctive but still diverse style or tradition of analysis" (6). Realism in politics is related to the power and interest of the nation and the states seek to maximize their security or their power. It assumes that the international system is anarchical and it encourages bad parts of human nature to be expressed. Realism also believes that conflict groups are an essential part of social and political affairs. According to realism, states are the most important actors in

world politics and they are guided by their national interests. The state assumes that there is no authority above it. Donnelly agrees that “realists characteristically give primary emphasis to egoistic passions and the tragic presence of evil in all political action” (10). Anarchy is the key factor of realist international relations theory. “In international relations anarchy not merely allows but encourages the worst aspect of human nature to be expressed” (10). So egoism and anarchy are compelling issues that play a great role in international relations. In view of Morgenthau, “Realism maintains that universal moral principles cannot be applied to the actions of the state” (qtd. in Donnelly 11).

Donnelly explains the sub-groups of realists based on the emphasis they give to the core propositions of egoism and anarchy:

*Structuralist realists:* They give the main emphasis on an anarchic international system. Structural realists are also known as “neo-realists” who highlight the power politics in International Relations. They believe that the relationship between nations is conflictual and competitive rather than cooperative.

*Biological realists:* They emphasize a fixed human nature and believe that social forces are the product of human nature. Human natures like pride, lust and quest for glory are the root causes of war. They are also called ‘classical’ realists. In view of Steans et al., “the classical realism is an attempt to understand the world from the point of view of the statesman or diplomat who is forced to operate in an uncertain or dangerous world” (57).

*Radical realists:* They adopt extreme versions of the concepts of anarchy, egoism and power politics. They have anti-status quo objectives and use critical view in the world politics.

*Strong realists:* They define realism as a positive theory of international politics. They believe that states strongly prioritize their own security.

*Hedged realists:* They accept the realist premise- anarchy and egoism, but express discomfort with power politics. They also believe in the role of economics, ideology, and culture in shaping International Relations. (11-12)

How anarchy creates conflict and war can best be presented in literary and popular arts.

Cynthia Weber takes Kenneth Waltz's concept that "international anarchy is the permissive cause of war" and views that the concept of international anarchy has been expressed through the film *Lord of the Flies*. She opines "*Lord of the Flies* tells a story about moving from one type of order (hierarchy) into another (anarchy), suggesting that anarchy is what allows conflict to occur" (18). The film "cleverly plays with these themes of good and bad individuals, good and bad states, and differing forms of organizations (hierarchy, or anarchy)" (24). The film introduces the lost world of hierarchy (the world from which the boys have just arrived) and the island world of anarchy (the world where they have entered). "Anarchy is unmarked as the film opens. The film is the story of how the boys behave in a situation of anarchy, in a world without adults" (25). The film explores the conditions of the boys that change severely when they move from the world of school/nation-state into the world of the lost island. By using the knowledge of social codes, they organize a hierarchy to establish their new order by electing Ralph as their leader. Jack is the only boy who challenges the leadership of Ralph as there is no way to enforce the rules. "As Jack proves in this scene, the rules mean nothing without the power of enforcement" (29). Order is restored only by the arrival of a British naval officer.

Weber analyzes the plot of the film *Lord of the Flies* and justifies the anarchy that causes war. Weber reviews:

*Lord of the Flies* seems to make a pretty good case for Waltz's myth that "international anarchy is the permissive cause of war" and that, in a world of structural anarchy, the necessary pursuit of survival in this self-help world may well

lead to conflict. Whether one goes with Waltz's thesis in *Man, the State, and War*, that an immediate cause of war like human nature (a first image problem) or bad social organization (a second image problem) is needed to supplement international anarchy or his thesis in *Theory of International Politics*, that the structure of anarchy is enough to explain why competition among actors will occur, thereby leading to the possibility of either balancing or war, *Lord of the Flies* seems to support Waltz's myth that "international anarchy is the permissive cause of war." (30)

Realist International theory presumes war is a basic characteristic of mankind. War occurs because of the flawed and selfish nature of human beings. States are also self-interested. For the sake of state security, a state may take the means of war. Similarly, realist international relations theory believes that power is the immediate aim of international politics. Both domestic and international power politics are struggles for power. Flawed human nature creates the desire for more power, and that creates conflict and the threat of war. A state may form alliances with other states for the sake of power. Realism maintains that only power can ensure the state's survival. They can violate norms, rules and practices if they find inconvenience in pursuit of power. Anarchy theme is also a realistic concept of International Relations. Fictional works also include the theme of anarchy. 'International anarchy is the permissive cause of war' is the basic concept of realist International Relations theory. Anarchy shows lack of order and lack of an orderer. So there is always the chance of civil war as well as war between states. There is no world government to control the nations, and they are free to be anarchical.

Fictional works also unpack the war that crosses national border lines. The struggle for power among nation-states is also an issue of literature. The greed for power causes conflict and eventually wars occur among nations. These are also subjects of fictional works. Selfish, flawed, and egoist humanity has been exposed in different literary works. States are

outcomes of people, and the nature of people is selfish, and states also behave selfishly, and such selfish behaviors are also delineated in literary works. Power is a key element of international relations and the hunger for power, in fact, hinders justice in society. It is best exemplified in literary or fictional works. International Relations is related to power politics. A literary text also deals with power politics.

The major trends and issues of Realist International Relations theory that this research has used in this study to analyze the selected texts are the selfish and flawed nature of human beings that causes war, conflictual and competitive cross-border activities, international anarchy, power politics, greed for power because of flawed human nature, pessimistic nature of state, statism, survival, and self-help.

### **Idealist International Relations Theory**

In a general sense, idealism is the process of changing situations from bad to good for human progress by using human morality and rationality. Idealism believes that human nature is not defective, but society and nation create problems in humanity. The motto of this concept is the well-being of all the people and the world. Idealism is an optimistic social, political, and economic philosophy. Idealists desire harmony instead of enmity in all aspects of life. In the field of international relations idealism describes the harmonious world view. It is “an approach to international politics based on liberal assumptions and principles. It's a more optimistic (Utopian) version that envisions a world in which law, institutions, and diplomacy replace power, competition and use of force” (Shimko 43). Idealism is also known as liberalism. It assumes that actors in international politics are rational and cooperation between them is possible. E. H. Carr calls the liberal idealists as utopians. Mingst et al. view that idealism posits the cooperative nature of the states. According to them, “states generally cooperate and follow international norms and procedures that they have agreed to support” (5).

As in realists' view, idealists also believe in the inevitability of war, but it can be eliminated through collective action. In their view, war is the product of society; it is not inherent in individuals. The realists take individuals as possessors of evil ideas, whereas the idealists consider individuals as possessors of rationality, moral values, and virtues, and also capable of controlling their basic impulses. Goodness, beauty, truth, and justice are basic elements of idealism. The idealists emphasize common interests, so they do not believe in conflicts and clashes. They have the belief that "people and nations share common interests and the prospects of comparative activities among them will satisfy these interests" (Ghosh 21). They believe that most of the relations between nations are cooperative and non-conflictual. Though they accept the possibility of war, in fact, the majority of nations live in peace, and to seek peace is not the outcome of a balance of power; it is an inherent nature of human beings. Liberals think that military power is ineffective, but they view that power can be viewed in positive terms that can be used for the common good.

As human beings are rational, they also have the capacity to keep the world rational. In this sense, idealism is based on optimism in matters of human rationality. Bishwal admits, "Liberal idealism is based on a liberal view of human beings and human society. According to this view, human beings are essentially rational and when they apply reason to International Relations they can set up an organization for the benefit of all" (7). Bishwal's claim also justifies the importance of international organizations for the betterment of human beings. Cooperation and complex interdependence are the major themes of liberalism. Modern science, technology, and economics have made different states interdependent to each other. In the same way, non-governmental organizations, multinational corporations, or international institutions have created a situation of cooperation and interdependence.

Idealism believes in the myth that "there is an international society" that resonates with a resolution to any kind of international anarchy. According to this myth, the social

relationships among sovereign nation-states, as well as world governments, will be an alternative to international anarchy. In a similar line of argument, Weber directly links idealism to international relations. She views, "Idealism is arguably the founding tradition of international relations theory" (42). E. H. Carr calls idealism the modern school of Utopian political thought that "traced back to the break-up of the medieval system, which presupposed a universal ethic and a universal political system based on divine authority" (22). In Charles Kegley's opinion idealist worldview can be summed up in the following core principles:

1. Human nature is essentially "good" or altruistic, and people are, therefore, capable of mutual aid and collaboration.
2. The fundamental human concern for the welfare of others makes progress possible (that is, the Enlightenment's faith in the possibility of improving civilization was reaffirmed).
3. Bad human behavior is the product not of evil people but of evil institutions and structural arrangements that motivate people to act selfishly and to harm others- including making war.
4. War is not inevitable and its frequency can be reduced by eradicating the anarchical conditions that encourage it.
5. War and injustice are international problems that require collective or multilateral rather than national efforts to eliminate them.
6. International society must recognize itself institutionally to eliminate the anarchy that makes problems such as war likely. (qtd. in Weber 45).

Kegley emphasizes on altruistic nature of human beings whose progress depends on the welfare of others. Unlike realism, idealism believes that war can be avoided by changing the anarchical conditions.

Liberalism is concerned with 'what ought to be.' Liberalism focuses on the interdependence of international actors and harmony of interests. Liberals believe in democratic peace theory. Cox opines, "Liberals believe that domestic political systems are an important indicator of states' international behavior claiming that liberal democratic states do not tend to go to war with other liberal democracies. This is called democratic peace theory (DPT)" (99). It helps to widen the international 'zone of peace.' Liberalism claims that states and international organizations have a great role in solving pressing global issues. In their view, social and political order is possible for the benefit of everybody. The liberals believe war as a distortion of reality. Liberalism is founded on the belief that "the changing interests of inhabitants of states . . . [and] the underlying forces for change are creating opportunities for increased cooperation and greater realization of peace, welfare and justice" (Shimko 47). It views the possibility of the inevitability of human progress.

Idealism has a long tradition dating back to ancient Greco-Roman times. The Greek idealist philosophy expressed by Plato in *Republic* was the rational Utopia, "Part allegory, part legitimate policy proposed, and part critique of existing systems, *Republic* offers many ideas that, allegedly, point to an ideal city" (Hendricks). The hypothesized super-sensible world of idealists is beyond the bounds of human reason. It emerged with the full Roman Empire in 476 CE. In modern times the roots of idealism go back to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The contributors to this thought are John Locke (1632-1704), Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873). The Enlightenment liberal John Locke believes that justice is needed for the survival of international order. German philosopher Immanuel Kant's thought has been influenced by the development of liberalism in International Relations. In his inspirational and influential essay "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay" he asserts that world peace can be achieved indefinitely. Such world peace is possible by establishing a

federation of free republican nations that follow the same international laws and agreements. He believes that human beings can change from an aggressive brutal stage to a state of peace with the help of “the free practical reason” (26).

In the field of international relations, liberal ideas were shaped in the later eighteenth century. People viewed war as irrational and tried to overthrow the unrestrained power of the old regime. The enlightenment liberals “appealed to reason for unambiguous answers to all questions, and came under criticism for making light for serious problems, for assuming that there were simple solutions, evident to right reason, and for assuming that all good things go together, -that no truly difficult choices need to be made” (Devetak et al. 44). The idealist/liberal theory in Eighteenth-century Enlightenment optimism concluded the idea that our universe is possibly best. Mingst et al. rightly explicate, “The contribution of the Enlightenment to liberalism rests on the Greek idea that individuals are rational beings, able to understand the universally applicable laws means that people have the capacity to improve their condition by creating a just society” (81). They mean that individuals are rational by nature and that a just society is possible because they are liable to create such a society.

Nineteenth-century liberalism opposed the realist assumptions of great power diplomacy supporting free trade, arms reductions, and attachment to international law. Political and economic liberalism developed during that period, and the thinkers mainly described international affairs by explaining events related to diplomatic history. In the wake of the twentieth century, there was an urgency to discover ways to prevent conflict. Woodrow Wilson (1856-1924) was a politician and prominent theorist of idealism. His concept of idealism highlighted the role of national self-determination and international cooperation to strengthen peace and prosperity. He viewed, “The world must be made safe for democracy”. He emphasized international collaboration to make the world safe for democracy. Other

liberal theorists in the twentieth century are Leonard Woolf (1880-1969), Richard Rosecrance (1903- 2024), and Michael W. Doyle (1948-).

Idealism in the field of International Relations came into academic discipline at the end of the First World War. The outbreak of World War I forced the liberals to criticize the existing system of International Relations. They “sought to establish a liberal peace marked by open diplomacy, the right of self-determination, free trade, disarmament, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and the establishment of an international security organization in the form of the League of Nations” (Macmillan 21). Liberal idealism came into existence to stop future wars of mass destruction and unexpected human suffering (Bishwal 6). The useless waste of life in the war brought about a new determination for mutual cooperation. The idealists of that time believed that world peace could be restored by establishing international institutions. Mingst et al. expose, “The League of Nations illustrated the importance that liberals place on the potential of international institutions to deal with war and the opportunity for collective problem-solving in a multilateral forum. Liberals also place faith in international law and legal instruments such as mediation, arbitration, and international courts” (82). The international organization is a necessary part of the idealists for collective problem-solving. The idealists thought about the supremacy of the rule of law and the centrality of justice and rights to international relations. “They were also the proponents of collective security, human rights, New International Economic Order, peace and disarmament” (22). The idealists believed that international relations could be regulated by establishing international institutions. As a result, the League of Nations was established to form a just and peaceful international order. “This liberal or idealist enterprise rested on the beliefs that people, in general, are inherently good and have no interest in projecting wars with one another (Steans et al. 23). The Second World War forced the liberals to establish a more powerful regime, and the United Nations Security Council was designed. Cox asserts,

“Liberals have successfully constructed a wide variety of international regimes dealing with security, economic and social development, decolonization, international law, and a range of other issues” (103). After World War II idealism did not get importance for a long time. However, it has remained influential in the academic study of International Relations and continues to be influential within liberal International Relations theory today, too.

The main distinctive strands of liberal theory have been innovated since the 1970s. Pluralism, interdependence theory, transnationalism, liberal internationalism, liberal peace theory, neo-liberal institutionalism, and world society are some approaches that have been innovated since the 1970s. The pursuit of mutual interests became a prominent feature of world politics in the 1980s. “In more recent years liberals have made important contributions to the study of international relations in the areas of international order, institutions and processes of governance, human rights, democratization, peace and economic integration” (Steans et al. 24). Liberal concept plays a great role for peace, order, and integration in the international arena.

A positive human nature, international cooperation, and a belief in progress are basic liberal assumptions. In modern civil society, liberal philosophers saw great possibilities for human progress. In view of liberals, a democratic society that protects civil liberty and market relations keeps a peaceful global order (Burchill et al. 81). Idealists emphasize morality since it is an essential element of both domestic and international life (Andrew Williams 13). They are away from real situations and current thinking, and moral principles are before prudential considerations. They are ignorant about the world around them and go for a future perfect world (Griffiths et al. 151-152). Idealism also referred to as Liberal Internationalism seeks to establish a liberal peace.

The myth “there is an international society” is related to the idealistic concept of International Relations. It is best explored by Cynthia Weber in the 1996 film *Independence*

*Day*. The film, set in the post-Cold War world, tells the story of an alien invasion on Earth. This invasion attacks the people of many major cities of different countries, which couples humanity on earth to unite together to overcome the common enemy of the alien invaders. This film demonstrates that even in an anarchical world where there is an absence of international orderer, nation-states, setting aside their differences, can unite together for the greater goodness to get victory over international anarchy. The message of the film is that “international cooperation for the just cause leads to peace. Pure communication among humankind enables states to unite around such a just cause. And this just cause can be communicated, embraced, and implemented because ‘there is an international society’” (Weber 57). Nations can unite for the just cause that helps them keep peace.

Idealism believes that human nature is not defective. It wishes for the well-being of all people and the world. Literary works also include the idealistic nature of human beings who are full of well-intentioned optimism. The state has also a cooperative nature. Nations are cooperative and non-conflictual and they share common harmonious interests. The idea of utopian political thought is the concept of idealism. The utopian form of literature is full of idealism that assumes that cooperation between international actors is possible. Goodness, beauty, truth, and justice are basic elements of idealism, and they are also keenly sought out in literary works. Idealism believes that war is unjust and must be eliminated through collective action and mutual cooperation. It believes in international cooperation for the just cause that leads to peace. Many literary works also shun war and advocate for cooperative relations between nations. Liberty, equality, and freedom are essential tenets of idealism and are also dealt with in many literary works. Idealism crosses the political national border lines for the sake of peace, democracy, and fraternity. Idealism views that there is an international society that can offer some hope that international anarchy can be overcome. International organizations have a great role in keeping peace, order, and integration in the

world. Pluralism, interdependence theory, transnationalism, liberal internationalism, and liberal peace theory are some fundamental beliefs of idealism. These issues are also depicted in many literary works. This research has used these trends and issues of Idealist International Relations theory to analyze the selected narrative works.

### **Constructivist International Relations Theory**

Constructivism is the term that was coined and used in International Relations theory by Nicholas Onuf (1941-). It is related to the idea that individuals' role is really great to construct their knowledge. Constructivism believes that individuals are independent in constructing ideas. In shaping the behavior of social actors, constructivism emphasizes the importance of identities and shared understandings. The basic premise of constructivism is that human beings are the makers of the world we live in. Social constructivism highlights the role of individuals as active participants in the creation of their own knowledge. Social and cultural settings are prominent initiators of the creation of ideas. "Constructivism," notes Cynthia Weber, "argues that identities and interests in international politics are not stable—they have no pre-given nature" (qtd. in Shimko 56). People learn ideas by the give-and-take of dialogues with others in society. By working together they construct artefacts. According to constructivist philosophy, "the social world is not a given: it is not something out there that exists independently of the thoughts and ideas of the people involved in it" (Jackson et al. 211). Ideas and thoughts play a great role in constructing social roles.

Constructivists believe that there is no world government and that international politics is anarchic. "Anarchy is what states make of it." Anarchy may create conflict between nations. But conflict may not be perpetual; it depends on how actors (states) relate to one another but the action of the actors depends on what statesmen think and how they give their and others' identification. In Shimko's view, "Constructivists argue that the behavior of social actors (e.g., individuals, groups, nations) is shaped by ideas, norms, and identities. As a

result, they are skeptical of theories that portray certain types of behaviors as inevitable” (59). The ideas have a great role in shaping social construction. A literary work like a novel is also full of ideas and is a peculiarly effective means for the diffusion of ideas and attitudes. One’s ideas, outlooks, and attitudes are definitely influenced by it. The experiences of the characters seem natural, normal, and fitting. He/she is impressed by the ideas, and the previous outlook is modified to some degree at least, if not wholly (Braden 165-166). Ideas prevalent in society shape any literary work, and, on the contrary, the ideas expressed in the work also help to shape society. So the tool of constructivist International Relations theory is very much applicable to analyze a literary text.

Constructivist International Relations theory got its development with the end of the Cold War in the 1980s onward, but it also has deeper roots, and it is not an entirely new approach. “It also grows out of an old mythology that can be traced back at least to the eighteenth-century writings of the Italian philosopher Giambattista Vico” (Jackson et al. 211). Giambattista Vico (1688-1744), Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), Nicholas Onuf (1941-), and Alexander Wendt (1958-) are some prominent theorists of constructivism. Vico divides the world into the natural world and the historical world, and asserts that the historical world is made by men and women. States are also creations of men and women. Similarly, the state system is also a human creation, so men and women can develop and change in new ways. Immanuel Kant was a forerunner of social constructivism who claimed that human beings “can obtain knowledge about the world, but it will always be subjective knowledge in the sense that it is filtered through human consciousness” (Jackson and Sorensen 211). It is a late twentieth-century addition to International Relations. Since then it has been an increasingly significant approach. It “explains events in international politics through a focus on norms and identities-both of individuals and of states” (Mingst et al. 8). It believes that

International Relations is a social construction that does not have any fixed objective meaning.

Nicholas Onuf first introduced the concept of constructivism in the field of International Relations theory in *World of Our Making*. In his view, constructivism is related to doing, acting, and talking. He asserts, "Constructivism begins with deeds. Deeds done, acts taken, words spoken . . . people and societies construct, or constitute, each other" (36). People and societies are formed or constructed. Constructivism is related to human consciousness. The social and political world is related to our consciousness. International relations is intersubjective awareness among people. Thoughts and ideas are great things in International Relations. Constructivism believes that there are no natural laws of society and politics. "All rules in a socially constructed reality are related to practice" (52). The social world is the world of human consciousness with thoughts, beliefs and discourses among states and nations.

Nicholas Onuf, in *Making Sense, Making Worlds: Constructivism in social theory and international relations* describes social relations as the subject matter of constructivism. Though constructivism is related to all the fields of social inquiry, International Relations is the field in which it was first applied. Constructivism takes human beings as social beings as it is fundamental. "Social relations make or construct people-ourselves- into the kinds of being that we are" (4). Talking is so important that by talking we make the world what it is. In his view, "Constructivism holds that people make society, society makes people. This is a continuous, two-way process. To study it, we must start in the middle, so to speak, because people and society, always having made each other, are already there and just about to change" (4). Between people and society exist social rules that always link them. These social rules "make the process by which people and society constitute each other continuous and reciprocal" (4). Those rules make us participate in many situations in society. He further says,

"International society is heteronomously ruled because states exercise their independence under the principle of sovereignty and a number of commitment rules granting them rights and duties with respect to each other" (20). So, they are free for their individual choices.

In "Anarchy Is What States Make of It" Alexander Wendt (1958-), a pioneer constructivist, asserts the idea that "anarchy is what states make of it," and that power politics is the social construction under anarchy (395). The term anarchy indicates the condition that no one state rules over the rest. In his view, "A fundamental principle of constructivist social theory is that people act toward objects, including other actors, on the basis of the meanings that the objects have for them. States act differently toward enemies than they do toward friends because enemies are threatening and friends are not" (396-97). So our actions are constituted on the basis of collective meanings. According to him our every action depends on its meaning. A state has various identities like "sovereign", "leader of the free world", and "imperial power." Each identity is related to the actor's social definition. "[I]dentities are the basis of interest" (397). And those identities are formed on the basis of security of the self. In his view, constructivism relies on interaction. He puts, "The meanings in terms of which action is organized are out of interaction" (403). So he gives emphasis on the interaction between states. If they fail to have interaction, there is a situation of anarchy. Systemic interaction may also change the state identities and interests. In anarchist conditions identities and interests are produced by practice. There are various social threats and they are "constructed, not natural." He claims, "world of power politics is socially constructed" (411). Wendt in this way asserts the social construction of identities and power politics. Constructivism gives a way of studying social relations of any kind. Social relations are so powerful that construct ourselves into the kind of that we are. Indeed, we make the world by talking to each other. Talking is the way by which we make the world what it is.

In *Social Theory of International Politics*, Alexander Wendt explains the two basic principles of constructivism: "(1) that the structures of human association are determined primarily by shared ideas rather than material forces, and (2) that the identities and interests of purposive actions are constructed by these shared ideas rather than the given nature" (1). He asserts that shared ideas construct identities and interests of intended actions. These two principles emphasize the powers of social structures. In his view, "Constructivist sensibilities encourage us to know how actors are socially constructed" (7). In narrative works, too, people and societies are constructed. They present people and societies in certain forms to the readers. They are the forces to impact events and trends at the international level. Wendt says, "a fundamental principle of constructivist social theory that people act towards objects, including other actors, on the basis of meanings that the objects have for them" (qtd. in Smit 300). Relationships between states depend on the meanings and practices they perform. Though sometimes it seems stable, the meanings are not fixed. As ideas and practices vary, the relationship between states also vary. Social reality is created by interactions, and interactions can reshape the existing international system.

The change in thoughts and ideas alters the international system. Bishnu Satapathy views, "The social world is a world of human consciousness: of thoughts and beliefs, of ideas and concepts, of languages and discourses, of signs, signals, and understandings among human beings, especially groups of human beings, such as states and nations" (35). Conflicts among nations are also outcomes and wills of people. The conflict is expressed and managed through beliefs and ideas. He further posits, "[N]ations, nationalism and national identities are social constructions of time and place" (36). For constructivism, conflict is a disagreement between conscious agents. Moreover, culture, identity, and norms are constructed rather than discovered.

Constructivism has got great significance in international relations theory. Maja Zehfuss views, "The social world is seen as constructed not given. States may be self-interested but they continuously (re)define what that means. Their identities may change. Norms help define situations and hence influence international practice in significant way" (4). Highlighting the normative aspect of constructivism, Stefano Guzzini quotes the definition given by Ador who informs us that constructivism, "is the view that the manner in which the material world shapes and is shaped by human action and interaction depends on dynamic normative and epistemic interpretations of the material world" (7). Ador emphasizes the significance of the material world in social constructivism.

Constructivism refers to the claim that ideas have great contributions to politics and international relations. Guzzini opines that constructivism can be taken "in terms both of a social construction of meaning (including knowledge) and of the construction of social reality" (191). He views that "the international system could be understood as a social artifact" (196). Similarly, literature can also be understood as a social artifact.

Max Weber also emphasized on the social world (the world of human interaction). Human beings understand each other's actions and assign meanings to them. Weber concludes that "subjective understanding of the action of the component individuals is the specific characteristic of sociological knowledge" (15). Constructivists give emphasis on the importance of 'meaning' and 'understanding'.

Weber has explained Alexander Wendt's Constructivism concept "Anarchy is what states make of it" as mainstream anarchy myth. In her view this "myth holds that the effects of international anarchy are not quite so predictable" (68) because "anarchy is what states make of it." The conflictual behaviors of the states make the nature of international anarchy conflictual, and the cooperative behaviors of the states make the nature of international anarchy cooperative. So, "States determine the nature of international anarchy. And, most

importantly, what states do depends upon what states' identities and interests are, and identities and interests change" (68). In that sense states are decision-makers so identities and interests are not stable in international politics.

Weber mentions three fundamental principles of constructivist social theory:

- i. "People act toward objects, including other actors, on the basis of the meanings that the objects have for them": SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE.
- ii. "The meanings in terms of which action is organized arise out of interaction": SOCIAL PRACTICE.
- iii. "Identities [and interests] are produced in and through 'situated activities'": SOCIAL IDENTITIES AND INTERESTS. (73)

Constructivism pays attention to social interactions and activities. The meaning comes out of interactions. Weber believes that the literary and popular arts also illustrate the constructive myth. She analyzes the film "Wag the Dog" to demonstrate "how identities, interests, and institutions are inter-subjectively constituted" (75). To distract the public attention from the president's sexual rumors, Connie, the President's assistant, produces a phony war between the US and Albania. The public's attention is drawn toward the ongoing war, and the president's sex scandal is almost forgotten and the president is eventually re-elected. In the world of "Wag the Dog," identities, interests, and institutions are constructed and reconstructed. "The US public are constructed as patriots with an interest in beating the Albanians and securing the US borders" (80). In the film, the public is constructed to wag the tail. By observing the film Weber concludes, "Anarchy is what states make of it. War is what producers make of it. Our lives are what we make of it" (81).

