

I. Communalism as Local and Global Tension

Salman Rushdie is undoubtedly one of the most widely read and praised writers in English in India, during the post-colonial era. He, once a victim of religious intolerance, depicts a world rich in violence and murder born of communal and religious hatred. Rushdie's latest venture *Shalimar the Clown* published in 2005 is a lavish portrayal of how communal issue can destroy peace and fraternity of a harmonious society into bloodbath.

Communalism means allegiance to a certain ethnic or religious group. *Oxford English Dictionary* defines the term as, "A greater loyalty to an ethnic or religious group than to society in general." This concept of inclination and nepotism towards a group of person has been the chief cause of increasing enmity between the people of two different communities, resulting in communal riots and violence. People of the South East Asian nations are the greatest sufferer of this evil practice. Especially, in India this trend has claimed thousands of lives, since ages and damaged property worth millions.

Storyline of *Shalimar, the Clown* follows the similar line of communal issues and its aftermath, from local to global scenario. The plot of the story is set in various parts of world, starting from a small village in Kashmir. It takes avenge as the central issues, which is rooted in communal hatred, that grows from an individual's level. The story does follow a consistent line of growth, rather moves to and fro with many sub-issues related to the communalism. M. Madhusudan Rao, one of the contemporary critics of Rushdie commenting on his style and rhetoric in *Shalimar the Clown* opines:

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

Panchatantra. (31)

The rhetoric of the novel covers larger features of South Asian nationalities reviving the ways of story telling like that of the ancient Hindu epics.

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

Rushdie is a British novelist of Indian descent. He was born on August 14, 1947 on the Independence Day of India. His second book, *Midnight's Children* (1981), won Britain's prestigious Booker Prize and in 1993. In 2008 *Midnight's Children* was adjudged the best book to have won the Booker Prize in the previous 25 years.

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

The novel follows a simple storyline, which develops from a small village in Kashmir, where a society of various cast and religion live in peace; however, until the devilish issue of communalism penetrates. Hindus and Muslims were living in mutual understanding sharing religious tolerance towards each other in Kashmir, one of the most disputed zone of South Asia. Shalimar – a young Muslim boy falls in love with Boonyi a fellow Muslim girl. Their parents, with initial tiffs and bits are ready for their union.

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

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

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

The storyline of the novel moves to and fro, from the eastern part of the world to Europe, and to the U.S., from the communal to global issue. At the same time the novel paints a picture of turmoil present in the world. In fact, the reality is no part of the world today is free from disturbances of one or other nature.

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

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

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

The general belief of the west is that that the Muslim is a barbaric, uncivilized with a will to harm the west are amongst the root causes of growing terrorism in the west world. To the west, Islam is an intolerant, warlike religion may or may not be true, but given the prevalence of bloody borders Islam has with the rest; it is not unfair to take the charge as unfounded one.

Rushdie, though Muslim by birth, stands apart as a vehement critic of the fundamentalism reportedly associated with Islam and so much objected to by the west. In *Shalimar the Clown* Rushdie once again turns to Islam and its fabled bigotry as exemplified in the character of Shalimar Noman who knives Maximilian Ophuls, former American ambassador to India and now the head of US antiterrorist department. The clown who used to entertain people is forced to commit the crime murder not at all on political or religious grounds but totally on very personal and emotional reasons that is the great lover and enticer of woman had charmed and destroyed Boonyi, the clown's beloved.

Thus, portraying the act that the murder was prompted more by the seductive activities by American ambassador rather than by the willful murderous instinct of the clown, Rushdie is making a far-reaching political suggestion. He particularly deals in against the will of the Americans, who are interested to play with the destiny and sentiment of the eastern people responsible in many instances in bringing about conflicts between the west and the east.

Rushdie's next novel, *Shame* (1983) is a savagely controlled satire of Pakistan's political life that targets especially Pakistani leaders Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and General Muhammad Zia ul-Haq. The close rivalry between their fictional counterparts dominates the plot. This pattern of disguising one character as another for purposes of satire recurs in *The Satanic Verses*, in which two Indian actors living in London assume the appearances – though not the personalities – of the archangel Gibreel (Gabriel) and the ex-archangel Satan.

The main butt of the satire in *The Satanic Verses* is Britain's treatment of its ethnic minorities. Alternating sections of the book, however, recount the dreams the actor Gibreel has while playing the archangel: He witnesses the birth of Islam and relays

Allah's answers to Muhammad's questions – answers that cumulatively will become the Qur'an. The novel's title refers to a legendary episode in the life of Muhammad in which Satan substituted his own voice and message for Allah's. But Rushdie's Gibreel asserts that, since Allah is seldom around, he (Gibreel) receives both the questions and – telepathically – the answers from Muhammad and then transmits the latter back as though they came from Allah.

The author's implication that our reception of a divine message is subject to interference because of human fallibility – that is, we hear what we want to hear would offend any fundamentalist. Even more offensive to most Muslims is the novel's description of a brothel where business doubles after the prostitutes take the names of Muhammad's 12 wives. Devout Muslims took this as a grievous and gratuitous insult to Muhammad and his wives. As a result of demonstrations, India, Pakistan, South Africa, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia banned the work, and in 1989 Iran's Ayatollah Khomeini, without having read the book, issued a fatwa against Rushdie.