In constructivism the role of individuals to construct knowledge is great. Individuals are the makers of the world we live in. Identities and interests in international politics are not stable. They have no pre-given nature. Thoughts and beliefs create the social world because

every action in the world is contextual. Literary works are also contextual; context plays a great role in literature. The individuals in literary works also play a great role in constructing knowledge. In fact, literary works construct certain ideas. As states shape ideas, individual characters in literary works also shape ideas that are related to international relations. The ideas have a great role in shaping social construction. A literary work like a novel is also full of ideas about international relations. The ideas prevalent in society may shape the literary work and the ideas expressed in the literary work may shape society. The role of social consciousness is great to create the social world. The world is contextual that is affected by thoughts, beliefs, ideas, and concepts. Culture, identities, norms, and power politics are also constructed. Disagreement between conscious agents (beliefs and ideas) creates conflict, whereas agreement between them makes the situation amicable. “Anarchy is what states make of it”- no one state rules over the rest. These trends of Constructivist International Relations theory are the tools that this research has used to analyze the selected literary texts.

The above-mentioned discussion of International Relations theories explains different frameworks that would form the basis for analyzing literary texts. Realism talks about the flawed, egoistic, and selfish nature of humanity that affects the dynamics of relations between nations. Realism also talks about the inevitability of war for the security of a nation. Chance of war is always persistent because of the anarchic nature of international relations. The realist tradition accepts that ‘international anarchy is the permissive cause of war’. So, there is always a chance of civil war and war between states. Social organizations play vital roles in war. Bad social organizations create international anarchy which is the permissive cause of war. International Relations also analyzes the power politics that may create struggle in both domestic and international spheres. There is also the necessity of alliance building to maintain the balance of power. These frameworks that the Realist International Relations theory discusses appropriately form the basis for analyzing literary texts.

Idealism wishes for the well-being of all the people and the world. It assumes cooperation between international actors. The idealists believe that war can be eliminated through collective action. They consider individuals as the possessors of rationality, moral values, and virtues. Human beings have the capacity to keep the world in rationality. Cooperation and complex interdependence are the major themes of liberalism. Idealism believes in the myth that 'there is an international society' that can overcome international anarchy. Nation-states can unite together for greater goodness to achieve victory over international anarchy. Idealism is the expression of the rational utopia; it is concerned with 'what ought to be.' It believes that social and political order is possible for the benefit of everybody. Liberty, equality, and freedom are salient features of idealism. Idealism crosses the political national border lines for the sake of peace, democracy, and fraternity. These variables of idealist International Relations theory can be appropriate grounds for examining literary texts.

Constructivist International Relations theory poses the role of individuals in constructing their knowledge. It emphasizes the importance of identities and shared understandings. Human beings are the makers of the world we live in. Identities are socially constructed. Context is related to construction, and it is very important to reconstruct the world. Thoughts and beliefs create the social world because every action in the world is contextual. Literary works are also contextual; context plays a great role in literature. Constructivism believes that 'anarchy is what states make of it.' Anarchy creates conflict, but conflict may not be perpetual. States act differently toward enemies because they are more dangerous to them than to their friends. States are decision-makers. Constructivism emphasizes the interaction between states. The failure to interact creates anarchy. Social relations are powerful to construct ourselves. These features of constructive International Relations theory can be suitable foundations for examining literary texts. Ideas prevalent in

society shape any literary work, and on the contrary, the ideas expressed in the work also help to shape society. Literary and popular arts also illustrate the constructivist myth: 'Anarchy is what states make of it.' As the international system, literature can also be understood as a social artifact. So, the tool of Constructivist International Relations theory is very much applicable to analyzing literary texts.

## CHAPTER IV

### INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE CIVIL WAR IN HEMINGWAY'S *FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS*

#### *For Whom the Bell Tolls: An Overview*

Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is set against the backdrop of the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939). Robert Jordan, the protagonist, goes to Spain, from the USA to help the Republican side in the Civil War. The novel describes the four-day wartime activities in the summertime in Segovia, a hilly side of Spain. The protagonist goes to help the Republican local guerrilla band led by Pablo. His aim is to explode the bridge so that the Fascist group can be halted away and cannot use the road to move their tanks, artillery, or trucks toward the pass where General Golz is planning to attack. Republican commander General Golz gives him responsibility for blowing the bridge because "he knew how to blow any sort of bridge that you could name and had blown them of all sizes and constructions" (Hemingway 6-7). Golz has appointed him for this arduous task because he has heard that he blows bridges very well and very scientifically. Jordan is guided by the peasant guerrilla Anselmo to the hilly camp to meet the guerrilla band. On that hill are more than a hundred guerrillas serving the Republican side being divided into small bands. In the camp, he makes quick rapport with the local guerrillas. Pablo, the leader of the guerrilla group, disagrees with Jordan's plan of blowing the bridge, and secretly steals and throws some of the explosives of Jordan down into the river. But later, he feels lonely and agrees to take part with Jordan to blow the bridge. Jordan also realizes that blowing the bridge is an arduous task, but he becomes determined as per the order he has got from the center.

In a short time, Jordan makes love with Maria, a girl in the camp recently raped by Falangist groups. She is an orphan girl rescued by Pablo's wife Pilar, now she is in traumatic

condition because her parents have been killed by the men of General Francisco Franco. His love for her makes him very much invigorating so that he feels himself integrated in his life in those four days. He also desires to stop the action of blowing the bridge, so he sends Andreys, a member of a guerrilla group, to the headquarters for the blowing plan to be canceled. But Andreys gets delayed on the way so Jordan does not get permission on time. Then he explodes the bridge in the daylight and becomes able to perform his duty though Anselmo is killed by the shrapnel. While returning, the horse of Jordan is shot by a Fascist man, and he gets his left leg crumpled which makes him unable to move. He tells his friends to go away leaving him alone there to save them from the possible attacks by the enemy group. He still plans to attack the opponent group before he becomes unconscious or dies.

Hemingway was a staunch supporter of Loyalists in the Spanish Civil War. Though he was a journalist, he biasedly supported the Loyalist groups because they were popularly elected in 1936, however, the Fascists and extreme rightists attempted mutiny and coup which stretched into the Civil War. The loss of the Loyalists was a terrible defeat for Hemingway. He wrote reflecting on the Spanish Civil War, "There is no man alive today who has not cried at a war if he was at it long enough. Sometimes it is after a battle, sometimes it is when someone that you love is killed, and sometimes it is at the disbanding of a corps or a unit that has endured and accomplished together again. But all men at war cry sometimes, from Napoleon, the greatest butcher, down" (qtd. in Sean Hemingway 6-7). He highlights aspects of tortures and troubles that people experience during and after the war.

War was Hemingway's greatest subject throughout his life. He experienced war firsthand and used war scenes as settings for his memorable works. Throughout his life, he expressed the influence of war in his life as well as its effect on other people who experienced it (Putman). For Hemingway "war groups the maximum of material and speeds up the action and brings out all sorts of stuff that normally you have to wait a lifetime to get"

(Muller 2). Hemingway was keenly interested in war. His grandson Sean mentions that he “was a military expert, a student of war in its totality, from machine gun emplacements, tactics, and maneuvers to civilian, moral and industrial organization” (2). He experienced two Great Wars, in which he took part actively, and he expressed war experiences in many of his writings that portray “the physical and psychological impact of war and aftermath” (Sean Hemingway 2).

Born in 1899 in Oak Park, Illinois, Hemingway had many hobbies: watching uncensored movies, taking part in boxing matches and gambling, going for prostitution, consumption of alcohol, swimming, and bullfighting. He was a great writer, tough hunter, fisherman, war veteran, and enthusiastic about world politics. Probably, his adventurous hobbies and habits inspired him to visit different places in different parts of the world, and that helped him to write novels on international issues. In the early years of the First World War, America remained out of the war, but after Woodrow Wilson’s request to Congress in April 1917 for American involvement in the war, America was involved in war “to make the world safe for democracy by saving those countries . . . called allies” (Martin 22). Hemingway was also eager to experience war as other young men of his age. So, he joined the Missouri Home Guard (in March it became the National Guard) in January 1918. However, he failed the exam that would have allowed him to go to Europe with American troops to take part in the war because of his poor eyesight. Then, he joined the American Red Cross to support the Italian Army fighting the German-Austrian forces as an ambulance driver. Barely after a month in the war zone, on the night of July 8, 1918, he was blown up by an Austrian trench mortar. “He was apparently the first American wounded in Italy though another ambulance driver had been killed in June” (Oliver 7). His war experience during World War I (1914-1918) inspired him to write his premier American war novel, *A Farewell to Arms* (1929), in which the protagonist, the wounded Lieutenant Frederick falls in love with a hospital nurse

Catherine, and both of them go to Switzerland leaving the front. Catherine's death in childbirth and Frederick's dejections of duty indicated America's rejection of the war and its political isolation during the 1920s.

Hemingway was a continuous experimental writer. Eight novels, four volumes of stories, two guidebooks, poetry, a play, a film, a reminiscence, and innumerable journalistic articles are the justification of experimentation. His experimental quality has best been justified in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Gerry Bernner comments Hemingway as an experimental writer and his *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is an example of experimentation with novel writing with issues of historical significance. It is a great novel of love, bravery, suffering, and endurance.

Hemingway went to Spain during the Spanish Civil War as a correspondent to work for North American Newspaper Alliance (NANA) from 1937-1939. During that period he visited many war-front areas, met many republican soldiers and common people, and visited many religious, cultural, and geographical places. He also contributed 14 articles to the *Ken* magazine covering the conflicts of the Civil War. In his dispatches he covered the "feats of individuals and smaller fighting units" (Sanders 139). He tersely evaluated the involvement of the International Brigades. "In the later dispatches, he refuted the prediction of an early Franco victory, and it was his insistence on an eventual Republican victory" (139). Some of the dispatches were the direct calls for American intervention. He was openly taking the Republican side for the cause of humanity and democracy because the Republican government was the second democratically elected government in Spain. Through his dispatches, he also blamed that "The career diplomats of England, France, and the United States were easily impressed by the Fascists and had misinformed their governments about the Republican chances" (139). New York Times journalist Herbert Matthew viewed, "Madrid amidst other happy memories, has that one for me, too- of great days with a man

who exemplifies for me so much that is brave and good and fine in a somewhat murky world. Ernest Hemingway is great-hearted and childish, and perhaps a little mad, and I wish there were more like -but there could not be” (qtd. in Vernon 28-29). His stay in Spain during the 1930s was of great importance. The firsthand experiences that he got during his stay in Spain assisted him in writing *For Whom the Bell Tolls* as a compelling war narrative.

In *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, too, Robert Jordan, an American university professor from Montana, volunteers his services in the war for the anti-fascist cause. He is an idealist and has a commitment for the betterment of the situation. It is true that “For idealists a desire and commitment to overcome the conditions of real conflicts, or perceived injustices, in world politics is a possibly sufficient condition for change” (Crawford 15). He takes the side of the Loyalists because they are fighting the rebel army of General Francisco Franco (Oliver 146). In the novel, Pilar asks him, “Are you a Communist?” He answers, “No I am an anti-fascist.” (Hemingway 69). In fact, he was the descendant of anti-fascist republicans. Jordan says to himself “you are not a real Marxist and you know it. You believe in Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. You believe in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. . . . If this war is lost all of those things are lost” (315). Karkov, the Russian journalist in the novel, comments about Robert Jordan as “a young American of slight political development but a great way with the Spaniards and a fine *partisan* record” (442). He follows the slogan of the communist party “hold out and fortify, and you will win” (319). He has the conviction that “it is better to die on your feet than to live on your knees” (319). Jordan is a staunch supporter of love and dignity. He says to Maria, “I love thee as I love liberty and dignity and the rights of all men to work and not be hungry” (361). It is his conviction on liberty and dignity.

### **Love during Wartime**

Love and war are considered two chief issues in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Though they seem antagonistic to each other, they are perpetuating aspects in literary works. Love

integrates people, whereas war disintegrates them. In the novel, Jordan meets Maria in the mountains with Pablo's band of guerillas who are staying there to blow a bridge after blowing up a train three months earlier. They are in the mountains for guerilla war because it is easy for them to hide from enemies. Maria is in a traumatic situation after being raped by opponent groups a few months earlier. The horror scenes of the killing of her parents by the enemies is still fresh in her mind. She is taking shelter in the camp under the guardianship of Pilar. Examining Maria's condition Oliver comments:

[Maria was] recovering with Pilar's help from psychological wounds she received when the Falangists (a political wing of the Fascists) entered her hometown, killed her mother and father and the town Mayor, and then gang raped her and several of her friends. When Jordan joins the group, she becomes his lover. Pilar believes that being with Jordan will help Maria overcome her mental wounds. (146)

Pilar understands Maria's psychology and permits her to extend her love to Jordan. She tries to take her out of her traumatic situation.

The love between Jordan and Maria is a wartime love and love of the time of emergency. It flourishes within a short span of time. The love between them is "a highly romanticized rather than a strictly realistic love story" (Meyers 23). Jordan feels integrated during these four days after he falls in love with Maria, and Maria, who has already experienced sexual violence, feels secure to be with him emotionally. So she easily agrees to be together with him in bed. Jordan has been deployed in that area for an arduous job, and his love for Maria provides him hope and tenderness. On the other hand, Maria is a war suffered girl who has been raped by the Falangist group, so she wants to get freedom and fearless love. She is in a traumatic condition and takes Jordan as her redeemer. It helps her to revive somehow from her traumatic situation. The love creates mutual confidence between them. As

we know that war is an essential issue of International Relations theory, we can claim that the theme of war also adheres to love. So love is also a matter of international relations.

Pilar is strong and determined. She is a woman, but she does many jobs in the Republican camp including cooking, fanning the fire, tending the horses, and guarding the post in Pablo's absence. Pilar is a woman who serves as a soldier and participates in atrocities. She also cares about another woman, Maria who is more domestic. She is a sexually abused woman. But after Pilar's and Jordan's encouragement "she believes that finding the right sexual and emotional encounter will care her" (Engle 947). The love with Jordan helps her to subside the traumatic memory of the past. Sexual life is often separated from military activity, but like men, women have also sexual lives during war. Women are not imagined to be mothers if they are thought to be soldiers. Maria challenges the stereotypical ideas about raped women. She does not become in a deserted condition. Instead, she starts a new life after being ashamed of herself. Her relationship with Robert Jordan justifies that "Rape is not necessarily a fate worse than death; women can have 'healthy' and 'normal' emotional and sexual lives even after rape" (954). Sex becomes a source of revival and socialization for Maria. As war crosses the normal borderline, love also does the same. A Spanish girl shares the bed with an American.

### **The Spanish Civil War**

War and peace, and conflict and cooperation are characteristic features of international relations. War is an important issue of Realist International Relations theory. The civil war or the war between nations is almost the same. Different opponent groups, either within the nation or from other nations, are involved in a war. War is inevitable because as Realist International Relations theory believes the nature of the state is anarchical. The myth of Realist International Relations theory 'international anarchy is the permissive cause of war' suggests the anarchical nature of the state that can make war between the

nations or within the nation. In such wars, there may be the involvement of people from different organizations or countries. The issue of war is also expressed in fictional narrative works. Literature is a veritable field to study the realist nature of International Relations theory. In Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* war occurs because of the anarchical nature of the state. The Civil War starts because of a conflict between two groups: the Republicans and the Nationalists. There is no other organization to stop them from conflicting situations because a state has an anarchical nature. Many other nations and their people support either of the groups directly or indirectly.

*For Whom the Bell Tolls* is one of the great artworks of Hemingway that deals with the conflicts and consequences of war. As Sheeran opines "Great art certainly captures and reflects the essence of human conflict and the consequence of war" (51), it describes the Spanish Civil War that began in the middle of July 1936, when a group of generals attempted a military coup against the Second Spanish Republic. The war was "against a Republican government committed to social reform, devolution, and secularism. Directly or indirectly, the conflict caused about half a million deaths in a population of 24 million" (Lennon 6). Oliver also records that "Spain was split into two, and a harsh civil war was fought for nearly three years until, at the end of March 1939, the rebel generals completed their slow territorial conquest of the country by eventually taking the major prize that had eluded them throughout the war, Madrid itself" (6). The Spanish Civil War was a great war in the history of Spain that caused great destruction.

War is a vague term that crosses the boundary of a limited territory. Two opponent groups are inevitable for war and states are major factors for it. General Carl Von Clausewitz opines that "war is nothing but a duel on a larger scale. Countless duels go to make up a war, but a picture of it as a whole can be formed by imagining a pair of wrestlers. Each tries through physical force to compel the other to do his will; his immediate aim is to throw his

opponent in order to make him capable of further resistance” (13). War may occur between two or more states, or it may occur within a state. If it occurs between internal armed forces of the same nation, it is called civil war. Civil war is an “internal armed conflict between people of the same nation” (“Civil”). Though in civil war the conflict is between people of the same nation, they may be assisted by people outside the nation. The outside assistance was vital in the Spanish Civil War.

So far as the Spanish Civil War is concerned, during this war Spain had been the battle ground for people of many nations. The Nazi and fascist regimes of Hitler and Mussolini, as well as international Catholicism and Moroccan troops, supported Francisco Franco, and the Soviet Union (Stalin) supported the Republic led by Francisco Largo Caballero and later by Juan Negrin. Similarly, volunteers from dozens of countries joined the International Brigades and defended the Republic. A small number from Ireland fought on the other side. France and Britain stayed outside pursuing a policy of non-intervention aimed at limiting the conflict by making arms sales to Spain illegally (Lannan 6-7). As a result of the situation of international anarchy, there was no strong power to withhold them from grouping. In the novel *Jordan*, an American, joins the International Brigades and works as a dynamiter under the command of the Russian commander General Golz. Alpert Michael gives the statistics of the foreign involvement in the Spanish Civil War. He records:

The individual number of volunteers had come from France, followed by Poles, Italians, Americans and Germans. . . . There were several hundred Russian officers who acted as advisers to the Popular Army of the Spanish Republic. . . . Altogether the Russians sent 204 interpreters, both men and women, most of whom had learned their Spanish in the USSR, though a few had lived for many years in Latin America. . . . The two battalions or 1500 foreign volunteers who were brought to Madrid from their base on 6 November 1936, saved the capital. (179-181)

Why do wars occur? This is a great question that people always raise and try to answer. In Liliestern's view "the war as a whole always has a final political purpose, which means that war is undertaken and conducted in order to realize the political purpose upon which the state's [leading] powers have decided in view of the nation's internal- external conditions" (qtd. in Clausewitz xv). The realist International Relations thinker Kenneth Waltz claims, "[T]he locus of the important war results from selfishness, from misdirected aggressive impulses, from stupidity" (16). This explanation asserts that men behave badly because they are bad by nature. The selfish and aggressive nature of men creates conflicts and wars, and states become "inherently aggressive" (Ghosh 26). Realism believes that the working of a state within results in its relation with other countries. "It is necessary, therefore, to accept the inevitability of war and pursue the necessary preparations for conflict" (Steans et al. 54). Realism also believes that conflict groups are essential parts of social and political affairs. In the Spanish Civil War, the conflict groups were nationalists and the Republicans. The troops led by General Francisco Franco revolted against the newly elected 'popular front' government. Franco's supporters came to be known as the nationalists or Falangists, whereas the newly elected group was known as the Republicans. The defenders of the newly elected government were also called the Loyalists. Both of the groups had their own reasons for the war. The war was of great significance for "those Spaniards who had hoped the Republic would usher in an unprecedented era of social justice and modernization, and for others who regarded [the Republic government] as a revolutionary and irreligious assault of Spanish tradition" (Lannon 6). So both rival groups have different credos for supporting war. In the novel, the war occurs in the pass of the mountains of Segovia.

### **International Independence of the Nations**

The realist concept of International Relations claims that nations are sovereign and accountable to no higher power that they have to obey. So they have international

independence. This type of international independence creates anarchy, which is the permissive cause of war (Weber 16). Because of their international independence, they may have their own way of domestic politics, but it affects international relations. It is related to the power and its exercise by states. Realism accepts three basic assumptions-"first, that the world is composed of sovereign nation-states; second, that there is no world government which means there is no international orderer, and third, that the absence of world government or an international orderer by definition means that international politics is anarchical" (Weber 17). So there is always a chance of war within a nation or with other nations. The activities related to the Spanish Civil War mentioned in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* are the outcomes of international anarchy and selfish and misdirected aggressive impulses of men. The novel asserts that the activities shown by the fascists or nationalists were full of selfish and misdirected aggressive impulses. The protagonists and other characters who are fighting from the side of the Republicans believe that the Fascists are full of selfish and misdirected aggressive impulses. People are involved in the war by crossing their national borderlines and get involved in wars, some for the betterment of humanity and democracy. This type of involvement is related to the study area of International Relations. Knutsen rightly puts, "International Relations deals with human behaviour in the largest of all social groups: the international society" (30). In the novel, we get references to the involvement of Germany and Italy in supporting the Fascist group, but the main highlights are the activities performed by the republican side. It is mainly because the involvement of the Republican side in the war was for the cause of humanity and democracy.

The Spanish Civil War, an inherent subject of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, was a conflict for power. The rise and fall of power is an issue of Realist International Relations theory. As the outcome of the Spanish Civil War, the nationalists rose into power whereas the loyalists (Republicans) lost the power, and about a half million people were exiled whereas the other

half were executed. “On both sides, the Spanish Civil War was peculiarly destructive. About half a million people died, out of a population of 24 million. Whole towns and villages were virtually obliterated. . . . Families were also destroyed, both by death and by political divisions that sometimes pitted brother against brother, and father against son. The economy, too, was devastated” (Lannon 71). The novel is the outcome of the ardent desire of Hemingway who “wanted to present continuing, immutable truths about Spain and felt it necessary to go beyond Madrid and the political sphere of war” (Sanders 140).

The nations are independent of themselves, so they are anarchical. They are free to determine their domestic policy, but in reality, it affects their relations with other nations. Their domestic policy makes their relationship with other countries either amicable or conflictual. In the novel the Loyalists have amicable relations with Russia and the Nationalists have amicable relations with Italy and Germany.

### **Anarchy, Cause of Destruction**

Anarchy inside the nation creates a destructive situation that causes unrest and war. This situation happens in Spain during the Civil War. Though the war was between two internal armed groups, it did not remain only in their control, and both sides looked for external support. As Waltz asserts, “International anarchy is the permissive cause of war” (qtd. in Weber 16), there was no international body to stop them from waging war. The Fascist governments of Italy and Germany provided military support to the Franco group, whereas the Soviet Union supplied arms to the Republican group. People from many other countries were also involved in the war. Edmund Quinn asserts, “. . . more than 40000 men, and women from around the world formed ‘Loyalist International Brigades’ to fight ‘the good fight’, as the war was known in the leftist circles. Among these groups was the American Abraham Lincoln Brigade, a force of 2800, approximately one-third of whom were killed in action” (299).

The mass of non-Spanish and communist sympathizers from almost every country in Europe and the United States went to take part in the war in Spain (Turnbull 5). The Spanish Civil War was internal in its origin, but in the course of time, sixty-one different nations took part in the war. The role of international involvement happened to be decisive for the progress and ending of the conflict. “International support for both sides was vital for fighting and continuing the war during the early months. Italian and German aid enabled the military rebels to move the African army to the Peninsula at the end of July 1936, and Soviet aid made a decisive contribution to the Republican defense of Madrid in November 1936” (Casanova 212).

Similarly, from its beginning, the Spanish Civil War got international attention and foreign involvement. Francis Lannon observes:

Governments, political parties, trade unions, churches and private citizens across Europe and even beyond, recognized that the conflict in Spain. . . . Suddenly Spain seemed for thousands who had never been there, and who had never paid it much attention before, the centre of the world. And in a sense it was because the conflict was ideological as well as political and military. Making the social revolution or breaking it, defending religion or destroying it, stopping fascism or joining it, saving democracy or overturning it- these were issues that were significant far beyond Spain’s frontiers. (6)

Nazis, Fascists, international Catholicism, Moroccan troops supported Franco. Fierce fighting occurred in different parts of Spain causing a great deal of human and non-human destruction. Eventually, the Republicans got into desperate condition. “In January 1939, Barcelona was captured, and in March of that year Madrid fell to the nationalists. On April 11, 1939, General Franco declared victory” (Quinn 300). When there are unequal power

structures, the strong orders with its power, whereas the weak follows because of being powerless (Devetak et al. 9).

The critic Walter J. Slatoff asserts that killing is a sin, but people are killing others (143). In the novel, Jordan questions himself “Don’t you know it is wrong to kill? Yes. But you do it? Yes. You still believe absolutely that your cause is right. Yes” (314). The protagonist in the novel has the conviction that killing is justifiable for the just cause. There is a lengthy discussion between Jordan and old Anselmo about killing. When the old man Anselmo says “I do not like to kill men.” Jordan replies that “Nobody does except those who are disturbed in the head”. He further says “But I feel nothing against it when it is necessary. When it is for the cause” (Hemingway 42). The old man admits that he has also killed people by means of necessity. He asserts “I think it is a sin to kill. To take the life of another is to me very grave. I will do it whenever necessary” (44). He thinks that he will kill in the future, too, but it gives him no pleasure, and regards it as a sin. By referring to the dialogue between Jordan and Anselmo the critic Slatoff claims that Hemingway agrees to kill in necessity. Slatoff posits, “Hemingway has achieved a high degree of honesty and artistic neutrality by emphasizing Loyalist as well as Fascist atrocities and by showing the humanity of various characters on the Fascist side” (142). Besides it, the novel does not affirm one aspect. The novel describes the wartime activities and torturing and killing of many people. But Slatoff views that the novel “asserts absolutely and without qualification that killing is unjustifiable and sinful, the one thing we have no right to do even though it is necessary” (143). In his writing Slatoff also takes a reference of a lengthy discussion about killing between Jordan and old Anselmo. In the discussion the old man shows his dislike to kill people and says it is sinful. But Jordan says that killing is bad in normal situation, but he accepts it when it is necessary and when it is for the just cause.

In Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, the action takes place within four days in Guadarrama Mountains near Segovia, northwest of Madrid. It describes the explosion of the bridge of strategic importance in Guadarrama Mountains of central Spain to keep the Fascists away from the mountains. The protagonist "Robert Jordan, a young American professor and an expert dynamiter, comes to the camp of a band of loyalist guerrillas with an assignment from general headquarters to blow up [the] strategically important bridge" (Quinn 301). He was an expert "who knew how to blow any sort of bridge that you could name and he had blown them of all sizes and constructions" (Hemingway 6-7). He gets the order from General Golz to stall the fascists after the Loyalist attack. Voluntarily Robert takes part in this arduous job of destruction for the cause of liberty and the rights of the people, mainly because the progressive issues like "Land reform, jobs, improved wages and better public provision for health and particularly education were essential items on the Republican agenda" (Lannon 16). He was a staunch supporter of these progressive agendas.

### **The Constructivist Perception**

Constructivism in international relations asserts the fact that relations between nations are created by ideational factors that are constructed by actors in societies (in nations). It believes that state sovereignty is socially constructed and identities are also socially constructed. Constructivism focuses on human consciousness and its place in world affairs. It asserts that the most important aspect of International Relations is social. Human creations are largely cultural and state systems are inter-subjective. Social structures create identities of states. The world of international relations is not the physical entity, but the human consciousness. Jackson et al. rightly assert that "the study of international relations must focus on the ideas and beliefs that inform the actors on the international scene as well as the shared understanding between them" (209). The international system is constituted of ideas and is based on a common understanding among people. Change in thoughts and ideas will

certainly help change in the system. “The social world is a world of thoughts and beliefs, of ideas and concepts, of languages and discourses, of signs and signals, and understanding among human beings, especially groups of human beings, such as states and nations” (Jackson et al. 212). The constructivists assert that social fabric influences world politics, and social facts are made by human action. Constructivism acknowledges that “human beings are always situated in particular contexts which inform their actions, they also reproduce or reconstruct their world through their actions. The world we live in is, therefore, always contextual” (Steans et al. 183). Context is related to constructivism and it is very much important to reconstruct the world. Daniel Thomas explains, “According to . . . constructivist theories of international relations, actors (states) seek to behave in accordance with the norms relevant to their identities . . . [which are] definitions of the self in realization to others that provide guidance for how one should behave in a given context” (qtd. in Shimko 55).

Ideology is of great importance for humans because it produces meanings and values in social life. It is a body of ideas that express characteristics of a particular social group or class. It incorporates “ideas (or false ideas) which help to legitimate a dominant political power” (T. Eagleton 1). In *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Hemingway tries to construct the idea that the Spanish Civil War was the war between two ideologies: Republic and Fascist. This approach is related to the Constructivist International Relations theory because it is related to ideas and ideologies. In Gerry Brennen’s view Hemingway does not only mention the Civil War among the Spanish, he talks about the war of ideologies. Brennen also asserts that the Spanish Civil War was a war of ideologies. He views:

In the novel, Hemingway attends not only to the Civil War among the Spanish, but also to the civil war between international ideologies of opposing political extremes, Fascism and communism. More immediately Hemingway internalizes the civil war within the guerrilla band and within Jordan himself, the latter evidenced by his

numerous internal debates and by the civil war between his values: love, pleasure, self-cynicism, and the now, opposed to war, duty, others, idealism, and the future.

(502)

In *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Franco's group is named as the Fascists, and the popularly elected groups are referred to as the Republic. "The nationalists, or Falangists, as Franco's supporters came to be known, were backed by large landowners, the clergy, and eventually by an increasing number of middle class. The Loyalists, defenders of the elected republic government, drew their support from urban areas and the peasant class" (Quinn 299). In this way during the war, the Spanish population was divided into two clear-cut factions on the basis of two different ideologies held by the two fighting groups. Every war is fought for certain causes. In the Spanish Civil War both groups "were convinced that they were fighting for civilization against the powers of darkness" (Turnbull 5) "On Franco's side, the evidence of statements by generals at the time of the July rising reveals that their chief pre-occupations were national unity, and law and order. They wanted to end the Republican's experiments with devolution, and to curb the waves of street violence, land occupations and strikes that seemed to be swelling out of control" (Lannon 7). There were also political aims of restoring the monarchy, which had collapsed in 1931 or "the establishment of an alternative or more illiberal monarchical line in Carlism, or to the promotion of the Spanish Fascist movement, the Falange, and even the continuation of the Republic, but under a different constitution" (7). The Nationalists believed on established gender roles in society. On the other hand, the Republicans believed that men and women could be equal, they believed that "women could be politicians, public speakers, even soldiers, the most traditionally masculine of all occupations" (69). They meant for democracy and secular social order. The term Republic implied "a shift in public policy in favour of the working masses and the poor. . . . The Republic meant, for those who cheered its arrival, a democratic, civilian secular order" (16).

Both the conflicting groups constructed certain thoughts, ideas, and ideologies and people gave their support to each of them believing in their ideas and thoughts. The society constructed two conflictual ideologies and the relation between people happened to be conflictual.

*For Whom the Bell Tolls* gives a vivid fictional account of the Spanish Republican Guerrilla Civil Warfare to its American readers. It describes the activities done mainly by the Republicans for the betterment of the Spanish people. The novel "emerges from the bloody and tumultuous history of the twentieth century" (Stoltzfus 190). Though the novel is set in the backdrop of the Spanish Civil War, it shows international concern for democracy by stopping the advancement of Fascism in Europe. It intermixes political commitment and art. The protagonist Robert Jordan joins the International Brigades to participate in the war to support the Republicans (the ruling group) for the sake of democracy and the betterment of humanity. He voluntarily participates in the war because the republican democratic spirit flows in his blood. Republicanism is the political concept that leads people away from crossing national boundaries. The idea of republicanism leads him to take part in war in foreign lands. He says, "My father was also a Republican all his life. Also my grandfather" (Hemingway 69). His grandfather had fought in the American Civil War (1861-1865) with other major figures like Quantrill, John Mossy, Grant, Sherman, Stonewell Jackson, Jeb Stuart, Phil Sheridan, McClellan, and Killy-the-Horse-Kilpatrick. He thinks of himself, "You had read on and studied the art of war ever since you were a boy and your grandfather had started you on the American Civil War. Excellent that Grandfather always called it the war of the Rebellion. . . . Your grandfather fought four years in our Civil War and you are just finishing your first year in this war" (347-348).

Robert Jordan, an expatriate, believes in the victory of the Civil War though a republican fighter Pablo has lost belief in his group's power and assumes that the opponent

group is more powerful than his own. He asserts that the opponents are “always stronger, always better armed. Always with more material” (Hemingway 17). For him to be in war less armed means to “be hunted and to die. Nothing more” (17). On the other hand, Jordan has a conviction to win the war, so he is involved selflessly in the war in a foreign land. Idealists are away from real situations and current thinking, and moral principles are before prudential considerations. They are ignorant about the world around them and go for a future perfect world (Griffiths et al. 151-152). His involvement in the war is for the sake of humanity and freedom. His involvement is related to the Idealist concept of International Relations theory. His involvement in the war in foreign countries indicates the existence of international society. He shows his fraternity with the Spanish Republicans. People from many other countries are involved in that war for the cause of democracy and the betterment of society. The novel is a great means to relate various ideas and issues related to International Relations. The involvement of Jordan in the Civil War created the idea that people should cross national boundaries for the cause of democracy, harmony, and the betterment of humanity.

Ideas like home, homelessness, and foreignness are also issues that are related to the Constructivist International Relations theory. The novel deals with home, homelessness, and foreignness. Home is an important element in International Relations. “Home is a place of refuge, rest and belonging, where families are born and lives are shaped or torn apart. . . . Home is repeatedly the untold and silent story of international relations” (Sheeran 70). At the beginning of the novel, we find Pablo’s boastful feelings about being a citizen of Spain. He does not like the order of the foreigners. He tells Jordan, “What right have you, a foreigner, to come to me and tell me what I must do” (Hemingway 17). In reply Jordan says, “I am a foreigner is not my fault. I would rather have been born here” (18). Though they are fighting for the same group, there is a clear demarcation between home and away. Though Jordan is

performing his duty selflessly for the cause of democracy, he is undermined as a foreigner. The importance of home is great for a person because it gives him a sense of superiority. They are now guerillas who have lost their houses. Anselmo has lost his house and he is full of reminiscences. He recalls, “In my house, when I had a house, and now I have no house, there were the tusks of boar I had shot in the lower forest” (42). His house was a symbol of pride and glory for him. At the end of the novel, Jordan is deserted voluntarily to die. He has no home in Spain to go for shelter.

The constructivist International Relations theory has a myth, “Anarchy is what states make of it” (Wendt 391). Very narrow ideas related to nationalism, ideologies, and dogmatic feelings are created by nations and other organizations so that people behave almost blindly. In the novel, the Fascist groups behave mercilessly towards the other people in the name of nationalism. They have named themselves as Nationalist groups. The Spanish Civil War is not only related to the people of Spain. It is the clash of two different ideologies: Republicans and Nationalists. These two groups are assisted by different nations directly and indirectly, or by the involvement of the people of different nations.

The Spanish Civil War was of great importance to the Soviet press. It “published daily reports accusing international fascism, meaning Germany and Italy, of fomenting and sustaining the war” (Payne 12). “The first *Pravda* editorial on the Spanish war on August 1, [1936], was headed ‘Fascism means war, Socialism means peace’” (126). It is a way of constructing ideas. This news is related to the Constructivist side of International Relations, relevant in Hemingway’s *For Whom the Bell Tolls*.

### **Supporting the Republicans, a Utopian Concept**

Utopia is an idealist concept that is also used in art and literature. Manuel and Manuel observe utopia is “The conception of heaven on earth that underlies Western utopian thought presupposes an idea of perfection in another sphere” (17). It is a vision of better society than

the existing one. The Utopian concept of the narrative is related to the Idealist International Relations theory. *For Whom the Bell Tolls* reveals the utopian concept coined by Sir Thomas More. It is a type of idealist concept related to International Relations. Among foreign writers, journalists, and actors of the time, Hemingway was the most prominent to side with the Republicans. He did so mainly for the Utopian concept. Though his involvement in blowing the bridge is a destructive act, he does it for the cause of democracy and the betterment of humanity. The novel justifies that war is necessary to preserve republican norms like humanity, democracy, freedom, equality, rights of people, and brotherhood. Jordan envisions a better world which inspires him to take part in war selflessly. He finds that the Republican government of Spain is working for the rights of the common people. On the other hand, Francisco Franco's government is a despotic government which is crumpling the rights of the people.

The guerrilla group led by Pablo is living in the Guadarrama mountains near Segovia as a family though they are from different places and social groups. During the time of war, all friends become a family. When Joaquin cries remembering his family members, Maria says, "I am thy sister. And I love thee and thou hast a family. We are all thy family" (Hemingway 145). It is the sense of brotherhood that crosses national and cultural boundaries. The sense of belongingness of people of different nations and cultures is an aspect of idealist International Relations.

Every war is fought to kill the opponents. Robert asserts "Every fascist dead is a fascist less" (287). He has the belief that his group should win the war because if they "do not win this war there will be no revolution nor any Republic nor any thou nor any me nor anything" (295). He further puts, "You see that we are working for one thing. To win the war. Unless we win, all other things are futile. Tomorrow we have a thing of great importance. Of true importance. Also we will have combat. In combat there must be discipline. For many

things are not as they appear. Discipline must come from trust and confidence” (302).

Anselmo also believes that they should win the war. As Agustin plans to shoot “the anarchists and the communists and all the canalla except the good Republicans,” Anselmo believes that they should win that war and they should shoot nobody (295). He also plans about ruling after the war. He suggests, “We should govern justly and that all should participate in the benefits according as they have striven for them. And that those who have fought against us should be educated to see their error. . . . That we should none. Not even the leaders. That they should be reformed by work” (296). The war for them is for maintaining a just society, a society that is better than the existing one.

Death becomes very near during the war worldwide. In one conversation informing about foreign dynamiter Kashkin, Robert says, “He is dead since April.” Pablo responds “That is what happens to everybody” (Hemingway 17). Robert affirms, “Dying is only bad when it takes a long time and hurts so much that it humiliates you” (487). At last, lieutenant Berrendo, a fascist officer, appears near him. “He could feel his heart beating against the pine needle floor of the forest” (490). For him, the sense of death becomes minor in comparison to the conviction. People can easily sacrifice for their creeds and beliefs.

In the novel, Jordan has an idealistic purpose. He almost reaches the breaking point of his resolution. Still, he overcomes all the hurdles and succeeds in achieving his resolution, and he can accomplish the duty assigned to him. His goal is serious and the plot of the novel ends at his near death. He is waiting to die soon, but he can save his comrades by being able to send them away from the risk zone. In fact, he has got martyrdom.

The novel expresses something about discipline, obedience, and faith during the time of war at national as well as international levels. As Pablo refuses to obey his order, Jordan tells him, “I come only for my duty. I come under orders from those who are conducting the war. If I ask you to help me, you can refuse and I will find others who will help me” (18). In

the mountains, they are working for the Republic with great faith and with the hope of winning the war. Pilar says, "I put great illusion in the Republic. I believe firmly in the Republic and I have faith. I believe in it with fervor as those who have religious faith believe in the mysteries" (96). Jordan's great faith is in blowing up the bridge because he thinks "For us will be the bridge and the battle, should there be the one" (46). He tells himself, "There is a bridge and that bridge can be the point on which the future of the human race can turn" (46). Discipline and obedience of orders are essential ingredients to win any war. Anselmo who is a mature guerilla fighting for the cause of democracy realizes the weaknesses of his side. So he concludes, "All through this war we have suffered from a lack of discipline and from disobeying of orders" (200). People have faith in certain beliefs, and they fight for it with strong discipline. The novel constructs the idea that obedience, faith, and discipline are the surest weapons to win a war.

### **Wartime Atrocities**

The novel reports a long list of wartime activities of the Republican side. It justifies the idea that war is fought for certain convictions, but it also makes people brutal. "On the second day Pilar tells Jordan about the beginning of the Republican movement when she witnessed the ugly killing of twenty fascists in their hometown" (Oliver 147). Pilar reports that when the Civiles (the Fascists) surrendered at the barracks, "Pablo had surrounded it in the dark, cut the telephone wires, placed dynamite under one wall and called on the *guardia civil* to surrender. They would not. And at daylight, he blew the wall open. There was fighting. Two *civiles* were killed. Four were wounded and four surrendered" (Hemingway 105). Pablo and others had finished the wounded. Pablo charged them as the murderers of the peasants. Then he made the four arrested kneel on the wall and shot each in turn on the head with the pistol. That morning they had won the town. There were more than twenty other fascists. Pablo had not shot them. He "had them beaten to death with flails and thrown from

the top of the cliff into the river” (108). The people in the plaza killed them cruelly. They hit Mayor Don Benito with flails. “They beat him until he fell and the man who had struck first called others to strike him. . . and with his face in the dust of the plaza, they dragged him over the wall to the edge of the cliff and threw him over and into the river” (114).

Don Federico Gonzalez, who owned the mill and feed store and was a fascist of the first order, came to the plaza. “He ran fast through the double line with flails falling on his back and shoulders until he fell and those at the end of the line picked him up and swung him over the cliff” (116). Then Don Ricardo Montago volunteered to be killed. He insulted the Republic saying, “Down with the miscalled Republic and I obscenity in the milk of your fathers” (117). They clubbed him to death very quickly. Then came the turn of Don Faustino Revero, son of a lawyer. He was thrown alive to the river. The people in line were now full of thirst to kill because it is true that “To kill gives much thirst” (121). The next turn was of Don Guillermo Martin, owner of the flails store, a fascist. The drunkard beat him with flails. The cruelty and ugly actions were thought necessary to preserve the Republic. The fascists were killed indecently and with mockery. The next turn was of Don Anastasio Rivas, a grain buyer and an agent of several insurance companies, who also loaned money at high rates of interest. He was beaten to death by the mob against the stone flags of the paving of the arcade. Now lines change into the mob. They move into the hall and kill the remaining fascists including the priests and carry them, put them on the cart, and throw them into the river. But three days later the fascists take the town.

The revolution has shattered the lives of innocent common people like Maria. Jordan plans to care for her seriously by taking her with him after the blowing of the bridge. But unfortunately, he has to get separated from her as he is seriously wounded on the way after blowing the bridge. During war, people are compelled to take part in war for life. Andres reacts, “The fascists attacked and made our decision for us. We fight to live” (384). Andres

further says, "But you have no house and no courtyard to your no-house, he thought. You have no family but a brother who goes to battle tomorrow and you own nothing but the wind and the sun and an empty belly" (384). War indeed shatters the lives and families of people, and it has left him in desolate condition.

During the war cruel activities are done from both sides. The war has its certain rules, but people involved in war follow them and commit crimes and show atrocities by killing civilians, killing confined soldiers, and assaulting property, cultural artifacts and other targets that are not directly associated with battles (May 17). The novel also mentions the cruel actions done by the fascists. Jordan, Pilar, and Maria go to the camp of El Sordo, the commander of one of the guerilla groups. They meet Joaquin, a guard, at the gate who has a bad experience of war because the fascists had shot his father, his mother, his sister, and his brother-in-law in Valladolid, his hometown, in a barbarous way. "When the fascists purified the town they shot first the father. He had voted socialist. Then they shot the mother. She had voted the same" (Hemingway 144). Joaquin was not the only person who has lost his relatives, Jordan has heard the story of the loss of mother, father and other relatives from the mouths of many people. Maria has also had a similar experience. She reports, "My father was the Mayor of the village and an honorable man. My mother was an honorable woman and a good Catholic and they shot her with my father because of the politics of my father who was a Republican. I saw both of them shot and my father said, 'viva la Republican', when they shot him standing against the wall of the slaughterhouse of our village" (364). These scenes of cruelty construct the idea that war makes people merciless and cruel. The cruelty also creates a sense of revenge in people.

War is so cruel. Cruelty is the inevitable nature of war. When war is fought cruelty appears. Kashkin and Roberto were returning after blowing up a train. They were returning in the dark when they "encounter a fascist patrol and as [they] ran he was shot high in the back

but without hitting any bone except the shoulder blade. He traveled quite a long way, but with the wound was unable to travel more. He was unwilling to be left behind and [Jordan] shot him” (159). When Jordan becomes wounded while returning after blowing up the bridge, and he becomes unable to keep up his journey, Agustin also asks him that he will shoot if he likes. After killing Sordo and his soldiers on the hill fascist Lieutenant Berrendo “felt only the hollowness that comes after action. He was thinking: taking the heads is barbarous. But proof and identification is necessary” (337). Fernando reacts “What barbarians these fascists are! . . . We must teach them we must take away their planes, their artillery and teach them dignity” (339). As realism asserts, the sense of cruelty and revenge always lurks in men which drives them to behave cruelly.

### **Working of International Society and Its International Connection**

Idealist International Relations theory assumes that “there is an international society”. People of different nations unite together because they “share common interests and the prospects of comparative activities among them will satisfy these interests” (Ghosh 21). Hemingway’s *For Whom the Bell Tolls* favors the republican alliance and claims that the alliance in international society is necessary for the success of the Republican side. The volunteers from different foreign countries are taking part in the war joining the International Brigades, an international alliance. Fifty-two-year-old Russian commander General Golz is also involved in the Civil War. He is the communist commander of the 14<sup>th</sup> and 35<sup>th</sup> International Brigades of the Republican Army. In the novel we find him planning to attack the fascists to keep them away from the Guadarrama Mountains. Golz has a victorious history. He is a person “who had captured the gold train that winter with Lucaz in Siberia. Golz who had fought against Kolchak, and in Poland, in the Caucasus. In China, and here since the first October” (Hemingway 438). As he is attacking the front, he orders Robert

Jordan to blow up the bridge. He is fighting in a foreign country for republican and communist causes.

For Sinclair Lewis the novel is a masterpiece that is “crystallization of the world revolution that began long ago- perhaps in 1776, perhaps in 1848- and that will not cease till the human world has either been civilized or destroyed- perhaps in 1976, perhaps in 2848” (qtd. in Oliver 146-147). As mentioned in the novel, international alliance is inevitable for revolutionary activities because people of all over the world have certain common beliefs and they unite together for those common causes. Lewis further remarks, “When the reader, identifying himself with Robert Jordan, actually smells the fighting, then freedom may become an activity to live for, to die for, and brotherhood may become inevitable” (qtd. in Oliver 147). A similar brotherhood prevails in the novel among people involved in the guerrilla band. Jordan at last sends all others away though he is seriously wounded to save them from the attack of the enemy group. This sense of international brotherhood is the constructed idea that guides them to unite together. It is related to the constructivist International Relations theory.

Jordan loves Spain very much though it is not his native land. He has lived ten years in Spain studying the country and the language before the war. This time he is serving there for a year as a dynamiter, and has a plan to destroy the bridge. By him “The two posts will be destroyed and the bridge will be blown according to Golz’s order and that is all of my responsibility” (Hemingway 234). He could speak Spanish idiomatically and had a knowledge of different places: “He never felt like a foreigner in Spanish and they did not really treat him like a foreigner most of the time. Only when they turned on you” (142). It shows that a person does not only love his native land; he also becomes so much attached to the land where he spends a certain period and whose culture and language he knows. In Jordan’s view, “The first thing was to win the war. If we did not win the war everything was

lost. . . . He gave absolute loyalty and as complete a performance as he could give while he was serving” (142). It is a sense of internationalism and a sense related to Idealist International Relations. This type of thinking of Jordan is a sense of humanity and freedom that crosses the narrow walls of national boundaries. The political faith in humanity and liberty is not limited only within a certain territorial boundary. Robert Jordan fought in the war because:

[I]t had started in the country that he loved and he believed in the republic and that if it were destroyed life would be unbearable for all those people who believed in it. He was under communist discipline for the duration of the war. Here in Spain the communists offered the best discipline and the soundest and the sanest for the prosecution of the war. . . . [In] the conduct of the war, they were the only party whose program and whose discipline he could respect. (170)

While blowing up the bridge Jordan reflects, “as long as we can hold them here we keep the fascists tied up. They cannot attack any other country until they finish with us and they can never finish with us. If the French help at all, if only they have the frontier open and if we get planes from America they can never finish with us. Never, if we get anything at all. These people will fight forever if they’re well-armed” (449). Jordan has fear of spreading the fascist ruling in many other countries, so he wants to defeat them in Spain to finish them there.

War is fought for certain conviction whether it is inside the nation or outside of it. While returning after blowing up the bridge, Jordan is seriously wounded. He tells other companions to leave him and go to the Gredos. As Agustín does not want to leave him alone in the jungle, he replies, “In war there are many things like this” (484). Agustín replies “War is a bitchery” (484). After all others go away to Gredos leaving him in the jungle alone, Jordan thinks:

I have fought for what I believed in for a year now. If we win here we will win everywhere. The world is a fine place and worth fighting for and I hate very much to leave it. And you had a lot of luck, he told himself, to have had such a good life. You've had just as good a life as Grandfather's though not as long. You've had as good a life as anyone because of these last days. (485-486)

While watching activities at the bridge, Anselmo thinks that he has worked well for the Republic. He affirms, "I have worked hard for the good that we will all share later" (206). They have faith in the Republic because "everything can be done under the Republic" (215). The Republic and fascism are the political concepts that exist in every country. Jordan says that America is under the rule of the Republic, but there are many fascists "who do not know they are fascists but will find it out when time comes" (216). And he concludes, "We cannot destroy them. But we can educate the people so that they will fear fascism and recognize it as it appears and combat it" (216). Jordan believes that ideologies spread internationally. Some ideologies are positive, and some others are oppressive, but it takes people time to recognize them.

Class discrimination is a worldwide concept. Many wars in the world had been fought against class discrimination. Even in Spain there was a vast gorge of class discrimination. Pilar comments, "In this country where no poor man can make money unless he is a criminal like Juan March, or a bullfighter, or a tenor in the opera? Why wouldn't he be tubercular? In a country where the bourgeoisie overeat so that their stomachs are still ruined and they cannot live without bicarbonate of soda and the poor are hungry from their birth till the day they die" (192). Members of the communist party, whether Spaniards or Russians, who fought on the side of the republicans in the Spanish Civil war, are called peasants and workers in the novel. It is true that in every war it is poor people who fight in the front. In the course of talking with Jordan, Anselmo affirms, "To me it is a sin to kill a man. Even Fascists whom we must

kill. To me there is a great distance between the bear and the man” (44). Jordan replies, “To win a war we must kill our enemies. That has always been true” (44). Anselmo, who is old by age, thinks that the fascists are the same men as the republicans are. “It is only orders that come between us. Those men are not fascists. . . . They are poor men as we are. They should never be fighting against us and I do not like to think of the killing” (201). In matter of class poor people of both groups belong to the same class, it is ideologies that have discriminated them.

In the course of talking Jordan shares the ideas about customs, culture, and occupations of his country with those Spaniards. In the US men and women eat together, but in Spain, a man does not eat with his woman. In his country people “raise cattle and sheep. . . . Much grain also and beans. And also much beets for sugar” (215). In his country “most land is owned by those who farm it. Originally the land was owned by the state and by living on it and declaring the intention of improving it, a man could obtain title to a hundred and fifty hectares” (215). Jordan’s international involvement helps exchange knowledge about different customs and cultures.

Pablo, the leader of a band of guerillas, was not involved in war at the beginning of the Civil War. He was at Zaragoza where he was working for a horse contractor. In the meantime, he got into many contacts with the people of Austria where they were “much developed politically” (189). He was pretty inspired by them and got involved in the movement taking the side for the Republic. It indicates that the international connection also helps a person to be involved in domestic politics.

The novel shows the increasing reliance of the Republican side on the Soviet Union. The Soviet government and its people took part in the Spanish Civil War actively in the name of liberation of Spain. The Spanish government had paid much to the Soviet government for its help in the war: “On 16 October 1936, the day the first major Russian arms shipment

reached Spain, the Soviet leader Joseph Stalin sent Jose Diaz, Secretary General of the Spanish Communist Party, the PCE the following: . . . the liberation of Spain . . . is not the private concern of the Spain but the general concern of all advanced and progressive humanity” (171).

In Gaylord’s hotel in Madrid, the Russians had taken over. At Gaylord’s people met Spanish commanders speaking Russian who took part in war without prior training. Those people “were peasants and workers. They had been active in the 1934 revolution and had to flee the country when it failed and in Russia they had sent them to the military academy and to the Lenin Institute the Comintern maintained so they would be ready to fight the next time and have the necessary military education to command” (237). During the war, there was direct support for the Republicans from the side of Russia. Stalin was afraid of aggression eastwards against vulnerable Soviet frontiers. So Russia gave aid that “saved the Spanish Republic from almost certain military defeat in November 1936” (Graham 41).

Gaylord’s was the hotel where many Russian officers stayed and made strategic war plans. There stayed Valentin Gonzalez, an ex-sergeant in the Spanish Foreign Legion who had deserted and fought with Abd el Krim: “He was a wonderful Brigade commander though in a situation where it looked as though everything was lost” (Hemingway 238). There also stayed the simple stonemason Enrique Lister Galicia, who now commanded a division and who talked Russian, too. The cabinet worker, Juan Modesto from Andalucia, Spain, who had just been given an army Corps also stayed in the hotel. The Russian Officers trusted him truly because he was a sincere soldier and a true party member.

At Gaylord’s were also Kleber, Lucasz, Hans, and the Hungarian officer Gall who had done a fine job of their share in the defense of Madrid with the International Brigades. They had fought there with the true comradeship of the revolution. The Madrid Palace had been turned into the International Brigade Headquarters in the capital. General Gall is a Hungarian

officer, an unpopular commander in the International Brigades, fighting for the Republicans. Hemingway also refers to the real figure Andre Marty (1886-1955) who was a French Communist commissar and head of the International Brigades during the Spanish Civil War. He came from the central committee of the French Communist party. He was “one of France’s great modern revolutionary figures who had led a mutiny of the French Navy in the Black Sea” (434). He had a high political place in the International Brigades. In the novel *Comrade Marty*, the officer in General Golz’s headquarters “refuses to see the value of Robert Jordan’s message and so delays sending Andres forward to Golz in time to delay the Loyalist attack” (436). By observing the residents of Gaylord’s hotel, we can know the involvement of people from different nations during the Spanish Civil War.

During the Spanish Civil War, the Spanish government sent tons of gold to Russia for its help in the war. Russia had been a repository for the Spanish government to keep their valuables safe. Karkov, a Russian journalist, informs Jordan that the Spanish government has had much money and gold. He assures, “They will give nothing to their friends. You are a friend. All right. You will do it for nothing and should not be rewarded. But to people representing an important form or a country which is not friendly but must be influenced - to such people they give much. It is very interesting when you follow it closely” (252). This reaction of Karkov shows that some people served in the war selflessly, whereas the Russian Government took rewards for its assistance to the Spanish Government.

The Russian journalist Karkov was associated with *Pravda* and had direct communication with Stalin. Talking about political assassination he remarks:

We do not believe in acts of terrorism by individuals. Not of course by criminal terrorist and counter revolutionary organizations. We detest with horror the duplicity and villainy of the murderous hyenas of Bukharinite Wreckers and such dregs of humanity as Zinoviev, Kamener, Rijkov and their hunch men. We hate and loathe

these veritable fiends. But I still believe that political assassination can be said to be practised very extensively. (253)

His view on war and army is that anarchy cannot win a war. All must have a certain level of political development, and they must know the cause and importance of their fighting. They must believe in fighting and must accept discipline. He says, “We are making a huge conscript army without the time to implant the discipline that a conscript army must have, to behave properly under fire. We call it a people’s army but it will not have the assets of a true people’s army and it will not have the iron discipline that a conscript army needs. . . . It is a very dangerous procedure” (255). He highlights the role of discipline in the desired result of war.

The liberal peace theory is associated with the theme that the people have no interest in war. In other words, war is not in their interest; it is mainly related to belligerent leaders or states (Steans et al. 34). In the novel, Pablo shuns war because he has realized that death “happens to everybody” in war (Hemingway 17). He is tired of being hunted because war destroys everybody. The other minor characters also shun war, but they are involved because of the order of the leaders in distant places.

The discussion shows that the Spanish Civil War, the main subject of the novel is related to international relations because it describes the war that affected not only Spain but many other countries. The domestic politics of Spain affects international relations. Some nations and people help the Republicans, whereas some others help the Fascists. The nations like France and Britain remain neutral, but the people of these nations take part in the war independently. The protagonist, the American dynamiter, voluntarily takes part in blowing up the bridge at Guadarrama Mountains near Segovia to stop the Fascists away from the mountains to make the Republican attack successful. He is a believer in Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. He was convinced that the Republicans meant for a democratic, civilian, secular order. So he takes part in the war in a foreign land for the cause of humanity. This

war is related to politics, and the novel is in favor of the republican alliance. Most of the novel is full of descriptions of activities done by the supporters of the Republican side. It shows that war is an inevitable part of the Republicans for their humanitarian cause, but it presents the activities shown by the Fascists as being full of selfish and misdirected aggressive impulses. The novel also explains the involvement of the Russian people and government in the Spanish Civil War. The description of war mentioned in the novel shows that war has an international nature. When it is fought for certain political causes, it may draw the involvement of the people of many countries. Freedom, equality, rights of people, and brotherhood are the aspects of international relations. The political faith in humanity and liberty is not limited only within certain territorial boundaries.

## CHAPTER V

### EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE TO AUTOCRATIC REGIME IN GREENE'S *THE HONORARY CONSUL*

#### *The Honorary Consul: An Overview*

Graham Greene's influential novel *The Honorary Consul* depicts the socio-political situations of South America in the 1970s. It includes ample instances that can be explained by using various issues and ideas of International Relations. Cross-border activities are frequent in the novel since the actions take place in the border lines of Paraguay and Argentina. One of the main characters Leon Rivas is an idealist who has the hope for a better future. The novel describes religion and politics which have an international nature. The novel also includes ideologies: capitalist and communist. The autocratic Paraguayan leader has a friendship with democratic America. The working of power politics plays a great role in the novel. These two nations have a common understanding though they have different political ideologies. These

features in the novel are very conducive to analyzing this novel through the International Relations lens.

Graham Greene (1904-1991) is a prolific leading English novelist of the twentieth century. His contribution primarily includes writing short stories, novels, plays, and non-fictional works. He was a renowned freelance journalist who traveled widely in his life for his journalistic career, which helped him locate his novels' settings. Sex, love, life, death, whisky, Catholicism, and South American politics are all his familiar territories. After publishing his first novel *Stambul Train* (1932), he continuously published strings of novels on various topics and issues. Many of his novels have also been filmed. His novels are categorized as

thrillers and catholic novels that use tough language and swiftly moving suspenseful plots. They treat contemporary political settings and life's moral ambiguities.

During the twentieth century, Greene was one of the most widely-read English novelists. He held great capacity in story-telling and always wanted to convey a message. His novels have a compatible preoccupation with sin and moral faith that are based on sordid locales associated with danger, violence, and physical decay. The moral and spiritual struggles within individuals are chief concerns of Greene's writings. His later novels are set in remote places with wars, revolutions, and political changes. In Graham Smith's view ". . . Greene's first outstanding creative period was marked by a visionary inwardness, a turning in on the self in order to make a fictional examination of spiritual issues. His second phase involved a move outwards to the public world of international politics" (qtd. in Hoskins xiii).

Greene has also written novels about international relations and international politics. During World War II, he was appointed to the foreign office and was posted for a short time in Freetown, Sierra Leone. He is a political writer who wrote about our world and its horror and widespread political evils. He has sensed that condemning political evils through writing is very important. In the critic Haim Gordon's view:

[. . .] this evil is so often concealed from the public eye by the leaders who perform it, as well as by their many toadies and supporters, including intellectuals. In a series of profound and well-documented studies, Noam Chomsky has shown that the mainstream media in the United States has always supported the political evil of the government, as long as this evil serves the interests of the capitalist elite and the major US-based corporations. (34)

Greene means to say that it is our responsibility to raise our voices against such evils. We also become responsible for such evils if we show our indifference to them. "Political evil not

only destroys the basis of justice; it often blocks the emergence of excellence, of a new beginning” (37). Greene’s writings expose the political evils. Gordon asserts:

Graham Greene’s backyard was the world. He described some of the terrible outcomes of the reign of greed, lust for power. . . . He also reached into several places that are off the main track and described the terrible results of these same evils that he encountered in faraway countries. How many people would have heard of the tyrannical evils of that fascist monster, General Alfredo Stroessner, who virtually owned Paraguay for decades with continual support of the United States, if Stroessner had not been mentioned in Greene’s novels *Travels with My Aunts* and *The Honorary Consul*.(27)

Critics take Greene as a Catholic writer. Greene’s strong belief in the Catholic Church has strongly influenced his narrative. As an open Catholic, “his tendency to view the religion through human rather than ideological eyes lends a stronger degree of credibility to his narratives” (Jesse). But Greene thinks of himself more as a political writer than a Catholic one. He viewed literature as a means to play a dynamic role in the process of social change. He said, “For me political action is writing and nothing else” (qtd. in Valverde 125). But Maria Couto labels him as a Catholic writer. She puts it, “Graham Greene has often declared himself to be a political novelist, not catholic novelist but a novelist who happens to be a Catholic. . . . The politics of his fiction is the politics of life itself in the Lukacsian sense: ‘everything in man’s life is politics, whether man is conscious of it, unconscious of it, or even trying to escape from it’” (1).

Greene was not interested in domestic politics while he was young, but in his writings, he mentions the political issues of the Far East and Central America. He asserts, “I find myself getting involved in politics that are really a matter of life and death, as they were in the Far East and are in Central America” (qtd. in Valverde 125). He is interested in the

politics of life and death. In his youth, Greene shared “a strong predisposition towards socialism, which [he] believed would become the solution for the serious problems suffered for so long by poor countries” (Valverde 125).

Greene was inclined to leftist political ideology. He had sympathy towards communist political doctrine. He had joined the British Communism Party for a month in 1923. He always saw a desire for justice and idealism in Communism. He reacts, “I don’t know, either, how to explain my attraction towards Communism. Deep down one has always nurtured this dream, perhaps a naive one, of Communism with a human face” (qtd. in Valverde 126). He was “an admirer of a Utopian Communism committed to the search for social justice” (Valverde 127). We find a Utopian sense in his writings, too.

*The Honorary Consul* (1973) is a political novel by Greene. The story set in Corrientes, a provincial city in Argentina, on the shore of the Parana River, revolves around the three main characters: Eduardo Plarr, an unmarried medical doctor, the Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum, the title character, and Leon Rivas, a married ex-priest. Eduardo Plarr is a doctor shifted to Corrientes from the capital city Buenos Aires working there privately. He is the son of a Paraguayan mother and an English father, who migrated to Paraguay leaving England at the age of ten. His native land was always in his memory. He is proud of his native land, “the legendary island of snow and fog, the country of Dickens and of Conan Doyle” (Greene 1). He kept a picture book that he used to show to Eduardo Plarr that had “Buckingham Palace, the Tower of London, and vista of Oxford Street filled with hansoms and horse-drawn cabs and ladies with clutched long skirts” (2). He was an exile. South America “was a continent of exiles-of Italians, of Czechs, of Poles, of Welsh, of English” (2). While Plarr is a child of fourteen, leaving his father in Paraguaya, he and his mother go to Buenos Aires and settle there. His father “promised with a mechanical optimism that he would join them soon” (1). They have not heard about him except a one-hand-delivered letter

to them, but it is known that he is a rebel and has been put in prison in Paraguay by the despotic government. Later on, Dr. Plarr knows that his father was killed while he was escaping from the prison. He realizes that life in exile is not simple in comparison to the life of a native-born. He was tired of collecting “so many documents, so many visits to government offices” (2).

Dr. Plarr has an acquaintance with the English Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum, a sixty-one-year-old man with an excessive drinking habit. Charley Fortnum is an unpaid Consul of Great Britain, but he earns by selling British car Pride every two years. He also collects some money by witnessing documents. Once Dr. Plarr meets him to have his witness of his documents, he stamps the paper and adds his signature. He demands “a thousand pesos” for it (35). Dr. Plarr and Fortnum regularly visit the local brothel of Sanora Sanchez, the city's only entertainment place. Charley Fortnum marries a twenty-year-old prostitute Clara whom Dr. Plarr also used to meet in the brothel. Dr. Plarr has a relationship with her even after her marriage. Likewise, the third important character is Leon Rivas who is the leader of the revolutionary group and Dr. Plarr's childhood Paraguayan friend. He is an ex-priest, but he left the field of religion after he realized that religion cannot improve the situation of the poor and is involved in communist revolutionary activities under the command of the leader El Tigre whom he has never met personally. He comes to Argentina to accomplish the plan of kidnapping the American Ambassador. But his plan goes wrong and, at last, he is killed along with Dr. Plarr and his other comrades. Another minor character whose past is almost similar to Dr. Plarr is optician Gruber who is Dr. Plarr's friend in the city. Though he was only child, leaving his old parents in Germany, he escaped from there in 1936 when the persecution of Jews was intensified “to save of the name of Gruber from becoming extinct” (59). His parents were too old to leave Germany and he never heard from

them again. Gruber is like Dr. Plarr, “a man without a father. He didn’t even possess a family grave” (59). He is also a traumatic personality.

The American Ambassador is in Argentina to visit the Jesuit ruins. He is a man of business and he “wants to create a good impression” and wants to “show scholarly interest” in the province (10). The revolutionary group from Paraguay plans to kidnap him during his visit to the ruins in that area. But the fumbling revolutionaries mistake Charley Fortnum for American Ambassador. They drug him excessively and he goes in a comma and they take the help of Dr. Plarr to save him because their job is to “save lives” (20). Though they know their mistake, they keep Fortnum in control and keep him at the hut of Pablo and demand the release of ten of their friends from Paraguayan prison as ransom. But neither the Paraguayan nor British government takes any measure for the Consul’s release. In an escape attempt, Charley Fortnum is shot in his leg and gets wounded. Dr. Plarr is summoned to the hut of the revolutionaries to treat wounded Charley Fortnum. Dr. Plarr visits the hut to treat Fortnum, but he is arrested there by the revolutionaries as they suspect that he may disclose the reality to the opponent group. The police chief Colonel Perez gives an ultimatum to the revolutionary group to release the captivated Charley Fortnum. Dr. Plarr has an acquaintance with Colonel Perez, so Leon Rivas sends him to talk to the Colonel to extend the ultimatum period. But the Air Force army surrounds the shelter of the revolutionary group, and Dr. Plarr, Leon Rivas, and Aquino, another revolutionary leader, are killed, and the Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum is freed. The Honorary Consul becomes a survivor of the conflict, but Dr. Plarr becomes the victim despite his innocence. Charley Fortnum decides to call the baby Eduardo if Clara gives birth to a boy.

Major events in *The Honorary Consul* occur in South America (Paraguay-Argentina). The novel takes a fictional provincial Argentinean town up the River Plate about eight hundred kilometers north of Buenos Aires as its setting. While Greene was visiting Argentina

in the early 1970s, he witnessed the clash of ideologies firsthand and determined to write a novel using his experience to incorporate the phenomena. At that time the guerrilla movement was reaching its climax. General Alfredo Stroessner, the longest-time dictator (1954-1989) in Paraguay, was ruling the nation abusing human rights extensively, with tortures and deaths for political opponents. He cruelly oppressed the opponents' activities putting several opposition leaders in prisons. After he came to power in 1954 through the coup with the assistance of military General Epifanio Mendez Fleitas, he made the opposition futile by arrest, torture, death, and exile. Peter Lambert examines:

In the context of the Cold War, Stroessner cultivated US support through virulent anti-communism, his advocacy of 'Paraguayan Stroonista democracy' and his faithful support of the US in its foreign policy initiatives (Vietnam, Dominican Republic, Cuba etc.). In return, the US offered Stroessner consistent economic and diplomatic support from his coup in 1954 until 1977, recognizing successive fraudulent re-elections which quietly ignoring the systematic violation of human rights. (13)

In 1960 the Left, especially the Paraguayan Communist Party (Partido Comunista Paraguayo) was involved in the guerilla movement that cost about a hundred of the party's best activists. With the military assistance of the US, Stroessner government severely suppressed the Left. The novel is written against a backdrop of political chaos in Paraguay. The plot of the novel condemns the US support to Paraguayan tyrannical General Alfredo Stroessner. It describes the political chaos that lies under the surface of Latin America. The novel mocks the puppet ruler of Paraguay under the assistance of the US.

The group of revolutionaries fighting against a corrupt regime go from Paraguay to Argentina to capture the American Ambassador who is visiting Jesuit ruins in the border town. By mistake, they kidnap the wrong man, Charley Fortnum, the British Honorary Consul. Murray Roston Comments:

Charles Fortnum is only a peripheral character there, a somewhat absurd drunkard, incapable even of hanging the British flag correctly, a man who exists largely on a dubious tax item permitting him, as Honorary Consul, to import and sell a Cadillac every two years. His unimportance to the British embassy, which regards him, as an encumbrance, it would be glad to be dispensed with, complicates the kidnapping, since no real diplomatic effort is made to release him. (132)

In reality, the British Ambassador expresses his concern about the kidnapping case of Mr. Fortnum. He does everything in his power. However, the situation is beyond his power because the Paraguayan General is down in Argentina in the south fishing and “refuses to discuss the matter while he is on holiday” (Greene 114). The Argentine Foreign Minister says, “It is a purely Paraguayan affair, and the President can’t be expected to bring pressure on the General, when he’s a guest of the nation” (114). The kidnapping case is complicated because the kidnapers claim that they wanted to kidnap the American Ambassador, but the American Ambassador “refuses to admit he was the intended victim” (112). He views that America is very popular in Paraguay.

### **Cross-border Activities**

Literature is a common means to understand culture through the written word and helps us to know the concerns of international relations. It helps to lessen cross-border incursions by recovering common humanity. By inculcating common humanity it helps people to cross the narrow domestic walls of the nations for ever-widening thoughts of humanity. Literature is also a good means for "national experience". Literature played a great role in the struggle for liberation in South Africa. The writers of that time addressed the national issues aggressively. In many issues, the writers surpass the state and speak to issues related to global affairs. The novel *Things Fall Apart* (1958) by the Nigerian Writer Chinua Achebe presents the pain that is created in the native inhabitants after their home is invaded

by unwelcome outsiders. The psychological disorientation in the novel is the outcome of the imposition of Western customs and values upon traditional African society. The process of disruption has been exposed by the sufferers in various forms of literary works like songs, poems, and novels. Forceful dislocation from the home also creates traumatic situations for people. The painful experience of dislocation from their homes has been a recurring theme for many writers. Building a new home in a new land also provides difficulties. The play *The Slave* (1964) by Amiri Baraka exposes the low social positions of blacks and the limitations of racial integration.

The story of *The Honorary Consul* chiefly revolves around the two protagonists: Eduardo Plarr, a half-English-half Paraguayan, unmarried doctor living in a small city in Northern Argentina, and Charley Fortnum, the aging and alcoholic honorary British consul of that city. Nevertheless, there is the interdependence of these two figures with the other two, Clara, the Consul's young wife (a former local whore), and Leon Rivas, a Catholic priest who is now second-in-command of a group of Paraguayan guerrillas. The action takes place in Corrientes, the northern provincial Argentinian border town. The novel includes cross-border activities which often occur in gray zones. A group of Paraguayan revolutionists mistakenly hijacks Charley Fortnum, the Honorary Consul, to pressure the Paraguayan government to release some of their men in Paraguayan prison. The Paraguayan government does not heed their demand, and, at last, the Argentinean police Colonel Perez's team succeeds in defeating the kidnapper group that costs the lives of Dr. Eduardo Plarr, Leon Rivas, and others. The novel includes suspense that studies psychologically and sociologically on personal and political corruption.

Eduardo Plarr serves as the negotiator between the revolutionaries and authorities. He is an unmarried doctor who left Paraguay for Buenos Aires with his mother at the age of fourteen to escape the political conflict in Paraguay, but his English father remains in

Paraguay as a rebel and they never hear from him again except a single hand-delivered letter. Later on, he knows from Aquino, a member of rebel group, that the Paraguayan police killed him while he was escaping from the prison. Dr. Plarr looks after his patient all day long and meets his friends of English origin Dr. Homphries and the Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum, the only two people of English origin beside him. But he falls into the vicious circle of guerrilla warfare and political tactics of South America. Without his direct involvement with the revolutionaries, he is unintentionally taken to the revolutionary group. He also tries to settle the conflict as a middle person, but, at last, is killed by Argentinian paratroopers. Commenting about his death, Neil Sinyard views, “Two of Greene’s most complex heroes—Querry in *A Burnt Out Case* and Plarr in *The Honorary Consul* die laughing, or with a laugh on their lips. Laughter can be dangerous in Greene, it can get you killed. But it may be necessary to keep the horror of life at bay” (64). Plarr’s father is a rebel and is supposed to be yet in one of Paraguayan prisons, but Plarr is, in fact, not interested in any type of rebellious activity. Though Dr. Plarr is innocent in political terms, he has to lose his life mainly because of cross-border activities. The Argentinian police mistakenly take him as one of the members of the revolutionaries.

Upon the arrival of the American Ambassador to Argentina, the governor of the city, who needed an interpreter for the guest, organizes a diplomatic dinner in which he invites the Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum, one of the three pillars of the English colony living in that town. The purpose of the American Ambassador was to visit the historical and artistic sites to create a good impression. Charley Fortnum, a British Consul with dubious authority and weakness for drinking, is hijacked by Paraguayan revolutionaries who have mistaken him for the American Ambassador. But he is kept in control by them because the revolutionaries want to keep him in captivity because “It will be a warning to people who are more important. Perhaps they will take our next threat seriously. That is small tactical point gamed

in a long war” (Greene 24). They demand release of ten prisoners of war in exchange for the release of the useless honorary consul. Basically, they plan to kidnap American Ambassador in the north of Argentina because the General takes great precautions in Paraguay, and “they have much less fear of guerillas” in Argentina (87). The British Embassy takes the consul as useless, shows no initiative for his release, and gives more importance to a minor scandal- the marriage of the consul to a twenty-year-old prostitute. In the same way, the Americans do not do anything in this case because they do not “want to anger their friend the General for the sake of Charley Fortnum” (23).

In the international arena, a person is behaved on the basis of his importance. The Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum is kidnapped for the American Ambassador, but the revolutionaries think that he will be a matter for a bargain for them and demand the release of some of their friends from the prison of Paraguay as ransom. Leon tells Fortnum he has been kidnapped “to save innocent men from imprisonment and torture” (91). He speculates, “The British Ambassador will talk to the President. The President will speak to the General. He is here in Argentina on a holiday. The American Ambassador will intervene too. We are only asking the General to release a few men. Everything would have been quite easy if one of our men had not made a mistake” (91). But Charley Fortnum replies to Leon Rivas, “You can’t get anything in return for me. I’m not worth a peso to a human soul” (94). The same happens at last. The demand of the revolutionaries is not heard by the authorities and Leon Rivas is killed at last by the Argentinian police. Charley Fortnum is a high-ranked person. But he loses the hold of his position by involving in excessive drinking and going frequently to brothels. As he praises a brothel girl, Dr. Humphries reminds him of his position. He asserts, “And you are the consul here, honorary or not. You’ve no business to be seen in a low dive like that” (31). But Charlie Fortnum marries Clara though people talk much about this matter. It shows the debased situation of a diplomat.

The novel includes cross-border activities that are associated with Realist International Relations. Such Cross-border activities mainly create conflictual situations. The revolutionaries are working in Argentina by crossing Paraguay's border. Politics becomes very much active in the gray zone. In the case of the kidnapping of Charley Fortnum, while talking to Dr. Plarr, Colonel Perez says, "Any accident which occurs so close to the border may be political" (71). The Colonel suspects that the kidnapping might have been done for certain political motifs. In his view, some people of high profile might have committed that activity. He asserts, "In politics crime is often the occupation of a caballero" (72). Indirectly he expresses his suspicion towards Dr. Eduardo Plarr himself.

The novel includes the incidents of exile, and it is the process of political expulsion of certain people. The state uses its force to expel its citizens from the nation to avert the situation of prospect danger in the nation. Using power to accomplish the selfish desire of a nation belongs to the concept of Realist International Relations. "For realists, the main form of power is military or physical" (Steans et al. 57). Dr. Plarr's father was also a man who was working in a foreign land as an exile. He was from Britain working now in Paraguay involved with the Communist party as a rebel against the despotic ruler of that nation. The Paraguayan forces had created great panic in the people who were so frightened by their presence at any time. As a result, Dr. Plarr's father "would lock even the internal doors of his house, the bedrooms, the lavatories, the unusual guest rooms, not against robbers but against the police, the military, and the official assassins" (8). In the novel, Dr. Plarr becomes thoughtful about his father, and he realizes, "His father was . . . an exile, and this was a continent of exiles- of Italians, of Czechs, of Poles, of Welsh, of English" (Greene 2). The politics of Paraguay also affect the family of Dr. Plarr. So he and his mother leave his father in Paraguay and flee to Argentina for a more peaceful life. His father Henry Plarr, who is an English-born Paraguayan, who left England at the age of ten, sees them off standing "on the way at

Asuncion beside the short gangway of the small river boat . . . [promising] with a mechanical optimism that he would join them soon” (1). He was an exile. Latin America at that time was the continent of exiles. The pang of separation is deep-seated in Dr. Plarr, and he always searches out his father in his imagination. Though he is a Paraguayan-born person living in Argentina and has never been to England, the sense of Englishness always lurks with him because he is an English by the lineage of his father, and he befriends Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum and Doctor Humphries, the only other two English men living in that city. It is the sense of home and world. The domestic activities and norms intersect with the ancestral home i.e. Britain. The constructivist theorist Alexander Wendt also views that domestic norms traverse world systems. Dr. Plarr has an earnest desire for his ancestral home and he has a sense of homelessness. Moreover, Dr. Plarr is attached to three countries. He is related to England because he holds a passport to England, Paraguay is his birth nation that he has abandoned now, and Argentina is his adopted country where he is living now. So he is a man who is not fixed to only one nation and one identity. He has got a sense of isolation and alienation. This sense of home and homelessness is related to the Constructivist International Relations theory.

Leon Rivas, his wife Marta, Aquino, Miguel, Diego, and Pablo are involved in the revolutionary group. Leon Rivas, Marta, Aquino, and Miguel are from Paraguay, whereas Pablo and Diego are from Argentina. Diego is an intimate friend of Pablo who worked together in a company and joins the plan of Leon Rivas as they are influenced by the ideology of Leon Rivas who is a friend of Pablo. Pablo permits to use his hut as the shelter for those kidnappers. The communist ideology binds the people of two different nations together for cross-border activities. They are working together because they have got shared ideas. The Constructivist theorist Alexander Wendt rightly puts, “[T]he structures of human

association are determined primarily by shared ideas” (*Social Theory* 1). Pablo permits Leon Rivas to use his hut as a shelter because they share the same ideology.

### **Idealist Concept of Liberty and Equality**

Idealism is related to human’s rational free choice. It believes that social institutions are the outcomes of individual needs. Robert Crawford asserts, “For Idealists a desire and commitment to overcome the conditions of real conflicts, or perceived injustices, in world politics is a possibly sufficient condition for change” (15). In his view idealism is a means to overcome existing conflicts and injustices. Idealism is full of hope and optimism. Idealist International Relations expects cooperation for freedom and liberty from people of different countries. The idealists “are futurists who seek a perfect world” (Griffiths and O’Callaghan 148). Leon Rivas is also optimistic and has the hope of liberty and equality. With that faith in him, he was earlier involved in religion and was a Father. But now he has left the priesthood. He is angry with Mother Church because the Gospels make no sense in Paraguay. They say “‘sell all and give to the poor’- [he] had to read out to them while the old Archbishop we had in those was eating a fine fish from Iguazu and drinking a French wine with the General” (97). He did not also like to wear beautiful vestments during mass while the common people in front of him wore all in rags. He did not want such discrimination and was involved in a rebellion group leaving his job of priesthood. Though he has captivated Charley Fortnum, he shows his mercy towards him. He provides wine to him and gives him a coffin to sleep in to save him from the damp earth because he does not want him to catch rheumatism.

In a meeting, Dr. Plarr asks Leon, “Why kidnap the American ambassador here instead of the one you have in Asuncion?” Leon Rivas replies “South America is pur country, Eduardo. Not Paraguay. Not Argentina. You know What Che said, ‘The whole Continent is my country.’ English or South American?” (87). It is the idealistic concept of Leon Rivas that expresses brotherhood among the people of the whole Continent. Leon Rivas is an idealist

since he is optimistic about the release of his innocent friends from prison as a ransom for Charley Fortnum. He has selfless hope for the goodness of other fellow rebels. So, though Charley Fortnum is captured for the American Ambassador, he keeps him captivated considering that his demand will be fulfilled for the release of Charley Fortnum. Idealism is founded upon a commitment to principles of liberty, equality, and an idealist society. El Tigre's group is also committed to liberty and equality, so it has revolted against the despotic ruling of General Alfredo Stroessner. This group is using force for the sake of the common good.

For the British diplomat, Paraguay is different from other places. In the course of talking to his wife about the kidnapping case of Fortnum, Sir Henry views, "This isn't Uruguay or Columbia -or Brazil, for that matter. Or Bolivia. Or Venezuela. Or even Peru" (112). So he is convinced that they will free the Consul soon. It shows that nations have their national characters that are evaluated in the international arena.

Leon Rivas belongs to a bourgeois family, but he is committed to improving the lives of the underprivileged. Rivas decides to enter the Catholic church, the only institution that he thinks helps the poor exactly what he wants to do. After becoming a priest in a poor neighborhood he realizes, however, that he has joined the wrong institutions because "they [the fathers] never touched on the horror. . . . They saw no problem. They just sat comfortably down in the presence of the horror like the old Archbishop at the General's table and they talked about man's responsibility and Free Will" (196-97). Then he leaves the post of priesthood and joins the revolutionary organization of El Tigre with his own utopian dream to bring the kingdom of God on earth. He is involved in revolution with his commitment to the sanctity of human life. Because of the lack of his and his friends' experience, the revolutionary action turns out to be tragic. He gets disillusioned from his conviction, rejects the institution, and chooses to take human beings' side: "First, he rejects being part of the

establishment becoming an abogado. Second, he gets separated from the official church, and finally, he is not able to fulfill his duty as a committed revolutionary” (Valverde 13). Thus we get his image in the end totally different. Valverde further puts it:

[. . .] The disloyalty that Leon Rivas maintains towards the established social system, the church, and finally the institutionalized revolutionary group, based on his utopian desire of bringing this world closer to the kingdom of God, is considered a virtue, since in Greene’s belief system, characters who fight any established institution and commit with humanism are the ones who are valued more positively: ‘Loyalty confines us to accepted opinions; loyalty forbids us to comprehend sympathetically our dissident fellows, but disloyalty encourages us to roam experimentally through any dimension of sympathy’. (136)

Idealist International Relations theory presumes a utopian world and assumes cooperation between people of different nations. In *The Honorary Consul*, Leon Rivas has an idealistic concept. An ex-priest, he is involved in revolutionary activities. He is a follower of the revolutionary group of El Tigre. He works selflessly for the sake of good for the people, to make the nation, Paraguay, free from the hand of the cruel ruler General Stroessner. He gets cooperation from people of different nations. His group is working in a foreign country i.e. Argentina, and gets shelter in a hut of Pablo in a village. He also gets help from Dr Plarr, originally a Paraguayan, but now living in Argentina. He is involved in revolutionary activities to save people from the despotic ruler for the sake of freedom. He views, “Our job is to save people” (Greene 20). After kidnapping British Honorary Consul by mistake, Leon Rivas decides that he will be the means of bargain for the release of his ten men from Paraguayan prison, but, at last, he realizes that the authority does not pay much concern about the life of the Honorary Consul. He concludes, “I never believed it would come to this. You see- if it had been the American Ambassador- they would have given way. And I would have

saved ten men's lives. I never believed I would have to take a life" (214). His group makes Fortnum a captive. But they do not kill him, instead, they send an ultimatum to put pressure on the Paraguayan government. At last, because of Leon Rivas, Fortnum saves his life, but Leon Rivas and his men are killed.

### **Love as Sideline Diplomacy**

Love is a sideline in diplomacy. Some of the diplomatic leaders are involved in love affair with the local women. It can also be taken as a means of soft power. *The Honorary Consul* deals with the love affair of the Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum who is already sixty-one years old and his first wife has died. Eventually, he marries a twenty-year-old prostitute Clara. She is involved in prostitution because of her compulsion to earn money that is needed to support her family. Though the Honorary Consul knows Clara's occupation, he loves and marries her. His "love for Clara is characterized by charity, sympathy, kindness and affection" (Hoskins 228). He marries her because he "demonstrated a remarkable generosity of spirit" (228). He is an imperfect man, but we get perfection in him in the matter of his unselfish love for Clara. In his later life, he gets a good companion, whereas Clara gets economic support to assist her poor parents. Charley and Clara are two survivors in the novel. They are united and their relationship is strengthened by the memory of the dead friend and Clara's lover Dr. Eduardo Plarr. Dr. Plarr is an unmarried person who frequently goes to the brothel of Sanora Sanchez to fulfill his sexual urges. But later on, he is involved in physical relationships with the Honorary Consul's wife Clara. The Consul also knows that Dr. Plarr has relationships with his wife, but he ignores the matter mainly because he is much older than his wife and needs her help at this age.

A rebel has both public as well as family life. Though he is ready to sacrifice his life for the sake of the nation, he is also devoted to his love for his family members. Eduardo's father Henry Plarr is a rebel who has opposed the Paraguayan government and is at risk of

punishment, but he wants his family members to be in peaceful condition, so he sends his wife and his son to the capital of Argentina, Buenos Aires. He is very much concerned with their safety. In a handwritten letter sent after four years of their separation he writes, "It is my great comfort that the two whom I love best in the world are both in safety, your affectionate husband and father, Henry Plarr" (Greene 3). It shows Henry's love for the nation as well as his family. He is ready to put his life at risk, but he wants his family members to be in the safe zone.

From Buenos Aires, Dr. Plarr goes to work in a small northern city "near the border of the country where he had been born and where his father was buried" (3). It expresses the unconscious love of Dr. Plarr for his father and the notion that he has left for his life. He renews his English passport every ten years. It expresses his love for his ancestral nation.

### **International Nature of Religion, Culture and Politics**

Literature warrants the value of its ability to tell tales of international relations. It is a great gift to intellectuals and professionals of International Relations (Sheeran xii-xix). Sheeran emphasizes the importance of poetry because the "defeat in the field of human conflict can be discovered in the venerable poems of classics" (xx). He believes in the impacts of literature on cultures, nationalities, and world politics. In his view, "[T]here is a special relationship between the relevance of literary production to an understanding of International Relations" (xxi). As in literature, international relations is also related to life and death. Through words, ideas, and intentions in narrative works like fiction "shape, hinder and liberate the possibilities" (xxii). The events, decisions, and trends at the international level are affected by literature.

*The Honorary Consul* is overtly a political novel, but it intermixes religion, too. Leon Rivas leaves his involvement in religion and diverts himself into politics because in his view existing religious practices are reluctant to social problems and they are unable to change

society. The morality of the political system turns him into a killer. The novel mentions the religious journey “set in a mutual dialogue with the social and political realities of the time” (Bosco, *Graham Greene’s Catholic Imagination* 107). Religion and politics are the issues that are not confined to a nation. The novel includes the political and religious issues that are connected to different countries and are concerned with international relations.

South America was the place for refuge. Gruber, Dr. Plarr’s earnest friend, is a migrant in the city. “As a boy he had escaped from Germany in 1936 when the persecution of the Jews was intensified. He was an only child, but his parents had insisted that he escape abroad, if only to save the name of Gruber from becoming extinct” (Greene 59). John Plarr, father of Dr. Eduardo Plarr, is also a migrant who has settled in Paraguay marrying a Paraguayan woman. Politics interests a man who lives in a foreign country. Dr. Plarr views, “But of course politics interests me. I’m a kind of political refugee myself” (44). Until Colonel Perez and Aquino inform him, Dr. Plarr does not know whether his father is alive or dead, who is a political offender. He utters, “The General doesn’t believe in prisons for political offenders across the border –he leaves them to rot alone in police stations all over the country” (45). It shows the General’s cruelty toward political offenders.

Dr. Plarr’s father is a political rebel. His mother talks about his father’s involvement in politics while they were in Paraguay. She informs, “Your father could talk of nothing else” (48). But his mother is unconcerned about politics; she never reads newspapers and listens to the radio. “Twice there were attempted revolutions in the capital which made big headlines in ‘El Litoral’, but on both occasions when he telephoned to his mother he found she knew nothing of the disturbances” (48). Because of his father’s rebellious nature, the family is compelled to go for separation. So, now he and his mother are in a foreign nation being separated from his father.

Culture also expresses national characteristics. Reading in an open area was a normal practice in Paraguay, but it was strange practice to the people of Argentina. Once when people in Argentina saw Dr. Plarr “sitting on a bench with an open book had looked at him with keen curiosity. Perhaps they thought it was a custom peculiar to foreign doctors” (5). It was a sign of foreignness to them. Culture is related to nationality. The British Ambassador Sir Henry Belfrage feels uneasy when he gets his eggs fried on both sides. In his view the cook “must have picked the habit up from the Yankees. It’s a Yankee custom” (110). Cooking egg on one side is a British custom. Similarly, taking “maple syrup with sausages” is a Yankee custom. The ambassador thinks it is a Yankee cultural imperialism. The ambassador also reacts to the wine provided at the American Embassy. In his view the wine is Californian and it is terrible to him. But his wife says that it was Argentine. He also talks about French table wine. It shows the foreign influence on food culture in Argentina. Argentina is a melting pot where people can enjoy the cultural practices of different nations. American Ambassador loves Coca-Cola much. When Dr. Plarr returns from Buenos Aires after meeting the British Ambassador, he goes to the hotel ‘Nacional’, he invites his two friends Humphries and Saavedra, and at the hotel “the Coca-Cola sign glow[s] in scarlet letters like the shrine of a saint” (127). Coca-Cola indicates the cultural imperialism of America.

### **Ideas, Consciousness and Common Understanding**

Constructivism believes that ideas are not stable, they have no pre-given nature. “The ideas and beliefs . . . inform the actors on the international scene as well as the shared understanding between them” (Jackson et al.209). The US is a democratic nation, but it supports the despotic ruling of General Alfredo Stroessner of Paraguay. The two nations, though having two different ideologies, are in a strong friendship because the rulers are the creators of the situation, not the abstract ideologies. Constructivism focuses on ideas,

consciousness, and common understanding among people. In the novel, Leon Rivas and Aquino are from Paraguay, and Pablo and Dr. Eduardo Plarr are in Argentina, but they unite together mainly because of the common understanding that they should fight against the tyranny of General Stroessner. According to Constructivist International Relations theory, if states share similar values, they pursue a peaceful and cooperative relationship. In the novel Argentina and Paraguay share similar values and pursue cooperative relationships. States behave on the basis of the meaning of the object to them. In the novel Argentinian government does not support the rebel group of Leon Rivas because General Stroessner is more meaningful to it than the rebel group. The rebel group is an enemy of it, too, because the group may be threatening to it.

Dr. Eduardo Plarr meets the Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum for the first time at the Italian Club who is exceedingly drunk and has fallen on the floor. When Dr. Plarr enters the Club Dr. Humphries informs, "The gentleman you see sitting here on the floor and refusing to get up is Mr. Charles Fortnum, our Honorary Consul. You are Dr. Plarr, aren't you? Glad to meet you. I'm Dr. Humphries, Doctor of letters, not medicine. We three, you may say, are the pillars of English Colony" (28). There are only three English-speaking people living in that town. All three are in certain positions. Though Humphries is a so-called doctor of letters, Dr. Plarr is a medical doctor and Charley Fortnum is a diplomatic representative of Britain. Humphries' expression is reminiscent of the English colonial past. It is a boastful expression of the once colonizers that expresses the pride of the descendants of colonizers. As Eduardo Plarr and Charley Fortnum reach the Consulate of Charley Fortnum from the Italian club, Charley says he feels pride at "having the native tongue . . . the tongue that Shakespeare spoke" (34). It is the expression of his pride in being an Englishman and it is the expression of supremacy of the English language. Charley Fortnum is very much at being able to help the people of the United Kingdom in Argentina. For him, "Nationality is

thicker than water” (34). Charley Fortnum does not like the heat and humidity of Argentina. For him, “This is a damnable climate” (35), but he is destined to settle there because his father “chose to live in it and die in it” (35), and he does not have any choice because he is sixty-one years old, and it is not any good to opt to go elsewhere at this age.

Similarly, constructivist international relations theory believes that individuals are of great importance in creating certain ideas. Literary works are also the sources of the creation of ideas. The constructivist international theory believes in the myth, “anarchy is what states make of it.” A state is independent in formulating certain ideas. In *The Honorary Consul* both virtuous and vice ideas related to international relations have been created. England, America, Paraguay, and Argentina are the countries referred to in the novel. Mainly, Paraguay is at the center of the novel to formulate ideas. It is revealed in the novel that the Paraguayan ruler is cruel and revolutionary groups are fighting the despotic ruler. However, the Paraguayan state formulates the idea that these rebel groups are communists and they must be exterminated for the cause of democracy. This idea becomes helpful to the despotic ruler of Paraguay, who wants help from the US and other countries. The despotic ruler is killing the rebellious people mercilessly who are fighting for freedom and equality. In the novel, the states are responsible for creating an anarchic situation. The Argentinian government is also convinced with the activities of the Paraguayan General and depots its police force to attack the revolutionaries.

El Tigre, the leader of the revolutionary group, is an individual who plays a great role in creating ideas of freedom and equality. So many people are influenced by his ideas and are involved in revolutionary activities even at the cost of their lives. The protagonist Leon Rivas is a priest and belongs to a middle-class family, but he is influenced by the ideas of a revolutionary group led by El Tigre and takes part in revolutionary activities leaving the job of priesthood to help poor people. The revolutionaries are so moved by the ideas of

revolution that they become ready to lose their lives. Pablo, a member of the rebel group, suggests Leon Rivas surrender before the police attack them, and Aquino, another rebel member suggests he kill Fortnum and run away in the night; but Leon Rivas does not listen to their suggestions. He decides to remain there because he strongly believes in the order of his leader El Tigre though he is far away from them at this time.

Dr. Plarr has a double consciousness about his nationalism. He has moved to Argentina from Paraguay, but he has also a love of Paraguay where he was born. After spending many years in Buenos Aires, Dr. Plarr had shifted to a neighboring province of Paraguay because unconsciously he had “the sense that here he would be living near the border of the country where he had been born and where his father was buried” (2). He had never been to England, but he renews his passport every ten years without knowing the cause. He makes friendship with the only two other English citizens living in the city. They are the Honorary Consul Charles Fortnum and Doctor Humphries.

### **Nations, Anarchy, and Power Politics**

Realism is a vague term used in multiple ways in different fields, such as philosophy, science, literature, and International Relations. Realism unfolds a true status of international politics. In International Relations, realism is, "a tradition of analysis that stresses the imperatives states face to pursue a power politics of the national interests" (Burchill et al. 29). Some realists argue that “there are unchanged laws which regulate individual state behavior; states, like men, are by ‘nature’ self-interested and aggressive and will pursue their interests to the detriment of others and without regard to the constraints of law or morality” (Steans et al. 53). So every state has its own behavior on the basis of its interest.

The state is the main source of conflict in the novel because it has behaved badly to its subjects. Realist International Relations theory believes that states are self-interested and aggressive because there is “no system of law enforceable among them” (Waltz qtd. in

Weber 20). Paraguay under the rule of Alfred Stroessner is also a cruel state that does not listen to the demands of the revolutionary group so in the end Colonel Perez and his team rescue the Honorary Consul by using the force that causes the death of Dr. Eduardo Plarr, Leon Rivas and some other revolutionaries. It is related to domestic power politics. Colonel Prez is a friend of Dr. Eduardo Plarr, but he kills him mercilessly because his primary aim is to preserve the security of the state.

Though the revolutionaries kidnap the Honorary Consul within Argentinian territory, their main concern is with the Paraguayan government. But the Argentinian government takes action against these revolutionaries. This action is related to power politics between nations. The Paraguayan government has the assistance of the US, and the Argentinian government does not like to be at risk by supporting the revolutionary group. In realism power politics plays a great role in making relations between nations inimical or amicable. Similarly, Paraguay has built an alliance with the US for the sake of balance of power. As a result, it is ruling cruelly on its domestic politics putting the citizens in prisons that raise voices against the violation of human rights and freedom. Henry Plarr, father of Dr. Eduardo Plarr, is one of the freedom fighters who is put in prison all through his life, and, at last, shot to death as he tries to escape from the prison.

Colonel Prez knows that Doctor Eduardo Plarr is not one of the kidnapers of the Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum, and he has probably been held as a hostage by the revolutionary groups, but he kills the wounded Plarr. It may be because the truth may be revealed by the Doctor. Gordon concludes, "What seems to have worried Colonel Perez is that Doctor Plarr might disclose the factual truth about the kidnapers and their goals, and also about the actions of the police force, which he commands, including its brutal methods. Concealing this truth requires silencing Plarr forever" (41). Doctor Plarr becomes the victim of the injustice shown to him by the friends of his acquaintance. He trusts both sides. He goes

to serve the revolutionary group as per the request of his childhood friend Leon Rivas, and he also goes to meet Colonel Perez, the person of his acquaintance, to request him to extend the hour of ultimatum. But the revolutionary group keeps him as a hostage, and Colonel Perez kills him thinking probably that he may reveal the factual truth and evils of the Paraguayan despotic ruling of General Stroessner. The novel questions trusting and believing in others and criticizes the world as being full of skepticism and mistrust.

In the Diplomatic field, a consulate is taken as a sense of national pride. The British Consulate in Argentina is not very much furnished. When Eduardo Plarr asks Fortnum about his Consular, he replies, “But don’t go expecting too much. No marble halls, no chandeliers and potted palms. It’s only a bachelor’s digs- a bureau, a bedroom- all the usual offices, of course. The best the buggers at home are ready to provide. No sense of national pride” (33). It justifies that the standards of offices are also counted in international relations.

British Embassy is working in Argentina. On the other hand, the British Council is also functioning there; its duty is to handle cultural aspects, so it pays attention about poets and other literary figures working there. At a party, the British Ambassador Sir Henry Belfrage reveals the reality about Henry Fortnum. He puts:

There is no security involved. He’s only an Honorary Consul. . . . In a way an Honorary Consul is more difficult to get rid of than a career man. He can’t be transferred. That word honorary . . . it’s a bit bogus when you come to think of it.

Fortnum imports a new car every two years and sells it. He’s not entitled to -he’s not in the service-but I suppose he’s pulled a fast one with the local authorities there. I wouldn’t be surprised if he doesn’t make more than any Consul does there. (50)

The Embassy pays half of his bills and most of his stationery. Even in the Diplomatic field, the senior personality may create unnecessary trouble for junior staff. The British Ambassador gives the honorary Consul so much trouble with the mate report.

War is a basic characteristic of the Realist International Relations theory. States are full of self-interest and they may be involved in war for their self-interest, and no other organization is able to stop them because states are anarchical. It is true for realistic international relations that “International anarchy is a permissive cause of war” (Weber 9). In *The Honorary Consul*, the state is creating anarchy. We get people who fled from their native country because of anarchical ruling in the nation. The Paraguayan government is full of self-interest, and it is suppressing and putting people in prison who are raising their voices for freedom and human rights. After World War II America became a superpower and started advocating for freedom and human rights. It was waging the Cold War to suppress the communist ruling system in the world, but in the case of the Paraguayan ruling system that was ruled by a military base ruler General Alfredo Stroessner, it supports his despotic ruling system, mainly because of America’s self-interest. The main cause of America’s support to Paraguay was suppressing communist revolutionaries working in Paraguay. In the novel neither America nor England pay any attention to the demands of the kidnapers because they are full of self-interest. They want to have good relations with Paraguay at any cost for their selfish desires. Dr. Plarr rightly replies to Aquino, a rebel leader, “You can be sure that America will do nothing to the kind. Why should they? They don’t want to anger their friend the General for the sake of Charley Fortnum” (Greene 23). It is the flawed and selfish nature of the states. Instead of considering the demands of the rebellious group, a brutal force is used to release the captive. As a result, the innocent Dr. Plarr is killed along with the members of the revolutionary group. This nature of the state is related to the issues of realism.

The above analysis investigates the novel *The Honorary Consul* from different perspectives of International Relations. The novel depicts the socio-political situations of South America that can be explained by using various issues and ideas of International Relations. Cross-border activities are frequent in the novel because many of the actions in the

novel take place on the border lines of Paraguay and Argentina. The novel also includes the concept of idealism. The character Leon Rivas is very optimistic and has the hope of liberty and equality. So he leaves the job of priesthood and is involved in a revolutionary group to fight the despotic ruling of General Strossner. The novel includes the activities of British diplomats in Paraguay. The character Honorary Consul falls in love with a much younger woman than him. With this love, the Consul gets a better situation in his life. In this novel, love happens to be a matter of diplomacy. The novel mentions religion and politics that have an international nature. The novel includes two ideologies: capitalist and communist, and there is a clash between them in the novel, and the capitalist ideology gets victory over the communist ideology. The working of power politics plays a great role in the novel. Though America is a democratic nation, it has a good friendship with Paraguayan autocratic leader Alfredo Strossner because he is submissive to the American government and both nations have a common understanding to suppress the communist revolutionaries.

## CHAPTER VI

### DESTRUCTION OF UTOPIA BY EXTERNAL INTERFERENCE IN RUSHDIE'S

#### *SHALIMAR THE CLOWN*

##### ***Shalimar the Clown: An Overview***

Salman Rushdie's instrumental novel *Shalimar the Clown* includes Asia, Europe, and North America as its settings. It narrates the customs, cultures, and diplomacy of different countries. The major character Maximilian Ophuls is a great American diplomat who also serves in India as an American Ambassador. The novel inserts political as well as religious conflicts that stretch across the territorial borderlines. It extensively incorporates cross-border conflicts. The novel also mirrors earlier Utopia which falls into a dystopia because of religious and political conflicts. It also mentions the dire consequences of external intervention and hegemony. These attributes in the novel are subject to be explored through the lens of Realist, Idealist, and Constructivist theories of International Relations.

Rushdie's fourth novel *The Satanic Verses* (1988) created an uproar that led to riots in Muslim communities. The then-Iranian leader Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini gave a *fatwa* and Rushdie had to live in hiding for several years. Despite constant death threats, he continuously wrote essays, memoirs, criticism, short stories, and novels on different cultural, ethnic, political, and international issues. Though he was able to escape the *fatwa* and other assassination attempts, on 12 August 2022, he was stabbed by a young man Hadi Matar when he was scheduled to deliver a speech in Chautauqua, New York. Now he has recovered though he has lost the vision of his right eye. Rushdie continued writing despite the standing death threat. In 2023 he published *Victory City*, a novel arguing for the political power of epic and imaginative storytelling. He has recently published an autobiographical work *Knife: Meditations after an Attempted Murder* (2024) that gives an account of the brutal attack on him in 2022. Rushdie takes "imagination as the agent of synthesis or transmission" (Grant 2).

Like P. B. Shelley Rushdie emphasizes imagination. For him, imagination plays a great role in unlocking humanity fully. He insists that “the imagination, ‘the process by which we make pictures of the world . . . is one of the keys to our humanity’” (Grant 1). Imagination helps people take part in a global culture. Rushdie’s limitless imagination is the cause of the violence against him.

Rushdie has written successful and critically acclaimed novels altogether thirteen in number so far. Rushdie’s novels are allegorical and examine issues of history and philosophy with magical realism. His novels are famous for their effective and dramatic prose style which include surreal characters and brooding humor. They interlace “reality, myth, dream, and fantasy, turned history into fable and yet directly addressed highly charged contemporary political issues” (Eagleton viii). He is an influential writer in the postcolonial world. Though *Grimus* (1975) was his first novel, *Midnight’s Children* (1981) won him international recognition. To recognize his services to literature he was awarded a Knighthood in the Queen’s Birthday Honors on June 16, 2007. For him, literature is the place to explore the highest and lowest places in human society and the human spirit. It is the means to find out the truth of the heart. As a writer, he takes responsibility for tackling the larger issues of the day. In Sharp’s view, “Rushdie has chosen a very specific literary device, associated with a particular period of Western history, that of modern nation-state building” (123). His writings mention issues and features that helped modern state building.

Rushdie is an Indian-born British-American novelist and essayist. He also settled in Pakistan and worked as a copywriter for a short time. He is an internationally acclaimed influential writer in post-colonial literature whose name “has become so familiar internationally that even those who do not generally read literary fiction have heard of him and know something about the subjects concerning which he writes” (Teverson 3). He is a quiet mentor of younger Indian writers and has influenced a complete generation of Indo-

Anglican writers. He is a writer who is studied in different universities and is read across the globe. Rushdie's works include diverse subjects. Teverson expresses:

In the first place, it has had the effect of turning Rushdie, in the public imagination, into a writer who writes exclusively and bombastically about Islam, when in fact Rushdie's interest in religion is only one aspect of a much more complex body of writing that engages with subject areas as diverse as the role of the occult in the countercultures of 1960s London, institutionalized racism in the police force in Thatcherite Britain, the conquest of Moorish Spain by Queen Isabella in the fifteenth century, Christian fundamentalism in contemporary America, Hindu fundamentalism in contemporary Mumbai, the Indian visual arts, European avant-garde cinema, the global phenomena of popular music and the impact on culture of the World Wide Web". (5)

His writings include the subjects that include different affairs that cover different periods and different nations. Rushdie has written his fictional works in sophisticated modernist and post-modernist forms. In Teverson's view, "One of the characteristic features of Salman Rushdie's writing is its self-consciousness, and its willingness to incorporate an analysis of the cultural locations from which it is written" (8). In his novels, he explores the implications of this location.

Some of Rushdie's fictional works take events from his own biography and family history. *Midnight's Children* fictionalizes the events of his own childhood period. Similarly, his separation from his wife Elizabeth West provides him with subject matter for *Fury* (2001). Teverson mentions, "The habit of utilizing family yarns for storytelling seems to be one that Rushdie had learned from his mother, who, as he tells Ian Hamilton, was 'the keeper of the family stories' because of her 'incredible genealogical gifts'" (67).

*Shalimar the Clown* received the prestigious Vodafone Crossroad Fiction Award in India in 2005. It is a novel favored by the writer himself. In one interview with *Guardian* Rushdie advocates about freedom of a person. He claims, “. . . some incredibly important things were being fought here; being important to me, the art of the novel; beyond that, the freedom of the imagination, the great overwhelming, overarching issue of the freedom of speech and the right of human beings to walk down the streets of their own country without fear” (qtd. in Grant xiii). In the novel, he advocates for freedom without external interference.

In an interview with Anis Shivani, Rushdie feels very proud of *Shalimar the Clown* because it is a book published after years of research. In his interview, Rushdie gives the justification for the inclusion of the Kashmir issue in his novel. He points out:

My life really begins in Kashmir- my family originated in Kashmir- and the insurgency in Kashmir began in 1989, which is the same year as attack on *The Satanic Verses*, so I was rather preoccupied with what was happening to me, but in another part in my head I was very interested in what was happening there, and I always knew I was going to have to look at that sometime, and then finally I found a way of doing it. (235)

He accepts *Shalimar the Clown* as a dark book. He concludes, “I think that is right. I think the situation in Kashmir is very dark, and the book arises out of that feeling. There does not seem to be a good road out of the problem” (239). He does not agree that the fundamentalism has taken hold in villages of Kashmir. He views:

The truth about Kashmir is that it was never fundamentalist. The Islam of Kashmir was Sufi rather than Wahabbi or any of the other extreme groups like Deobandi and so forth. It was not like that. And now what has happened is that the pressure is being placed on village people. The pressure is not in Srinagar, the pressure is in these small

villages where the *Jihadis* arrive at night and make threats, and tell women that they have to be in purdah or else they'll have their noses cut off. So you have on one hand a considerable Jihadi presence. And there they are, cut between the two, and that in what I wanted to try to portray. (239)

*Shalimar the Clown* is “a 95 percent realistic book, with a little flavor, a little pixie dust dropped on it” (248). It is a novel where he deliberately tries to strip everything down. He thinks that “*Shalimar* is probably the most political novel I've ever written since *Shame*. I think it is a novel which was written by a desire to face up to the facts not only about Kashmiri politics, but about geopolitics” (249). It is a book that describes geopolitical consequences.

*Shalimar the Clown* is set on three continents comprised of India, Afghanistan, France, England, and the United States of America. It includes mainly the subject matter related to the state of Kashmir, the favorite place of Rushdie's family's holidays as well as the homeland of his maternal grandfather. In the novel Kashmiriness “is shown being crushed in a three-way power struggle between US interests, the Indian army and Islam insurgents from Pakistan” (Traverson 219). It also incorporates characters from India, Europe, and America, and they expose the customs, cultures, beliefs, and diplomacy of the countries they belong to. Three different worlds have been presented in the novel. The first world is the ancient world of Kashmir with wooden huts and tents and the first TV in town; the second world is the modern world of America with luxury apartments, Bentleys, and TV studios; and the third world is the European war-torn world with the Nazi experiments and concentration camps. *Shalimar the Clown* is a postmodern novel, complexly woven with the savor of magic realism.

In the novel, Rushdie gives his characters “a far bigger canvas, including on it -among many other things- the Nazi occupation of Alsace in World War II, the post-war projection of

American power around the globe, the end of the Cold War, the rise of the Islamic radicalism, and most centrally, the destruction of a peerlessly beautiful mountain land caught in politico-religious crossfires” (Thomson). For Rushdie, the story of Kashmir's destruction begins with the partition of 1947. The lines drawn by the former colonial powers were the sources of the destructive acts later.

The novel’s narratives revolve around the activities of four main characters Maximilian Ophuls, Boonyi, India, and Shalimar the Clown. Most of the story is described in flashbacks. It describes the paradise-like Kashmir that has changed into an ethnic battleground, a utopia changed into dystopia. Kashmir, a haven of peace and tolerance, falls into a hotbed of extremism and fundamentalist violence. This fallen situation of Kashmir is described in the story of two people who are born there, grow up and fall in love, and then are separated by circumstances that result in tragic consequences like murder and bloodshedding. The fictional Kashmiri village named Pachigam is described, at first, as an idyllic place, a natural paradise. The village is a peaceful place intermixing with Muslims and Hindus. The community is so close-knit that it unanimously agrees to the marriage between Hindu girl Boonyi and Muslim boy Shalimar. But the peaceful place changes into a battlefield after the encroachment of outsiders. One of the main characters, Maximilian Ophuls, a brilliant, cosmopolitan Franco-American US diplomat, who worked in India, and later US antiterrorist chief is killed by Shalimar in broad daylight at the door of his daughter’s residence in California. He was “slaughtered . . . like a halal chicken dinner, bleeding to death from a deep neck wound caused by a single slash of the assassin’s blade” (Rushdie 4). About the death of Maximilian Ophuls the critic Liao comments:

Max’s death makes a big story in political circles as well as in mass media. Even after the crime, which at first looks political, turns out to be a personal matter, the thought of having terrorists walking among them terrifies most Americans. The fact that the

purely personal affair is turned into a political issue produces uncanny terror, too, for Shalimar, who is hunted as a terror support and finds himself unhomed. (29)

As the American Ambassador goes to Kashmir, the panchayat chief Abdullah Noman organizes a cultural program as per the desire of the Ambassador because “he was a scholarly gentleman who evidently took a strong interest in all aspects of Kashmiri culture” (Rushdie 132). The play performed is *Anarkali* in which the best dancer in Pachigam Boonyi Kaul Noman dances as Anarkali. The Ambassador is attracted by the beauty of Boonyi and exploits her eventually. His exploitation of Boonyi happens to be the cause of his death though murder can be counted as a terrorist act. The rope dancer Shalimar becomes a serial killer who has already killed Boonyi and is on the way to finishing India, too. His killing is the outcome of determined revenge against the misdeeds done by Maximilian Ophuls by misusing his power. He grabs the dancer Boonyi, the newly married wife of Shalimar, and exploits her beauty, and leaves her after she gives birth to India. Fortunately, Maximilian Ophuls’s earlier wife Mrs. Margaret Rhodes takes responsibility for raising India. After spreading the news that “in India the goddamn American Ambassador was apparently fucking the local peasantry. . . .the renaissance hero, the best-selling author, the economic genius, the famous lover of his equally genius wife, and the flying Jew” loses his fame overnight, and he has to leave India as well as diplomatic service (206).

Boonyi returns to Kashmir where she is isolated from the society that treats her as a living dead. She spends many years in a secluded deserted hut as a living dead. After her father and father-in-law die, Shalimar kills her, manages the way to America, and kills Maximilian Ophuls, too. The novel includes the terrorist activities set in Kashmir on the Indian subcontinent. This issue of Kashmir, a place once Utopia changed into dystopia, is an issue related to Idealist International Relations theory. A state may be ideal till it functions on

its own, till it remains out of the selfish greed of outsiders. It changes into a dystopic situation after it faces the greedy clashes of outside forces. Earlier the place was ideal as:

The Pandits of Kashmir, unlike Brahmins elsewhere in India, happily ate meat.

Kashmiri Muslims, perhaps envying the Pandits their choice of gods, blurred their faith's austere monotheism by worshipping at the shrines of the valley's many local saints, its pirs. To be a Kashmiri, to have received so incomparable a divine gift, was to value what was shared far more highly than what divided. (Rushdie 83)

The people of different religions living with shared values are divided into enemies by the encroachment of external extremists.

### **Issues of Love and Conflict**

The novel has been explained in different issues since its publication in 2005. Love and murder are two major issues that the novel tries to analyze in a detailed way. Sacred love between Boonyi, a Hindu girl, and Shalimar, a Muslim boy, is sanctioned by both Hindu and Muslim society. Coincidentally, they were both born on the Dashera celebration organized in Shalimar Bagh. Love sprouts from their early life. They also get married with the consent of their families. But it is selfishly snatched away by American diplomat Maximilian Ophuls. Love between Boonyi and Shalimar gets shattered by the desire of greed: the greed of Max Ophuls over the beauty of Boonyi, and the greed of Boonyi over the hope of her better future. But Max Ophuls only exploits her youthful beauty, and discards her after she gives birth to an illegitimate daughter India/Kashmira.

A diplomat's role is to resolve misunderstandings and foster cooperation between nations. He is not only a person, he also represents a certain government. So his activities are not only personal, they also affect the relations between nations. In a positive sense, love may be a means of cultural diplomacy, a bridge between nations. In the ancient *Lichchhavi* Period, Nepali Princess Bhrikuti was married to the Tibetan King Songten Gampo. The love between

them became the means to foster relations between the two nations and spread the Buddhist religion in Tibet. In this way, love may become the means to strengthen the relations between nations. In *Shalimar the Clown* diplomacy and love go hand in hand. The love is very much selfish from the side of Ambassador Ophuls, whereas the love of Boonyi is based on seeking opportunity. Ophuls shows his greedy immoral love toward Boonyi that becomes the cause of his own death. Max Ophuls is involved in immoral activities by spoiling the life of Boonyi. In the name of organizing a dance competition, he calls Boonyi to his residence and exploits her by keeping her with him as a concubine for about two years. He spoils the married lives of Boonyi and her husband, Shalimar the Clown. It is the dominance of a powerful ambassador over a powerless normal citizen. In a broader sense, it is the misuse of power of a strong nation over a weak nation.

Love becomes the cause of conflict and revenge. The innocent love-dwelling heart of Shalimar changes into a reservoir of cruelty and revenge. Shalimar is a person, but he is influenced by the activities related to international affairs. A person cannot be isolated from world affairs. He/she is the outcome of what happens in the world. In the beginning, we get an organic harmony in Kashmir. The idea of Kashmiriyat (Kashmiriness) is prevalent in the region. The region has “communal harmony” and “cultural syncretism.” As a result of the cultural harmony, the society condones the marriage between Boonyi, a Hindu girl, and Shalimar the Clown, a Muslim boy. They are married in the name of Kashmiriyat. In the novel, Rushdie describes the Kashmiriness as follows:

Abdullah then mentioned Kashmiriyat, Kashmiriness, the belief that at the heart of Kashmiri culture there was a common bond that transcended all differences. . . . ‘We are all brothers and sisters here’, said Abdullah. ‘There is no Hindu-Muslim issue. Two Kashmiri-two Pachigami-youngsters wish to marry, that is all. A love match is

acceptable to both families and so a marriage there will be; both Hindu and Muslim customs will be observed. (Rushdie 110)

This type of narrative romance shows the syncretic community. The sense of Kashmiriyat is also expressed through everyday culture i.e. cooking in this context. Pachigam's Hindu Pandit Pyarelal exclaims: "Today our Muslim village in the service of Hindu Maharaja will cook and act in a Mughal-that is to say Muslim-garden, to celebrate. . . . Here in Kashmir, our stories sit side by side on the same double bill, we eat from the same dishes, we laugh at the same jokes" (71). This statement shows the cultural harmony between Muslims and Hindus in Kashmir.

This communal harmony and syncretism of Kashmiriyat leads to erosion by the intrusion of external forces: then Islamic separatists based in Pakistan and the militantly hyper-nationalist Indian state. Then the riots start and the villagers have to run away. Pakistan supported Islam, at first, fight for freedom (*Azadi*) of Kashmir from Indian encroachment for a secular vision of "Kashmir for Kashmiris":

In those days before the crazies got into the act the liberation front was reasonably popular and *Azadi* was the universal cry. Freedom! A tiny valley of no more than five million souls had locked, preindustrial, resource rich but cash poor, perched thousands of feet up in the mountains like a tasty green sweetmeat caught in a giant's teeth, wanted to be free. Its inhabitants had come to the conclusion that they did not much like India and did not come for the sound of Pakistan. So, freedom? Freedom to be meat-eating Brahmins or Saint-worshipping Muslims, to make pilgrimages to the ice-lingam high in the melting snows or to bow down before the prophet's hair in a lakeside Mosque, to listen to the santoor and drink salty tea, to dream of Alexander's army and to choose never to see an army again, to make honey and carve walnut into animal and boat shapes and to watch the mountains push them way, inch by inch,

century by century, further up into the sky. Freedom to choose folly over greatness but to be nobody's fools. *Azadi!* Paradise wanted to be free. (253)

In the novel, Rushdie takes the lived experience of war-ravaged Kashmir and exposes it to the outer world. It is a reclaiming and rewriting of Kashmiri history, landscape, and culture. It is a rewriting of the struggle of the Kashmiri people and their future hopes. It is a strategy of “worlding” the conflict. In Sreyoshi Sarkar’s view, in the novel, “the Kashmir conflict is reimagined in conversation with other global contexts of state oppression and people’s rebellion” (23). Sarkar further claims:

The conflict violence is described in more nuanced ways in the novel’s “worlding” of the three acts of genocide it describes. The first is the Jewish holocaust which takes away the lives of Max’s parents in 1940s in Strasburg. The second is the terrorizing, murder and forced exodus of the Hindu Kashmiri Pandits by Islamic terrorist organizations backed by the Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) in 1989. The third is the harassment and incarceration of local Kashmiri Muslim populations by Indian Army personnel under orders of the Indian political echelon. (27)

Sarkar asserts that Rushdie in the novel tries to justify the severeness of violence.

Power has “the capacity to influence the other against his or her will” (Guzzini 115). Ophuls crosses the limitations of a diplomat and misuses his power. He wrongly uses his power, and his misdeeds cause tragedy in his life and he has to leave his ambassadorship job. In this novel, the diplomat Maximilian Ophuls uses power over powerless people. The issue of power is related to the subject of Realist International Relations theory. In the novel, we get a clash between power and powerlessness. Using power Maximilian Ophuls grabs Boonyi from the hand of powerless Shalimar. In fact, Ophuls’s power is related to his post as an Ambassador. In the next term, his power resembles the power of America over India viz. Kashmir. Ophuls in the novel misuses the power offered to him by the state. The novel shows

America's hegemony over India. On the other hand, Shalimar in the beginning becomes powerless and loses his lovely wife Boonyi, but he becomes full of revenge and takes the wrong way to get power to fight with Ophuls. He is involved in a terrorist organization, and gets power by bad manners, and goes to America and kills his enemy Ophuls. Misuse of power leads people to a conflictual situation that results in death and destruction.

### **Cultural Diplomacy**

Most people in the world give emphasis on cultural identity. Cultural identities and cultural clashes are the issues of literary narratives, and they are also the subject of international relations. Cultural identities shape relations among countries, whereas cultural clash creates antagonism among them. Samuel Huntington rightly states, "Cultural identity is the central factor shaping a country's assertions and antagonisms" (215). He further puts, "Culture and cultural identities. . . . are shaping the patterns of cohesion, disintegration and conflict . . ." (20). Hence, they have a vital role in shaping relations among countries.

Likewise, cultural diplomacy operates beyond the national level. Nation's ideas are best represented in cultural activities. Ien Ang et al. opine that "Cultural diplomacy can best enhance our national security in subtle, wide-ranging, and sustainable ways" (4). They point clearly to the outcome that goes far beyond narrow national interest. In their views, "The current modishness of cultural diplomacy . . . should be seen in context of the changing architecture of international relations in an increasingly interdependent and interconnected world" (7). Cultural diplomacy in its primary aim serves strategic interests of national governments while at the same time it holds out the promise of moving beyond the national interest to support a greater good through mutual exchanges. Cultural diplomacy is "any practice that is related to purposeful cultural cooperation between nations and groups of nations" (2). In a broader sense, cultural diplomacy is "the exchange of ideas, information, art and other aspects of culture among nations and their peoples in order to foster mutual

understanding” (3). So cultural diplomacy is a great means to promote relations between nations.

*Shalimar the Clown* is a remarkable work that is rich in keeping ingredients of cultural diplomacy. Cultural diplomacy is the relationship between two nations through the means of cultural activities. The Cold War period was high time for cultural diplomacy. American statesman Thomas Jefferson is the first to acknowledge, “the potential for cultural expression to shape international opinion about fledging republic” (Schneider 191). The argument of Jefferson on the importance of culture to foster diplomacy is relevant even in the present time. The exchange of ideas, information, and people plays a great role in enhancing diplomacy. Similarly, the use of creative expression has also a vital role in increasing mutual understanding between nations. Cultural artifacts like novels are expected to promote mutual relationships between nations and their people. But Rushdie’s novel *The Satanic Verses* (1988) created an uproar that led to riots in Muslim communities resulting in a number of deaths. It “excited passions in a large part of the world that went far beyond the political” (Swan 430). The then leader of Iran gave the infamous *fatwa*, and the writer Rushdie had to hide himself under his secret alias Joseph Anton with the protection of British Police. The book created riots and demonstrations in many countries. John C. Swan sums up the revolts like this:

A little more than a week after its official publication, it was banned in India, in November it was banned in South Africa (in the meantime winning the Whitbread award for the best new novel in England); in January the book was burned in a demonstration by the large Muslim population of Bradford, England, and there were massive demonstrations in Hyde Park, along with many demands for banning and for extension of the country’s Christian-only blasphemy law. (430)

Instead of creating diplomatic harmony, the novel created antagonism between the people of different nations. The issue of international diplomacy was put in question. Muslim communities of different nations protested against Rushdie as well as against Britain for providing shelter to him. The Iranian government terminated its diplomatic relations with Britain for about a decade. But so far as the novel *Shalimar the Clown* is concerned, it seems to have been written to passivize that rioting situation ignited by the publication of *The Satanic Verses*. In this sense, it presents the idealistic concept of International Relations. The Idealist International Relations theory seeks international cooperation and friendship. Since its publication in 2005, the novel has received many readers and critics' acclaim. They have analyzed different aspects of the novel.

The novel is based “against the backdrop of international networks of diplomacy, capital, and Islamic terrorism and the repressive forces of Indian states” (Siddiqui 294). The diplomatic ideas exposed in the novel are very much relevant to the relations between India and other Western countries. It means to express the idea that the diplomats may deteriorate the situation that they are meant to smoothen if they behave in an unjust and selfish way ignoring the values of the residing nations. The novel pleads for cultural harmony. The situation of a place deteriorates when external forces attack the cherished local cultural practices. In Kashmir before the partition of India, Pakistan, and Kashmir in 1947 was cultural assimilation. Hindus, Muslims, and minority Jews were living together respecting each other's religious activities. The villages Shrimal and Pachigam had feasts together. “On the subject of the current Hindu maharaja of Kashmir, Abdullah [the panchayat chief] had managed to preserve a position of diplomatic neutrality” (Rushdie 73). Both external forces like Indian armies and Muslim extremists attacked the well-established Hindu-Muslim cultural values that were in practice in Kashmir. As a result of their encroachment “Kashmir for the Kashmiris’ was no longer an option. Only the big boys were left standing, and so it

was to be Kashmir for the Indians or Kashmir for the Pakistanis whose proxies the terror organizations were” (311). The novel gives the message on diplomacy that external interference is unjust at any cost because it creates riots among the people living there. This concept is related to the Constructivist International Relations theory. Ideas are constructed by human beings, and those constructed ideas determine the relations between nations. In this sense, cultural diplomacy is an issue of constructivist International Relations theory.

### **The Falling of Cultural Utopia**

Clemens Brucker explains *Shalimar the Clown* from a multicultural perspective. In his view, Rushdie in this novel expresses his opinion on the subject of multiculturalism. In the novel, he gives accounts of Kashmir of the 1940s and Los Angeles of the 1990s. It shows the past multicultural utopia with multicultural failure in the present time. He takes Kashmir as a multicultural place that has fallen. In Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, the man falls from paradise, but in *Shalimar the Clown* the veritable paradise itself falls, mainly it falls down culturally. At the beginning of the novel, we find Kashmir people of the Hindu religion respecting and honoring the customs of Islam religion and vice versa. They have a common bond and have transcended all other differences. The villagers of Pachigan and Shrimal have a feast together. “The words Hindu and Muslim had no place in their story. . . . 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” (Rushdie 57). Kashmir in this way is presented as a multicultural utopia. But as the novel proceeds “multicultural, hybrid Kashmir is violently changed into a betrayed, divided and terror-stricken world” (Brucker 15). In a multicultural society, religion plays only a secondary role. Though people follow different cultural traditions, they have a common bond. In the beginning, we find “an overarching Kashmiri culture which provides a sense of unity and belonging yet leaves all its varying subcultures enough space to breathe and grow” (20).

The multicultural paradise degrades into a terror-stricken world by the two forces, a fierce Indian nationalism, and a just brutal Muslim fundamentalism. The reference to Los Angeles of 1992 in the novel reminds the actual Rodney King scandal that sparked violent riots.

The love between Boonyi and Shalimar resembles the condition of Kashmir. Kashmir was an earthly paradise with a complex cultural inheritance. Singh et al. view, “But in the last four decades, we have seen Kashmir’s change in status from paradise to a war-struck place, caught between the international politics of capturing land and related international ideas. Peace, love, and brotherhood have always been the characteristics of the Kashmiri way of life” (505). They further comment, “At the initial level, their love was bliss, a far-like stretched scenic beauty. But as the story progresses, Boonyi and Shalimar become an allegory for the history of Kashmir, its Hindu-Muslim conflicts, and its political skirmishes of India and Pakistan” (506). Boonyi tries to come out of the traditional family bondage. Her desire for freedom is the eternal woman's desire to get freedom from the chains of society and patriarchy. Maximilian Ophuls is a good vent for her for the opportunity to search for freedom. Singh et al. assert:

Boonyi’s relationship with Max becomes the point of betrayal by the powerful American Ambassador Max which turned the plot upside down and Rushdie starts describing the underlying politics. Max can be interpreted in the terms of US’ roles in Kashmir politics. Rushdie unfolds the double stands of the US led efforts to establish a global-political-economic consensus in the wake of the Second World War involving South Asian Nations as the dice in the new game. (506)

Max’s love for Boonyi becomes an allegory to America's relationship with India. A Kashmiri girl is ruined and destroyed by a powerful American Ambassador Ophuls. It is America’s trampling over the culture of Kashmir. Singh et al. put it “Max’s treatment of Boonyi and the subsequent relationship during which he showers the bliss of so-called good and high-

lifestyle and later he abandons her when he loses his interest, can clearly be seen as an allegory of America's relationship with [India]" (507). Boonyi is the outcome of the pseudo-love of America to the world. In reality "Ambassador Max Ophuls, who these days was supporting terror activities while calling himself an ambassador for counter-terrorism, had been incharge of liaison with Talib the Afghan's branch of the *Muj* (Rushdie 172).

In the novel, Boonyi is treated as a commodity. It is patriarchy that has betrayed "towards females, disrobing them from their rights, freedoms, and longings, except only chasing their usability" (Singh et al. 507). In the novel, she is presented as the first rebellious woman. At an early age, she has her own stand to decide women characters in the novel. "A girl of sixteen makes her way out to choose her sexual freedom, disbanding the social fear of getting tagged as 'slut', 'whore'-the normal charge of being incoherent with the traditional female gender roles in the issue of chastity" (510). So she transgresses social and moral codes even after her marriage and opts to Delhi with Max to live as his mistress in search of her future. After negotiating her demands, she promises, "I will do anything you want, whenever you want it", she replied in immaculate English. "My body will be yours to command and it will be my joy to obey" (Rushdie 192). It is her decision to get a better future; it is her desire to be in a free and wider world.

Boonyi's desire to be free from middle-class orthodoxy shatters when she realizes that the free world of her desire is full of betrayal. Her desire for freedom creates catastrophe in her life and in the lives of the people related to her. She represents the urge of women to battle for liberation. As she loses her innocence, "The innocence in the valley gradually transgresses the course of simplicity with the name of false hopes and dreams and promises, and is ultimately betrayed in the process at the end" (Singh et al. 511). She accuses Max for his betrayal and reacts "I kept my love for my husband though my body served you. . . . Look what you have made of the body I gave you. But my heart is still my own" (Rushdie 205).

She accepts the consequence of the betrayal courageously and gives birth to Max's child. She also goes back to Kashmir though she already knows her fate there. The betrayal makes her courageous to endure whatever condition she gets in Kashmir, so she stays alone in Nazarebadoor's deserted cottage. Boonyi, a woman growing up in a submissive culture, becomes bold and independent because of the treachery she gets from the powerful Max Ophuls. Boonyi's daughter Kashmira/India also becomes a bold woman at the end of the novel. After returning from the visit to Kashmir, her maternal ancestral place, "her single-minded obsession with revenge demonstrates her strong will and valour" (Singh et al. 513). At the end when Shalimar approaches to kill her. She becomes ready for the counterattack with her bow. "The golden bow was drawn back as far as it would go. She felt the taut bowstring pressing against her parted lips, felt the foot of the arrow's shaft her gritted teeth, allowed the last seconds to tick away, exhaled, and let fly. There was no possibility that she would miss. There was no second chance" (Rushdie 398). Boonyi represents the beautiful and then tragic aspect of Kashmir. The women are the worst sufferers of the clash between India and Pakistan. The issue of women suffering in the novel is also the subject of International Relations because their sufferings are the outcome of the clash between two or more nations. It is the issue of Realist International Relations theory.

The Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front was for the liberation of Kashmir in the beginning, but later it outflanks and other religious groups take hold and the concept of free Kashmir wanes, and Kashmir falls into violence and destruction. Siddhiqu views:

Ultimately, the promise of a vernacular cosmopolitanism, a cosmopolitanism articulated from the margins, exemplified by Kashmiriat, is destroyed in conflict between an aggressive Indian state and the various Islamic factions of the so called Kashmiri Muj, an Americanization of *Mujahideen* (freedom fighters), who make Kashmir their battleground.

Rushdie alludes to the workings of an international network of Islamic terrorism, extending to the Philippines and the Middle East, and backed with Saudi cash. These networks represent the dangers of an internationalism divorced from the ethos of cosmopolitanism. Shalimar, upon joining the *Mujahideen*, fraternizes with recruits from different parts of the Muslim world. (299)

The novel is global in its scope. It covers Los Angeles, Kashmir, Continental Europe, and England. The chief characters are also linked to global developments. Though the novel has global scope, it has also been categorized as a national allegory, as Frederic Jameson generalizes that all third-world texts, mainly novels, are to be read as national allegory, and he explains, “Third-world-texts, even those which are seemingly private and invested with a properly libidinal dynamic-necessarily project a political dimension in the form of national allegory of the embattled situation of the public third-world culture and society” (Jameson 69). *Shalimar the Clown* is also the national allegory of Kashmir that over time, with the intervention of outer forces, falls into a horrific dystopic region.

### **Hegemony and Counter-Hegemony**

Hegemony is concerned with the Realist International Relations theory that denotes the consensual pre-dominance of a nation over the next one. The dominance may be of various types, such as political, military, social, and cultural. It dictates the internal situation of a subordinate state. In John Agnew’s view, “hegemony is the enrollment of others in the exercise of your power by convincing, cajoling, and coercing them that they should want what you want” (1-2). In the present time, strong nations keep others under their hegemony. In the nineteenth century, Britain was a hegemon spreading its empire in many parts of the world. In the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, the US is a hegemon though it is often being challenged by some other nations.

In *Shalimar the Clown* India is presented under the hegemony of the US. Max Ophuls, the US Ambassador to India, spoils Boonyi which signifies the coercion of America over India. During the Cold War period, India was buying weapons from the Soviet Union and Indian leaders were supporting the government of North Vietnam. Both the Soviet Union and Vietnam were enemies of the US, so the US Secretary while sending Ambassador Max Ophuls to India advises him “to make plain to the Indian authorities that our enemy’s friend can only be our foe” (Rushdie 178). Lyndon Johnson, the president of America (1963-1969) was indecisive about India. He “liked the dictator of Pakistan. . . so much that he was even willing to turn a blind eye to Pakistan’s growing intimacy with China” (178). By helping Pakistan, a permanent enemy of India, the US was showing its coercive behavior towards India. When Max Ophuls objected publicly “to the militarization of the Kashmir valley, and when the word *oppressors* passed his lips for the first time the bubble of his popularity finally burst” (197). The newspaper criticized him. “America was trampling over Southeast Asia, Vietnami children’s bodies were burning with unquenchable napalm fire, and yet the American Ambassador had gall to speak oppression” (198). But India’s newspaper editorial writers condemned the cajoling activities of America. They thundered, “America should put its own house in order, and stop telling us how to take care of our own land” (198).

Counter-hegemony is related to Idealist International Relations theory. In his retired life, Ophuls foresees the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Soviet Union, the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the reunification of Germany. He also foresees the happy ending of his age and “the new world which would come after would be better than the one that would die with him” (20). This concept of Ophuls resembles Francis Fukuyama’s political philosophy ‘The End of History’. He envisages a better post-Cold War world. He envisions:

Europe, free of the Soviet threat, and America, free of the need to remain permanently at battle stations, would build that new world in friendship, a world without walls, a

frontierless newfound land of infinite possibility. The doomsday clock would no longer be set at seven seconds to midnight. The emerging economies of India, Brazil, and a newly opened-up China would be the world's new powerhouses, the counterweights to the American hegemony of which he had always, as an internationalist, disapproved. (20).

In the last part of his life, he surrenders "to the utopian fallacy, to the myth of the perfectability of man" (20). It is the idealist concept that hopes for a better world ahead.

### **External Interference in Kashmir**

The stories deserve great value "in the making sense of the contradictory nature of international relations" (viii). In other words, literature has dramatic consequences in relations between states. Sheeran asserts that "Literature is a valuable medium to measure an understanding of the previous, prevailing and future social and political relations" (viii). As literature is a "product of history", it captures "great movements and minor footnotes" (xix). The historical events and their effects on human beings are vividly depicted in literature. Literature also reveals the psychology of war. It describes human natures like greed and selfishness that insinuate war to occur. It not only presents the historical facts related to war, it also evaluates the consequences of war on human life.

The novel tries to justify that external selfish interference can change a paradise-like place into a battleground butchering human beings in a very inhuman way. The novel shows that paradise-like Kashmir becomes a battleground because of external intervention. Before intruders intervened in Kashmir, it was "like paradise". Pachigham, a village in Kashmir, the birthplace of Boonyi and Shalimar, was the admixture of Hindus, Muslims, and Jews. The followers of these religions were living together inter-mixing their cultures. Pandit Pyaralal exclaims happily, in a Kashmiri context, "Who tonight are the Hindus? Who are the Muslims? Here in Kashmir, our stories sit happily side by side on the same double bill, we

eat from the same dishes, we laugh at the same jokes” (Rushdie 71). It was the belief that “at the heart of Kashmiri culture there was a common bond that transcended all other differences” (110). Muslims also actively took part in Hindu Dassehra celebrations. Pandit Pyarelal, father of Boonyi, once says:

Today our Muslim village, in the service of our Hindu Maharaja, will cook and act in a Mughal-that is to say Muslim-garden, to celebrate the anniversary of the day on which Ram marched against Ravan to rescue Sita. What is more, two plays are to be performed: our traditional *RamLeela*, and also *Budshah*, the tale of Muslim sultan.

Who tonight are the Hindus? Who are the Muslims? Here in Kashmir our stories sit happily side by side on the same double bill, we eat from the same dishes, we laugh at the same jokes. We will joyfully celebrate the reign of the good king Zain-ul-abidin, and as for our Muslim brothers and sisters, no problem! They all like to see Sita rescued from the demon-king, and besides, there will be fireworks. (71)

They feel no difference between Hindu and Muslim. There is cultural sharing between them that gives them optimum pleasure.

At the age of fourteen, Boonyi and Noman sher Noman “fall in love for the first time in the village of Pachigam” (46). It was a dangerous decision for them to be in love at that age, but they decide to be in love for their whole lives. Their love is easily recognized by the community and the Pachigam community arranges a marriage between Boonyi, a Hindu girl, and Shalimar the Clown, a Muslim boy. On that occasion Abdullah, the village head, verdicts, ““There is no Hindu Muslim issue. Two Kashmiri- two Pachigami- youngsters wish to marry that’s all. A love match is acceptable to both families and so a marriage there will be; both Hindu and Muslim customs will be observed”. Pyarelal added, when his turn came, ‘to defend their love is to defend what is finest in ourselves’” (110). Though they followed different religions, there was assimilation between them. They believed in geographical

bondage between them. So Abdulla calls Boonyi and Shalimar as Kashmiri-Pachigami youngsters, not a Hindu girl, and a Muslim boy. Kashmir was a melting pot for all religious followers before it was intruded on by outsiders. Max Ophuls, the American Ambassador to India at that time, spoils Boonyi's life in the name of providing her dance training. He is already at the age of fifty-five, and he knows, "To fall in love would break the treaty-nothing can come of it but trouble. But the secret creature within him stretched and yawned, climbed out of the almost-forgotten cellar and rose towards the light" (193). His misbehavior results in his own death, the death of his mistress Boonyi, and the death of his own daughter India. The misuse of the power of a diplomat like him causes great misfortune in his own as well as the lives of many others.

To encounter Russian support to the Afghanistan government, America provides weapons to Muslim revolutionary groups in Afghanistan. The reality was that "The Russians were in Afghanistan and consequently many Afghans had fled to Pakistan and were even to be found at forward camp number 22 in the 'tree' –Azad- sector of Kashmir" (270). Such groups are also supported by the government of Pakistan, and they create riots in once paradise-like Kashmir so that it becomes a battleground with mass killing and genocide. Max Ophuls was another liberal professor to become Ambassador to India after Galbraith who truly understood India. When US Secretary Dean Rusk calls him in the immediate aftermath of the 1965 Indo-Pakistan War and offers him the Indian Embassy, he glibly accepts it. At that time India was receiving arms from the Soviet Union, so the US secretary "was openly hostile to Indian interests" (178). The US secretary "not only opposed Indian line in Kashmir but also criticized the annexation of Hyderabad and Goa, and the vocal support of several Indian leaders of the government of North Vietnam" (178). He says, "Professor Ophuls, we are at wars with that gentleman, Ho Chi Minh, and you will be so good as to make plain to the Indian authorities that our enemy's friend can only be our foe" (178-79). The US

government sends him to India as an ambassador with the missions of “politics, diplomacy, and arms sales” (181), but he starts doing “with the far more ancient imperatives of desire” (181). He is so lured by the beauty and dance of Boonyi that he forgets his responsibilities and spoils her by making her his mistress.

Max Ophuls was an American with Pakistani sympathies. He objected to “the militarization of the Kashmir valley, and when the word *oppressors* passed his lips for the first time the bubble of his popularity finally burst” (197). In fact, India was against America’s trampling over Southeast Asia. So Indian editorial writers often reacted that “America should put its own house in order, . . . and stop telling us how to take care of our own land” (198). It is an expression of America’s self-interest toward India. The ambassador Max Ophuls supports terrorist activities though he calls himself the ambassador of antiterrorism. Everything in Kashmir is taken as politics, and old comfortable days are all gone. It becomes a place full of insurgencies. Mass killings, frequent rape cases, genocides, mass exodus become normal in that area. The words like *Mujahid*, *jihad*, *Talib- Talim* (all means freedom) become buzzwords among the rebel groups. Though the USA provides weapons to them, they hate the Christians and hate America. The motto “Kashmir for the Kashmiris, and everyone else, kindly get out” becomes very popular among the rioters (247).

The discussion exposes the depiction of Southeast Asia, mainly of Kashmir, in *Shalimar the Clown*, showing how the selfish desires of different nations create situations of chaos is related to Realistic International Relations. It shows that the diplomatic behaviors of the diplomats are not always oriented toward establishing harmonious situations between nations. Diplomats may also function for their personal or national selfish desires that may create conflictual situations. The novel includes the deteriorated condition of the selfish intentions of different countries. They make Southeast Asia, mainly Kashmir, a playground for the fulfillment of their selfish desires. The novel instills a sense of cultural harmony

among its readers. The ideas that the novel uses to describe Southeast Asia, mainly about Kashmir, help us make up our minds about that area. The cultural diplomacy that the novel expresses aspires for harmonious relations between different nations. The fictional characters and the fictitious societies depicted in the novel help us understand foreign countries and foreign cultures. The novel is a work that advocates cultural harmony. It presents Kashmir as a melting pot for all religious followers before it was intruded on by outsiders.

### **Commonalities and Specificities from International Relations Perspectives in Novels**

The three novels discussed above include various issues of International Relations theory. *For Whom the Bell Tolls* includes the International Relations issues related to the Spanish Civil War, and *The Honorary Consul* mentions the International Relations issues concerned with Latin America. In the same way, *Shalimar the Clown* incorporates International Relations issues associated with Kashmir. These novels are set in different periods and places, but they include some similarities as well as some specificities related to International Relations perspectives.

War is a major issue in all of these three novels. *For Whom the Bell Tolls* mentions the Spanish Civil War, and the war mentioned in *The Honorary Consul* is related to hijacking and counterattack for rescue. Similarly, *Shalimar the Clown* reports the terrorist attack on paradise-like Kashmir. Love and relationships are central to the major plot in these novels. In these narratives, the protagonists related to international affairs, are involved in love. Love is sideline diplomacy in these novels. In *For Whom the Bell Tolls* Jordan, an American dynamiter, joins in guerrilla warfare in Spain, and at the same time, maintains a passionate love affair with a Spanish girl, Maria. The love of a very short time becomes the source to recede the traumatic situation of Maria. In *The Honorary Consul*, the consul Charley Fortnum, one of the protagonists, falls in love with a prostitute, Clara. He marries her, and the marriage becomes the subject of talk in his society. But both of them are satisfied with the love affair because Fortnum is already sixty-one and he needs a woman to avoid loneliness in his old

age. The woman is only twenty years of age, but she also desires him for her social establishment and financial support to her parents in the country. Their love is a kind of compromised love. Dr. Eduardo Plarr, a Paraguayan-born Argentinian doctor, also involves in physical relationships with Clara. In *Shalimar the Clown* Max Ophuls, the American ambassador to India, makes married woman Boonyi his concubine and discards her after she gives birth to a child. His insincere love for Boonyi becomes the cause of his assassin at last.

The subject of power politics is inherent in all these three novels. The Civil War described in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is for power to rule the nation. To overthrow the ruling Republican government, the Nationalist group creates civil unrest with the assistance of external forces. In *The Honorary Consul*, the rebel group of Leon Rivas kidnaps the Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum for the American Ambassador to acquire power so that they plan to bargain for the release of their men in prison. Similarly, in *Shalimar the Clown* the situation in Kashmir worsens because of the clash of power politics between Muslim freedom fighters and the Indian government. In all these three novels the rebellious actions occur in certain national settings, but we can get active international involvement. In the Spanish Civil War described in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* there is the involvement of people of different European nations as well as of America; and the novel *The Honorary Consul* mentions the involvement of the people of Paraguay, Argentina, America, and Britain. Similarly, *Shalimar the Clown* includes the involvement of the people of India, Pakistan, and the USA. Cross-border activities have a great role in all these three novels. These novels, in general, include perspectives of Realist International theory, Idealist International theory, and Constructivist International theory.

Despite some of the commonalities, we also get some specificities in these novels when we interpret them from International Relations perspectives. The wartime love between Robert Jordan and Maria in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is very much pure and elated, but love between Dr. Plarr and Clara in *The Honorary Consul* is for physical and familial satisfaction,

and love of Max Ophuls to Boonyi in *Shalimar the Clown* is very much selfish and exploitative. The nature of war is also different in these novels. The war in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is the Civil war; the war in *The Honorary Consul* is related to kidnapping and counterattack on the kidnappers; and the war in *Shalimar the Clown* is of terrorist nature. In the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, the protagonist Robert Jordan voluntarily takes part in war with the hope of a better world and for the cause of democracy. He has the utopian concept of making the world better by supporting the Republicans in the Civil War. In the novel *The Honorary Consul*, the protagonist Leon Rivas envisions the utopian world and gets involved with a rebel group leaving the job of priesthood. But in the third novel, *Shalimar the Clown* the paradise-like utopian world changes into a dystopian world. The protagonist Shalimar the Clown changes into a serial killer. In the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* there is a clash of fascist and anti-fascist ideologies. The protagonist Jordan supports anti-fascist ideology and is involved in the clash for the hope of a better future. The civil war was really an outcome of a clash of ideologies. Similarly, the novel *The Honorary Consul* includes autocratic and anti-autocratic ideologies. The protagonist Leon Rivas sacrifices his life for the sake of progressive ideology, whereas, in the novel *Shalimar the Clown* we get a clash between Hindu and Muslim religions. The clash in *Shalimar the Clown* is religious, whereas the clashes in the other two novels are political. These three novels discuss diplomatic relations between different nations, but the novel *Shalimar the Clown* also discusses cultural diplomacy. It means that a diplomat should not behave ignoring the values and culture of the residing nations.

## CHAPTER VII

### CONCLUSION: INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN NARRATIVE WORKS

This research has analyzed the fictional works from the perspective of International Relations. Literary works are social constructions that are full of ideas. They cannot be taken only as aesthetic reservoirs because they also deal with different international issues. They cross national boundaries and deal with different international issues. So there is an inherent relationship between literature and International Relations.

Literature has a great impact on world politics, and it influences all cultures and nationalities. Power politics of the nation affects the relations between nations, and it can be a great subject for literary production. The literary works depict the creation and destruction of various civilizations. It shows the amicable and confronting relations of different nations. All these types of relations can also be the subjects of discussion in literature. Literature also deals with people-based relations between nations that also play a vital role in International Relations. Many of the literary productions can be approached from the perspectives of global affairs. Life and death are common subjects in literature as well as in International Relations. Literature does not only narrate personal stories, it also narrates the stories of local, national, and international relations. The fictional narratives help us know the events and trends on the international level. Issues like conflict, violence, war, friendship, enmity, power, democracy, diplomacy, tyranny, international law, civil unrest, and cross-border activities are related to different nations, and become the subjects of International Relations. They are also the issues that literary texts incorporate and explain as their subjects. This research identified that International Relations is not only the field of political science; literary works also narrate the issues and ideas of International Relations. So there is a close affinity between literature and politics. Literary artefacts are also useful variables for understanding the aspects of the theories of International Relations.

The research has answered three research questions: In what ways do issues and theories of International Relations contribute to the area of English studies in general and literary narratives in particular? How do literary narratives such as novels bolster the understanding and analysis of relations of different nation-states? To what extent do the issues and theories of International Relations influence the meaning of Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Greene's *The Honorary Consul*, and Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*? It was found that issues and theories of International Relations can contribute to the study of literary works like novels because they can be suitable tools for analyzing narrative texts. These International Relations theories provide analytical foundations that assist in explicating the political, social, and cultural contexts in which these narratives are situated. These theories have offered lenses through which power struggles, conflict, cooperation, hegemony, and diplomacy existing in the narrative texts have been explained in detail.

It was also found that literary works like novels significantly bolster the understanding and analysis of issues and ideas of International Relations. It was found that the narrative texts incorporate global issues, cultural dimensions, diplomacy, war and conflict, and trans-border activities that are pertinent to theories of International Relations like realism, idealism, and constructivism. Literature has an intrinsic relation with International Relations.

Similarly, it was also found that the three novels discussed include various issues and theories of International Relations. *For Whom the Bell Tolls* includes International Relations issues related to the Spanish Civil War, and *The Honorary Consul* mentions International Relations issues concerned with Latin America. In the same way, *Shalimar the Clown* incorporates International Relations issues associated with Kashmir. These novels are set in different periods and places, but they include some similarities as well as some specificities related to International Relations perspectives. These narrative texts can be studied by

applying the theories of International Relations like realism, idealism, and constructivism.

Literature has an intrinsic relation with International Relations. Though the world in literary text is fictional, it includes the ideologies, global issues, and inter-state issues that are discussed in the real world of international relations.

The use of international relations issues in literary works has been a phenomenon since ancient times. We get these issues mentioned in literary texts from the works of Homer to the writers of the present time. Since the ancient time, literary texts have included the issues and ideas of International Relations. Some of the literary texts have been great means to make the relations between nations amicable or envious. The research highlighted the importance of issues and theories of International Relations in the study of literature and applied them to study literary works like novels. This research took Realist International Relations theory, Idealist International Relations theory, and Constructivist International Relations theory as tools, and interpreted and analyzed the issues and ideas illustrated in the fictional variables *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul*, and *Shalimar the Clown*. It justified the relationships between literature and International Relations.

The research was library-based analytical research that took Hans H. Morgenthau's *Politics among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace*, E. H. Carr's *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, Woodrow Wilson's "War Message" and Nicholas Onuf's *Making Sense, Making World: Constructivism in Social Theory and International Relations* as primary theoretical texts for analyzing issues and ideas of International Relations theory. It consulted Paul Sheeran's *Literature and International Relations: Stories in the Art of Diplomacy* and Cynthia Weber's *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction* and other relevant texts to draw issues and theories to analyze the selected three primary fictional texts.

International Relations is concerned with states and their interaction with each other. It is an important subject in academia that has an interdisciplinary nature. It explains the conduct of a nation with other nations. Such conduct may be amicable or full of enmity. A state may behave with other states through foreign policy, diplomacy, or sometimes war. International Relations theory includes various issues like war and peace, conflict and cooperation, friendship, enmity, diplomacy, foreign policy, cross-border transactions, and operation of state and non-state institutes. It also includes strategic studies, great powers, the balance of powers, human rights, international society, violence, democracy, prosperity, treaties, civil-war, migration, refugees, climate change, organized crime, human security, and foreign intervention. These issues are included in different International Relations theories (ideas) like Realist International Relations theory, Idealist International Relations theory, Constructivist International Relations theory, Marxism, Globalization, Terrorism, Environmentalism, Historical Materialism, post-colonialism, Gender and Anarchism.

This research selected three of these theories for the study and analysis of the literary texts because these theories are the most prominent of all the theories. They are Realist International Relations theory, Idealist International Relations theory, and Constructivist International Relations theory. In orthodox International Relations study, these theories are solely analyzed to describe the relations between and among nations, but in this post-modern period, these theories have been rethought as tools to analyze the elements of International Relations in cultural artifacts like narrative/ fictional works. This research applied them as tools to analyze the novels: *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul*, and *Shalimar the Clown*.

Realist International relations theory argues that humanity is flawed, egoistic, and selfish. So War is a basic characteristic of humanity. This theory believes that states pursue power politics of national interest. There is the presence of struggle between nations for the

sake of power because self-interest, conflict, and violence always exist in society. It believes that the state is an autonomous body in world politics, and anarchy is prevalent in the world. It claims the anarchy myth, 'International anarchy is the permissive cause of war'. Fictional works also depict the war that crosses national borderlines. The struggle for power among nation-states is also an issue of literature. Selfish, flawed, and egoist humanity has been exposed in different literary works. The selfish behavior of the states and state rulers is also delineated in the literature.

Idealist International Relations theory believes in un-defective human nature. This concept wishes for the well-being of all people and the world. It is full of well-intentioned optimism which searches for harmony instead of enmity in all aspects of life. It envisions a utopian world. Desire for peace, harmony, freedom, democracy, liberty, and happiness are the essential trends of idealism. It believes in cooperation on a national as well as international level. The idealist myth is 'there is an international society' which can offer some hope that international anarchy can be overcome. It talks about the power that can be used positively for the common good. Many literary works also hate war and advocate for cooperative relationships between nations. Liberty, equality, and freedom are dealt within many literary works.

Constructivist International Relations theory is related to the idea that an individual's role is great in constructing ideas. The behavior of social actors is shaped by ideas, norms, and identities. Its basic premise is that human beings are the makers of the world we live in. Similarly, social and cultural settings are prominent initiations of the creation of ideas. The social world exists independently of the thoughts, beliefs, and ideas of the people. The relations between nations are also created by ideational factors that are created by actors in society. The Constructivist International Relations theory asserts that context plays a great role in reconstructing the world. It believes that there is no world government and

international politics is anarchic. The constructivist myth is, 'Anarchy is what states make of it'. Anarchy may create conflict between nations. A state behaves based on its core values. If a state shares its value with its neighbor, it pursues a peaceful and cooperative relationship. Literary works are also ideational and contextual. Context plays a great role in literature. As states shape ideas, literary works construct certain ideas that are related to International Relations. A literary work like a novel is also full of ideas about International Relations. The ideas prevalent in society may shape the literary works and the ideas expressed in the literary works may shape society.

The research has shown that the fictional works for the study -*For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul*, and *Shalimar the Clown*- include issues and ideas related to International Relations. Love and diplomacy are intermingling features in the field of International Relations. In all these three novels, activities related to love are linked with diplomatic figures. Maximilian Ophuls is an American diplomat to India in *Shalimar the Clown*, Charley Fortnum is a British honorary diplomat to Argentina in *The Honorary Consul*, in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* Robert Jordan, a dynamiter and professor from America, goes to Spain to help the Republican groups amidst the Civil War. He is to some extent an unacknowledged American diplomat to Spain. He falls in love with the Spanish girl Maria in a short period. His love is so romantic and desired by both of them. It makes Jordan integrated and Maria feels secure while being in love with him. Similarly, in the novel *Shalimar the Clown* the protagonist Maximillian Ophuls, an American diplomat to India, loves a married girl Boonyi. This love happens to be the source of tragedy in his family as well as in the family of Boonyi. In the next novel *The Honorary Consul* the consul Charley Fortnum, one of the protagonists, falls in love with a prostitute Clara. He marries her, and the marriage becomes the subject of talk in the society. But both of them are satisfied with the love affair because Fortnum is already sixty-one and he needs a woman to avoid loneliness in

his old age. The woman is only twenty years of age but she also desires him for her social establishment and economic help to her parents in the country. Their love is a kind of compromised one. In the novel next character Dr Plarr, a Paraguayan-born Argentinian Doctor, is involved in physical relationships with Charley Fortnum's wife Clara. These scenes in these novels justify that love and diplomacy go hand in hand, and love is an inherent element in matters of International Relations.

War is an important issue in International Relations. The myth of realist International Relations theory is that "international anarchy is the permissive cause of war." In *For Whom the Bell Tolls* war occurs because of the anarchical nature of the state. The cause of the Civil War is the conflict between two groups: the Republicans and the nationalists, and there is no other organization to stop them from conflict. The Spanish Civil War, an inherent subject of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* was a conflict for power between the Republicans and the Nationalists. It is an issue of Realist International Relations theory. The Civil War creates an anarchical situation that causes indiscriminating rapes, tortures, and killings. The supporters of one group torture and kill the people of the opponent group mercilessly. Great inhuman behavior creates the situation chaotic. The novel also exposes the clash of ideologies, an approach related to the Constructivist International Relations theory. It was the Civil War between international ideologies of two opposing sides: fascism and communism. Hemingway in the novel takes the side of republicanism. The novel is in favor of a republican alliance and claims that the alliance in international society is necessary for the success of the Republican side. Such international alliance is an issue related to Idealist International Relations theory which believes that "there is an international society." The novel reveals the utopian concept, a matter of international politics. The protagonist Jordan takes part in war for the cause of democracy and the betterment of humanity. The novel deals with home,

homelessness, and foreignness. The protagonist himself is homeless in a foreign nation. Class discrimination is a worldwide concept that has been explained in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*.

The cross-border activities of *The Honorary Consul* are related to international relations. The Paraguayan revolutionaries enter the territory of Argentina and mistakenly kidnap the Honorary Consul Charley Fortnum for the American Ambassador. The novel reveals the situation of anarchy that is related to the Realist International Relations theory. Paraguay rules despotically to its people and suppresses the revolutionary groups that raise their voices for democracy and freedom. He puts people who raise their voices for democracy in prison till they ruin their lives. There is no international organization to control the tyrannical activities of the government of General Stroessner. The novel also mentions diplomatic activities. The American Ambassador visits the ruins of Argentina. He is hosted at a diplomatic dinner by the Argentinian government, in which the Honorary Consul is invited as an English-speaking personality. The novel is a political novel that intermixes religion and politics which are trans-border issues. The Constructivist International Relations theory believes that ideas and ideologies are not stable. In the novel the US and Paraguay are presented ideologically differently. The US is a democratic nation, whereas Paraguay is a nation with tyrannical ruling. However, the US has amiable relations with Paraguay because Paraguay works according to the desire of the US. In the novel, Dr. Plarr has a sense of homelessness. He was born in Paraguay, now lives in Argentina, and keeps an English passport that he renews every ten years. According to the Realist International Relations theory, the state is self-interested and aggressive. Paraguay under the rule of General Stroessner is very aggressive towards the rebellious group. The state is creating anarchy. The concept of Idealistic International Relations theory is working in the novel. It presumes a utopian world and assumes cooperation between people of different nations. Leon Rivas

works selflessly for the sake of good for the people to make the nation Paraguay free from the hand of the cruel ruler General Stroessner.

*Shalimar the Clown* is set on three continents comprising India, Afghanistan, France, England, and the United States, and it exposes the customs, cultures, beliefs, and diplomacy of these countries. The novel is global in its scope. The novel presents the ancient world of Kashmir with wooden huts and tents and the first TV in town; the modern world of America with luxury apartments, Bentley, and TV studios; and the European war-torn world with the Nazi experiments and concentration camps. It describes the paradise-like Kashmir that has changed into dystopia. A peaceful place changes into a battleground after the encroachment of outsiders. The activities of the US diplomat Maximilian Ophuls are based on what we call the Realist International Relations theory, the myth of it is that 'international anarchy is the permissive cause of war.' Maximilian Ophuls creates trouble in India. He is the US representative in India and becomes the source of anarchy and unrest. The issue of Kashmir, a place once utopia changed into dystopia, is related to the Idealist International Relations theory. The novel uses the strategy of 'worlding' the conflict. It is the rewriting of the struggle of the Kashmiri people and their future hopes. The novel is remarkable in keeping the ingredients of cultural diplomacy to promote mutual relationships between nations and their people. It seeks international cooperation and friendship which are issues of the Idealistic International Relations theory. The diplomatic ideas exposed in the novel are very much relevant to the relations between India and other Western countries. The novel helps the readers construct certain ideas that a diplomat may deteriorate the situation that they are meant to smoothen if they behave unjustly and selfishly ignoring the values of the residing nations. This concept is related to the Constructivist International Relations theory. When a nation becomes the playground of many other nations, this condition does not only affect it,

its individuals are also severely affected. The novel provides a glimpse of an image of the Cold War world.

After discussing the selected novels from the perspectives of International Relations, it is concluded that *For Whom the Bell Tolls* predominantly includes the issues of Realist International Relations theory; and *The Honorary Consul* includes mainly the issues of Idealist International Relations; whereas *Shalimar the Clown* chiefly includes issues of Constructivist International Relations theory. To conclude, literary narratives represent historical-political issues of different times, so it is not appropriate to analyze them only from the perspective of aesthetics. They also include many issues and ideas of International Relations. War, peace, cooperation, enmity, ideologies, cultural diplomacy, utopian concepts, and cross-border activities are some of the important issues and ideas of the theories of International Relations.

After dealing with the detailed interpretation and analysis of the selected primary texts by applying the perspectives of major theories of International Relations, I have concluded that narrative works are veritable subjects to analyze International Relations issues and ideas. Literary works are social constructions that are full of ideas. They cannot be taken only as aesthetic reservoirs because they also deal with different international issues. They cross national boundaries and deal with different international issues. Literature has a great impact on world politics, and it influences all cultures and nationalities. The power politics of a nation affects the relations between nations, and it can be a great subject for literary production. The literary works depict the creation and destruction of various civilizations. They show the amicable and confronting relations of different nations.

### **Contribution to Knowledge**

This study makes a significant contribution to an interdisciplinary study as it has given a new interpretation of the selected primary texts within the context of new scholarship.

The research also shows the significance of literature in political science. As an interdisciplinary study, this research project draws knowledge from International Relations theory to analyze literary texts like novels. This study becomes significant in erasing a vast demarcation prevalent between literature and politics. The research contributes to establishing a nexus between literary works and International Relations theories. The research expands the scope of Political Literary Criticism. It makes the International Relations discipline more human-centered. Lastly, the research inspires further researchers to apply more International Relations theories to fictional works.

### **A Way Forward**

The three selected texts for this research are great works that can be studied from different perspectives of International Relations. Because of the study's limitations, this research has only explained and analyzed these works by applying three mainstream theories of International Relations: Realist International Relations theory, Idealist International Relations theory, and Constructivist International Relations theory. It searched out various issues and ideas of these theories in these selected narrative works. Since these narrative works are seminal works that include diverse thematic issues, they can be further studied by applying various other issues, ideas, and theories of International Relations. Some suitable topics for the further study of these novels from the perspectives of International Relations theories are:

- The Intersection of Local and Global Politics in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and *Shalimar the Clown*.
- International Relations and Fear, trauma, and politics of memory in *For Who the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul*, and *Shalimar the Clown*.
- The Geopolitical Backdrop of *For Who the Bell Tolls*, *The Honorary Consul*, and *Shalimar the Clown*.



### Works Cited

- Adams, Robyan, and Rossana Cox, editors. *Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Adamson, Judith. *Graham Greene: The Dangerous Edge Where Art and Politics Meet*. Palgrave Macmillan, 1990.
- Agnew, John. *Hegemony: The New Shape of Global Power*. Temple UP, 2005.
- Allen, Michael J. B. "The UnSpanish War in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Contemporary Literature*, vol. 13, no. 2, 1972, pp. 204-212. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/1207824](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1207824). Accessed 21 Aug. 2020.
- Alpert, Michael, editor. *A New International History of the Spanish Civil War*. Palgrave Macmillan, 1994.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. Verso, 1983.
- Ang, Ien, et al. "Cultural Diplomacy: Beyond the National Interest?" *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol. 21, no. 4. 2015, pp. 365-381, DOI:10.1080/10286632.2015.1042474. Accessed 21 Aug. 2023.
- Antunes, Sandrina, and Isabel Camisao. "Introducing Realism in International Theory." [https://www.e-ir.info/2018/02/27/introducing-realism-in-international-relations-theory/#google\\_vignette](https://www.e-ir.info/2018/02/27/introducing-realism-in-international-relations-theory/#google_vignette). 27 Feb. 2018. Accessed 21 Aug. 2021.
- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimension of Globalization*. U of Minnesota P, 1996.
- Baylis, John, et al., editors. *The Globalization of World Politics-An Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford UP, 2014.
- Beard, Charles A. *The Idea of National Interest: An Analytical Study in American Foreign Policy*. Macmillan, 1934.
- Bhabha, Homi K, editor. *Nation and Narration*. Routledge, 1990.

Bicker, Vivian. "What does the Bible Say about Climate Change?"

<https://www.Christianity.com/wiki/Christian-life/What-does-the-bible-say-about-climate-change.html>. Accessed 12 Feb. 2024.

Bisht, Medha. *Kautilya's Arthashastra: Philosophy of Strategy*. Routledge, 2020.

Bivona, Daniel. "Orientalism and Victorian Fiction." *Orientalism and Literature*, edited by Geoffrey P. Nash. Cambridge UP, 2019, pp. 101-

116. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108614672.006>.

Bleiker, Roland. "Forget IR Theory." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1997, pp. 57–85. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/40644880](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40644880). Accessed 30 Apr. 2020.

Bosco, Mark S. J. "From 'The Power and the Glory' to *The Honorary Consul*: The Development of Graham Greene's Catholic Imagination." *Religion & Literature*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2004, pp. 51–74. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/40059952](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40059952). Accessed 30 May 2023.

---. *Graham Greene's Catholic Imagination*. OxfordUP, 2005.

Boyers, Robert. *The Dictator's Dictation: The Politics of Novels and Novelists*. Columbia UP, 2005.

Bozeman, Adda Bruce. *Politics and Culture in International History*. Princeton UP, 1999.

Braden, Charles S. "The Novelist Discovers the Orient." *The Far Eastern Quarterly*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1948, pp. 165–175. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/2048860](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2048860). Accessed 25 Nov. 2018.

Brantlinger, Patrick. *Victorian Literature and Postcolonial Studies*. Edinburgh UP, 2009.

Brennan, Michael G. *Graham Greene: Fiction, Faith and Authorship*. Continuum, 2010.

- Brenner, Gerry. "Epic Machinery in Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 16, no. 4, 1970, pp. 491–504. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/26279232](http://www.jstor.org/stable/26279232). Accessed 16 Feb. 2023.
- Brincat, Shannon. "Reclaiming the Utopian Imaginary in IR Theory." *Review of International Studies*, vol. 35, no. 3, 2009, pp. 581–609. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20542805>. Accessed 6 Aug. 2021.
- Brown, Cris and Kristen Ainsley. *Understanding International Relations*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Brucker, Clemens. "Salman Rushdie and the 'Death' of Multiculturalism- A Close Reading of *The Satanic Verses* and *Shalimar the Clown*." [www.academia.edu/8473616](http://www.academia.edu/8473616). Accessed on 25 Dec. 2022.
- Burchill, Scott, et al. *Theories of International Relations*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Cahuasqui, Meagan. "Female Writers to Navigate Your Cultural Identity". *Cultural Colectiva*. [Com/books/books-by-female-writers-to-navigate-your-cultural-identity](http://Com/books/books-by-female-writers-to-navigate-your-cultural-identity).
- Carr, E. H. *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. Macmillan and Co., 1941.
- Carter, Natalie. "'Always Something of It Remains': Sexual Trauma in Ernest Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *War, Literature & the Arts*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2013, pp. 1- 40. Available from: [http://digitalcommons.butler.edu/facsch\\_papers/384](http://digitalcommons.butler.edu/facsch_papers/384). Accessed 6 Oct. 2018.
- Casanova, Julian. *The Spanish Republic and Civil War*. Cambridge UP, 2010.
- Chirot, Daniel, and Thomas D. Hall. "World-System Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 8, 1982, pp. 81–106. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2945989>. Accessed 19 Aug. 2024.

- Choudhuri, M. Sucheta. “‘Death was not The End’: Resentment History and Narrative In Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown*.”  
[https://otherness.dk/fileadmin/www.othernessandthearts.org /Publications/Journal: Otherness/Otherness Essays and Studies 2.1/5.Sucheta\\_Choudhuri.pdf](https://otherness.dk/fileadmin/www.othernessandthearts.org/Publications/Journal:Otherness/Otherness%20Essays%20and%20Studies%202.1/5.Sucheta_Choudhuri.pdf). Accessed 11 Apr. 2023.
- “Civil War”. *Black’s Law Dictionary*, edited by Brian A. Garner, 7<sup>th</sup> ed., West Group, 1999.
- Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War*. Oxford UP, 2007.
- Correa, Delia da Sausa and W. R. Owens. *The Handbook to Literary Research*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Routledge, 2010.
- Couto, Maria. *Graham Greene: On the Frontier Politics and Religions in the Novels*. Macmillan Press, 1988.
- Cox, M. with R. Campanaro. *Introduction to International Relations*. U of London, 2016.
- Craigwood, Jonna. “Sidney, Gentili and Poetics of Embassy.” *Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture*, edited by Robyan Adams and Rossana Cox, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Crawford, Robert M. A. *Idealism and Realism in International Relations: Beyond the Discipline*. Routledge, 2000.
- Darby, Philip. *The Fiction of Imperialism: Reading between International Relations and Post Colonialism*. Cassel, 1998.
- Devetak, Richard, et al., editors. *An Introduction to International Relations*. Cambridge UP, 2012.
- Doniger, Wendy. “War and Peace in the Bhagavad Gita.” [https://www.nybooks.com /articles/2014/12/04/war-and-peace-bhagavad-gita/](https://www.nybooks.com/articles/2014/12/04/war-and-peace-bhagavad-gita/) Accessed 23 Dec. 2023.
- Donnelly, Jack. *Realism and International Relations*. Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Eagleton, Robert and Martin McQuillan, editors. *Salman Rushdie: Contemporary Critical Perspectives*. Bloomsbury, 2013.

- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. Verso, 1991.
- Elman, Colin. "Realism." *International Relations Theory in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Martin Griffiths. Routledge, 2007.
- Engle, Karen. "Judging Sex in War." *Michigan Law Review*, vol. 106, no. 6, 2008, pp. 941–61. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40041601>. Accessed 22 Apr. 2023.
- Fernández-Kelly, Patricia. "On 'Shalimar the Clown.'" *Sociological Forum*, vol. 24, no. 2, 2009, pp. 471–74. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/40210417](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40210417). Accessed 21 May 2023.
- "Foreign Relations of Ashoka". [www.civildserviceindia.com/subject/History/prelims/Asoka-Foreign-Relations.html](http://www.civildserviceindia.com/subject/History/prelims/Asoka-Foreign-Relations.html)/ Accessed 12 Feb. 2024.
- Fukuyama, Francis. "The End of History?" *The National Interest*, no. 16, 1989, pp. 3–18. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/24027184](http://www.jstor.org/stable/24027184). Accessed 24 Feb 2024.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Basil Blackwell, 1983.
- Ghosh, Peu. *International Relations*. PHI Learning Private Limited, 2009.
- Ghosh, Soumya. "(Re)Narrating the History through Ambiguous Gender Discourse: A Study of Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*." *The Journal of English Language and Literature*, 16 Mar. 2016, [https://www.academia.edu/23316022/\\_Re\\_Narrating\\_the\\_History\\_through\\_Ambiguous\\_Gender\\_Discourse\\_A\\_Study\\_of\\_Salman\\_Rushdie\\_s\\_Shalarimar\\_the\\_Clow\\_n\\_email\\_work\\_card](https://www.academia.edu/23316022/_Re_Narrating_the_History_through_Ambiguous_Gender_Discourse_A_Study_of_Salman_Rushdie_s_Shalarimar_the_Clow_n_email_work_card)= title. Accessed 5 May 2023.
- Gordon, Haim. *Fighting Evil: Unsung Heroes in the Novels of Graham Greene*. Greenwood Press, 1997.
- Graham, Helen. *The Spanish Civil War: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford UP, 2005.
- Grant, Damian. *Salman Rushdie*. Northcote House Publishers Ltd., 2012.
- Greene, Graham. *The Honorary Consul*. Simon and Schuster, 1974.

Griffiths, Martin and Terry O' Callaghan, editors. *International Relations: The Key Concepts*. Routledge, 2002.

Groom, A. J. R., et al. *International Relations: Then and Now (Origins and Trends in Interpretation)*. Routledge, 2019.

Gupta, Madan Gopal. *International Relations since 1919: Part I (1919- 1945)*. Chaitanya Publishing House, 1957.

Guzzini, Stefano. *Power, Realism and Constructivism*. Routledge, 2013.

Hampton, Timothy. *Fictions of Embassy: Literature and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe*. Cornell UP, 2011.

Hemingway, Ernest Miller. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Oxford UP, 1996.

Hemingway, Sean, editor. *Hemingway on War*. Scribner, 2003.

Hendricks, Scotty. "Plato's *Republic* was a Totalitarian Nightmare, not a Utopia." *Big Think*, 19 Sep. 2022, <https://bigthink.com/the-future/platos-republic-dystopia/> Accessed 22 June 2023.

Hewson, Marc. "A Matter of Love or Death: Hemingway's Developing Psychosexuality in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2004, pp. 170–184. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/29533634](http://www.jstor.org/stable/29533634). Accessed 29 July 2020.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Andrews Crooke, 1651. Google Books, [https://books.googleusercontent.com/books/content?req=AKW5QaeWrex2lm2pmNwaj18Z7oTECVdH1JjGWY7XIsVmArXms8IQ53f3MWBwXm44\\_zFrrj6FHTvgRnu6AQoO\\_YnOJnJHqSGPP3KKswM8YHK17B3kV04iMDznl3uCGidq2IDKbeCj5hX8HZS7jcuMxULcIzshR\\_eNbjl9AbQjNLw4CUG2Vz75LEXWeC1bd7Zz9b4HTfJF\\_P2mcaVNIxY3b\\_WwfVu\\_FrJUFzjMvWFWnqVbqT651tabqKaQz6VFtrW7Um9Sq8hcPl6cL\\_Pa0JIh76Uc\\_i9XY1pDZdVGboUISmRiKZ6FsUos](https://books.googleusercontent.com/books/content?req=AKW5QaeWrex2lm2pmNwaj18Z7oTECVdH1JjGWY7XIsVmArXms8IQ53f3MWBwXm44_zFrrj6FHTvgRnu6AQoO_YnOJnJHqSGPP3KKswM8YHK17B3kV04iMDznl3uCGidq2IDKbeCj5hX8HZS7jcuMxULcIzshR_eNbjl9AbQjNLw4CUG2Vz75LEXWeC1bd7Zz9b4HTfJF_P2mcaVNIxY3b_WwfVu_FrJUFzjMvWFWnqVbqT651tabqKaQz6VFtrW7Um9Sq8hcPl6cL_Pa0JIh76Uc_i9XY1pDZdVGboUISmRiKZ6FsUos). Accessed 2 Sep. 2024.

- Horton, John and Andirrea T. Baumeister, editors. *Literature and Political Imagination*. Routledge, 1996.
- Hoskins, Robert. *Graham Greene: An Approach to Novels*. Garland Publishing Inc., 1999.
- Howe, Irving. *Politics and the Novel*. A Horizon Press Book, 1957.
- Huntington, Samuel. *Clash of Civilizations and the Remarks of the World Order*. Simon and Schuster, 1993.
- Hurd, Ian. "Construction". *Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, edited by Christian Reus-Smit, Oxford UP, 2008.
- Jackson, Michael, and Thomas Moore. "Machiavelli's walls: The legacy of realism in international relations theory." *International Politics*, vol. 53, no. 4, 2016, pp. 447-463. 10.1057/ip.2016.9. www.Researchgate.net./304749985. Accessed 22 Sep. 2020.
- Jackson, Robert and George Sorenson. *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*. Oxford UP, 2013.
- Jahn, Beate, editor. *Classical Theory of International Relations*. Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Jameson, Frederick. "Third World Literature and National Allegory". *Social Text*, vol.15, 1986, pp. 69-88.
- Jesse. "Review of the Honorary Consul". *Speculiction*. <https://speculiction.blogspot.com/2014/05/review-of-honorary-consul-by-graham.html>. Accessed 30 Oct. 2023.
- Johnson, Joel A. *Beyond Practical Virtue: A Defense of Liberal Democracy Through Literature*. U of Missouri P, 2007.
- Jones, R. J. Barry, et al. *Introduction to International Relations: Problems and Perspectives*. Manchester UP, 2001.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophic Essay*. Translated by Benjamin F. Trueblood. The American Peace Society, 1897.

Kauppi, Mark V. and Paul R. Viotti. *International Relations Theory*. Rowman and Littlefield, 2020.

Klein, Julie Thompson. *Interdisciplinarity. History, Theory and Practice*. Wayne State UP, 1990.

Knutsen, Torbjorn L. *A History of International Relations Theory: An Introduction*. Manchester UP, 1992.

Krishnamurth, Sailaja, and Sailaja Krishnamurti. "Reading Between the Lines: Geography and Hybridity in Rudyard Kipling's Kim." *Victorian Review*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2002, pp. 47–65. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/27793482](http://www.jstor.org/stable/27793482). Accessed 28 July 2020.

Krug, Matthias. "International Creation: Examining Cross-Cultural Influences in Ernest Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2013, pp. 261–288. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/intelitestud.15.2.0261](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/intelitestud.15.2.0261). Accessed 29 July 2020.

Kulshrestha, J. P. *Graham Greene: The Novelist*. Macmillan India Limited, 1977.

Lambert, Peter and Andrew Nickson, editors. *The Transition to Democracy in Paraguay*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, 1997.

Lannon, Francis. *The Spanish Civil War 1936-1939*. Osprey Publishing Limited, 2002.

Leung, Janice. "Machiavelli and International Relations Theory". <https://gjis.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/gjis/article/view/35136/3188>. Accessed 17 July 2021.

Liao, Pei-Chen. *Post-0/11 South Asian Diaspora Fiction: Uncanny Terror*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Little, Richard and Steve Smith, editors. *Belief System and International Relations*. Basil Blackwell, 1988.

Machiavelli, Nicollo. *The Prince*. Hackett Publishing Company Inc., 2008.

- Macmillan, John. "Liberal Internationalism." *International Relations Theory in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Martin Griffiths, Routledge, 2007.
- Malamet, Elliott. "'Art in a Police Station': Detection, Fatherhood, and Textual Influence in Greene's *The Honorary Consul*." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 34, no. 1, 1992, pp. 106–28. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40754971>. Accessed 31 May 2023.
- Manuel, Frank M. and Fritzie P. Manuel. *Utopian Thought in the Western World*. The Belknap Press, 1979.
- Mate, Bhushan. "Kautilya (Chanakya) in India's Foreign Policy." <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/readersblog/spark/kautilya-chanakya-in-indias-foreign-policy-34133/> Accessed 12 Dec. 2023.
- May, Larry. *War Crimes and Just War*. Cambridge UP, 2007.
- McEwan, Neil. *Modern Novelists: Graham Greene*. St. Martin's Press, 1988.
- Meyers, Jeffrey, editor. *Ernest Hemingway: A Critical Heritage*. Taylor and Francis. e-library, 2005.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. UBS Publishers' Distributors Pvt. Ltd., 2005.
- Mingst, Karen A., et al. *Essentials of International Relations*. 8<sup>th</sup> ed., W. W. Norton and Company, 2019.
- Mitchel, T. M. *International Cultural relations*. Alan and Unwin, 1986.
- Mohan, C. Rajan. "Strategic communities can learn from all traditions of statecraft. Jai Shankar's book is a call to fill Indian deficit." *The Indian Express*. <https://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/india-foreign-policy-china-border-row-ladakh-conflict-s-jaishankar-mea-6587070/> Accessed 8 Sep. 2020.
- Moon, Katharine H. S. "Homer's 'Iliad' and Modern IR." *Polity*, vol. 46, no. 1, 2014, pp.143–49. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24540238>. Accessed 9 July 2024.

- Moran, Joe. *Interdisciplinarity*. Routledge, 2002.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace*. A. A. Knopf, 1948.
- Moynihan, William T. "The Martyrdom of Robert Jordan." *College English*, vol. 21, no. 3, 1959, pp. 127–32. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/372836>. Accessed 16 Feb. 2023.
- Muller, H. Gilbert. *Hemingway and the Spanish Civil War: The Distance Sound of Battle*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
- Nash, Geoffrey P., editor. *Orientalism and Literature*. Cambridge UP, 2019.
- O'Conner, Maurice. "A Paradise Lost: Kashmir as a Motif of Rift in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*." *India in the World*, edited by Christina M. Gamez-Ferdinandez and Antonia Navarro-Tejero, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011. pp. 211-22. Accessed 17 Feb. 2023.
- Oliver, Charles M. *Critical Companion to Ernest Hemingway: A Literary Reference to His Life and Work*. Facts on File, Inc., 2007.
- Onuf, Nicholas Greenwood. *Making Sense, Making Worlds: Constructivism in Social Theory and International Relations*. Routledge, 2013.
- . *World of Our Making*. Routledge, 1989.
- Palmer, Norman D. and Howard C. Perkins. *International Relations in Transition*. AITBS Publishers, 2010.
- Payne, Stanley G. *The Spanish Civil War, the Soviet Union, and Communism*. Yale UP, 2004.
- Peterson, Peter and Paul Simpson-Housley. *Writing the City*. Routledge, 1994.
- Pitkin, Annabella. "Salman Rushdie Loses His Cheerfulness: Geopolitics, Terrorism and Adultery." *Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 61, no. 1, 2007, pp. 257–62. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24358092>. Accessed 11 May 2023.
- Plato. *Phaedo*. Translated by David Gallop, Oxford UP, 1975.

Poplawski, Paul, editor. *English Literature in Context*. Cambridge UP, 2008.

Putman, Thomas. "Hemingway on War and Its Aftermath".

<https://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/2006/spring/hemingway.html>.

Accessed 2 July 2022.

Quinn, Edward. *History in Literature*. Facts on File Inc., 2004.

Rao, B.V., *World History: From Early Time to A. D. 2000*. Sterling Publishers Private Limited, 2007.

Reeves, Julie, editor. *Culture and International Relations: Narratives, Natives and Tourists*. Routledge, 2004.

Roston, Murray. *Graham Greene's Narrative Strategies: A Study of the Major Novels*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Rushdie, Salman. *Shalimar the Clown*. Vintage Books, 2006.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. Vintage, 1978.

---. *Culture and Imperialism*. Knops, 1993.

Sanders, David. "Ernest Hemingway's Spanish Civil War Experience." *American Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 2, 1960, pp. 133–143. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/2710752](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2710752). Accessed 19 Oct. 2020.

Sarkar, Sreyoshi. "Shalimar the Clown and the Politics of 'Worlding' the Kashmir Conflict". *Open Edition Journals*. <https://journals.openedition.org/ces/4731>. pp 23-33. Accessed 23 Nov. 2022.

Satapathy, Bishnu. "Approaches to International Relations." *International Relations*, edited by Tapan Biswal, Macmillan, 2009, pp.1-42.

Sayamov, Yury. "The Philosophy of International Relations."

[http://eruditio.worldacademy.org/files/vol2 issue6/reprints](http://eruditio.worldacademy.org/files/vol2%20issue6/reprints). September, 2020, pp. 31-36. Accessed 22 July, 2021.

Scheingold, Stuart. *The Political Novel: Re-Imagining the Twentieth Century*. Continuum, 2010.

Schneider, Cynthia P. "Cultural Diplomacy: Hard to Define, but You'd Know It If You Saw It." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2006, pp. 191–203. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/24590653](http://www.jstor.org/stable/24590653). Accessed 30 Apr. 2020.

Shakespeare, William. *King Henry V*. Edited by JohnDover Wilson, Cambridge UP, 1968.

Sharp, Joanne P. "Locating Imaginary Homelands: Literature, Geography, and Salman Rushdie." *GeoJournal*, vol. 38, no. 1, 1996, pp. 119–27. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41146709>. Accessed 5 Nov. 2023.

Sheeran, Paul. *Literature and International Relations: Stories in the Art of Diplomacy*. Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007.

Shimko, Keith L. *International Relations: Perspectives, Controversies and Readings*. Wadsworth, 2010.

Shivani, Anis, and Salman Rushdie. "'Look at the World as It Is': An Interview with Sir Salman Rushdie." *The Georgia Review*, vol. 66, no. 2, 2012, pp. 222–50. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23268124>. Accessed 21 May 2023.

Siddiqui, Yuma. "Power Smashes into Private Lives: Violence, Globalization and Cosmopolitanism in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*." *South Asia Research*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 293-309. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/026272800702700303>. Accessd 8 Jan, 2023.

Sinclair, Gail D. "Female Foundations and 'The Undiscovered Country' in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Hemingway and Women Voice*, edited by Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, The U of Alabama P, 2002.

Sing, Asit Kumar. *International Relations since World War I*. S. Chand, 1967.

- Singh, Megha. "A Portrayal of Nationalism in Rabindranath Tagore's Gora." *Journal of Ravishankar University (Part-A: SOCIAL-SCIENCE)*, vol. 27, no.1, 2021, pp. 70-72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52228/JRUA.2021-27-1-9>. Accessed 20 June 2022.
- Singh, Rajni, et al. "(Re) Narrating the History through Ambiguous Gender Discourse: A Study of Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*." *English Language and Literature*, vol. 61, no. 3, 2015, pp. 501-518. Academia. edu/23316022. Accessed 25 Dec. 2022.
- Slatoff, Walter J. "The 'Great Sin' in 'For Whom the Bell Tolls.'" *The Journal of Narrative Technique*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1977, pp. 142-48. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/30225612](http://www.jstor.org/stable/30225612). Accessed 22 Feb. 2024.
- Smit, Cristian Reus and Duncan Snidal, editors. *Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford UP, 2008.
- Sowerby, Tracy A. and Joanna Craigwood, editors. *Cultures of Diplomacy and Literary Writing in Early Modern World*. Oxford UP, 2019.
- Stears, Jill, et al., editors. *In Introduction to International Theory: Perspectives and Themes*. Pearson International Limited, 2010.
- Stoltzfus, Ben. "Hemingway, Malraux and Spain: *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and *L'espoir*." *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. 36, no. 3, 1999, pp. 179-194. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/40247180](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40247180). Accessed 6 Oct. 2018.
- Sutch, Peter and Juanita Elias. *International Relations: The Basics*. Routledge, 2007.
- Swan John C. "'The Satanic Verses,' the 'Fatwa,' and Its Aftermath: A Review Article." *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, vol. 61, no. 4, 1991, pp. 429-43. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4308642>. Accessed 9 Nov. 2022.
- Sinyard, Neil. *Graham Greene: A Literary Life*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Teverson, Andrew. *Salman Rushdie*. Viva Books, 2010.

- Teunissen, John J. "For Whom the Bell Tolls as Mythic Narrative." [https://dalspace.library.dal.ca/bitstream/handle/10222/63931/dalrev\\_vol156-iss1\\_pp52\\_69pdf? Sequence=1 &is Allowed=1=y](https://dalspace.library.dal.ca/bitstream/handle/10222/63931/dalrev_vol156-iss1_pp52_69pdf?Sequence=1&isAllowed=1=y). Accessed 22 Apr. 2023.
- Thompson, Bob. *Story of His Life: Salman Rushdie, Living and Writing on an Epic Scale*. Sep. 26, 2005. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/2005/09/26/story-of-his-life/a9b2aa39-c411-42d1-a265-c3e193555086/> Accessed 25 Oct. 2024.
- Tom, A. Pete and Robert F. Gorman. *International Relations: Understanding Global Issues*. Brooke/ Cole Publishing, 1991.
- Turnbull Patrick. *The Spanish Civil War 1936-39*. Reed International Books Ltd, 1978.
- Valverde, Beatriz. "The Search for Utopia and its Consequences: Political Commitment in Historia de Mayta by Mario Vargas Llosa and *The Honorary Consul* by Graham Greene." *Interlitteraria*, vol.18, no.1, 2013, pp. 124-138.  
<https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=95400>. DOI:  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.12697/IL.2013.18.1.09>. Accessed 24 Feb. 2024.
- Vanouse, Donald. "Mourning and Melancholia in Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." <http://www.clas.ufl.edu/ipasa/2005/proc/vanouse.pdf>. Accessed 4 Oct. 2018.
- Vernon, Alex. *Hemingway's Second War: Being Witness to the Spanish Civil War*. U of Iowa P, 2011.
- Wagner, Linda Welshimer. "The Marinating of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Journal of Modern Literature*,3 vol. 2, no. 4, 1972, pp. 533–46. *JSTOR*,  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30053207>. Accessed 22 Apr. 2023.
- Wagner Martin, Linda, editor. *A Historical Guide to Ernest Hemingway*. Oxford UP, 2000.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. *Man, State and War*. Columbia UP, 1959.
- . *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1979.
- Weber, Cynthia. *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge, 2014.

- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society*. U of California, 1978.
- Welch, David A. "Tolstoy the International Relations Theorist". *Tolstoy On War: Narrative Art and Historical Truth in War and Peace*, edited by Rick McPeak and Donna Tussing Orwin, Cornell U P, 2012, pp. 175-189.  
<https://doi.org/10.7591/9780801465895-015>. Accessed 21 Feb. 2024.
- Wendt, Alexander. "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization*, vol. 46, no. 2, 1992, pp. 391–425. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/2706858](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2706858). Accessed 3 Oct. 2018.
- . *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge UP, 1999.
- Wilkinson, Paul. *International Relations: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford UP, 2007.
- Willard, Andrew R. "World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations by Nicholas Greenwood Onuf." *Political Psychology*, vol. 13, no. 1, 1992, pp. 145–150. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/3791430](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3791430). Accessed 15 May 2020.
- Williams, Andrew. *Liberalism and War: The Victors and the Vanquished*. Routledge, 2006.
- Williams, Michael C. "Hobbes and International Relations: A Reconsideration." *International Organization*, vol. 50, no. 2, 1996, pp. 213–236. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/2704077](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2704077). Accessed 21 July 2021.
- . *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations*. Cambridge UP, 2005
- Williams, Patrick, and Laura Chrisman, editors. *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Harvest Wheat Sheaf, 1994.
- Wilson, Woodrow. "'War Message' Delivered to Congress, April 2, 1917".  
<https://www.usmcu.edu/Portals/218/War%20Message%2C%20Woodrow%20Wilson.pdf>. Accessed 3 Sep. 2024.

Zehfus, Maja. *Constructivism in International Relations: The Politics of Reality*. Cambridge UP, 2002.

Zuo, Y. "Analysis of the Themes and Artistic Features of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Advances in Literary Study*, vol. 3, pp. 49-51. DOI:10.4236/als.2015.32008. Accessed 5 Oct. 2018.