Although Rushdie offered an apology and a formal statement of his adherence to Islam, the fatwa was not lifted, and he remained in hiding until late 1991, when he began to make isolated and unscheduled appearances and to allow a few interviews. In 1995, despite the continuance of the death threat, Rushdie began making television appearances, granting more frequent interviews, and giving public readings of his works. The Iranian government made a statement in 1998 lifting the death threat, although the fatwa cannot be lifted completely because, according to Islamic law, only the person who issued it can lift it as Ayatollah Khomeini had died shortly after he pronounced Rushdie's death sentence.

Pronouncement of fatwa by the Islamist orthodox leaders brought both hope and challenge to Rushdie. He went underground after the fatwa, however, continued to write.

His novels after *Midnight's Children* were awaited anxiously all over the world, and Rushdie did not disappoint his readers. Through his writings, he challenged the radical forces of Islamists. He disagrees with any such reclusive theories of which the very title speaks of the quality life and ethics. In fact, it is obvious from his writings, that he took the decree as a humor as no place in the world is safe. Commenting on the modern insecurity, Rushdie writes:

We live in a world without hiding places, the missiles have made sure of that. However much we may wish to return to the womb, we cannot be unborn. So we are left with a fairly straightforward choice. Either we agree to delude ourselves, to lose ourselves in the fantasy of the great fish, for which a second metaphor is that of Pan gloss's garden; or we can do what all human beings do instinctively when they realize that the womb has been lost for ever-that is, we can make the very devil of a racket where Orwell wished quietism, let there be Rowdyism. (99)

Therefore, it is not surprising to find politics almost always drawn into Rushdie's literature. This said it is also important to note that in "In Good Faith", another essay from the same collection, Rushdie speaks of the novelist's right to write as he pleases: "A book is a version of the world. If you do not like it, ignore it; or offer your own version" (412).

There is a connection between the many antics Rushdie exhibits as regards his relationship with Islam, politics, and the west. Besides being a phenomenally gifted writer of fiction and criticism, Rushdie is also a political novelist, an early veteran of the current clash between Islam and the west. His special relation with Islam, the east and his residence in the western metropolis, has made him a public figure that is constantly sought after by the media to comment on the political development or the so-called

terrorist crises. On a more artistic plane too, he is asked to comment on the elusive connections between the art of the novel and the art of the orator or demagogue, and the rhetoric of the western power houses.

It seems that Rushdie really believes novels have a social responsibility that they make many things happen. But he has to appear to be convinced of the distance between the art world and the real world, if only for the sake of his own freedom. Otherwise, the intolerant forces and fundamentalist elements would take issues claiming his novels have blasphemed their faith. But this dual instance has created confusion both for his admirers and his detractors. His defensiveness of art as a free domain is a symptom of a confusion that mars his reputation as a critical writer and thinker.

Regardless of the proliferation of news reports, or even because of it, the novel has a role to play in enlarging our awareness of suffering and its causes. Specially, in providing a counterbalancing account of the activities of the political structures, Rushdie literature has a commendable status. Descriptions of violence and atrocity are one of Rushdie's strengths as a novelist. Few people in the west understood what Indira Gandhi's state of emergency was like until Rushdie brought it to life in *Midnight's Children* (1981); and in *Shame* (1983).

There were even few people in the west, who knew why exactly emergency rule was imposed in India by then premier Indira Gandhi until it came into life in the form of *Midnight's Children*. It was only in September 11, 2001, when few terrorist hijacked four Boeing Planes that hit the twin towers in New York and the Pentagon – the Defense Ministry the west awoke to the sentimentalism of the so-called terrorist. The killings of almost four thousand people in the world's worst terrorist attack divided the timeframe of the world as Pre 9/11 and Post 9/11.

Since, then the world has never been the same. The communal issues like that of the Indian subcontinent have reached as far as the so-called developed nations, and even beyond. Hamid Mohsin in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* narrates the woes of a young Pakistani, who was educated in the United States as, "Being an Islam, that too bearded was the emblem of a certain terrorist in the western world" (32).

Thus, communalism which was once a communal issue has become a global issue. It has broken the barrier of mere religion and local politics but has gained an international status. Unfortunately, today no nations from the Latin America to Central and America, from Europe to Africa and Asia are free of communal issues and its impact on their people and community. In the postmodern scenario communal issues has crossed the frontiers of the nations and has become international. Madhusudan Rao in the context writes:

The focus of this novel is extremism. It tells the tale of two Kashmiri villages whose inhabitants gradually get caught up in communal violence. As we know from Yugoslavia, hatred takes on especially horrific manifestations when neighbors turn against each other. Their passion of hatred originates from a marriage solemnized by both Hindu and Muslim rites and reaches as far as Europe and America. (910)

The global scenario of breath taking pace of development has affected all the sectors of social life of a small remote village to international forum. So, is terrorism in the present context has crossed the barriers of all mere India or Pakistan to Europe and the United States of America.

In Europe the Great Britain has witnessed decade's long terrorism problem, in context to the violence lead by Ireland Republic Army (IRA) in demand for independent Ireland. This movement now, seems to have dozed off, after the then premier Tony Blair

in 1998 signed in proclamation signing, Ireland as an Autonomous State. However, due to bias policy on its minority groups, especially Muslims there have been rise in the violence, proof; the infamous bombings of railway networks in London on July 2007. It is needless to site once again the infamous September 11 bombings in the United States of America.

Communal issues, let it be for the sake of religion, or for rights have gone international. They are no more confined within the states of India and Pakistan, or South East Asian nations, which were previously claimed to have been. It has, or is fast in the process of being an international headache of the so-called western nations, who claim themselves as the watchdogs of international scenario and human rights. *Shalimar the Clown* is only an example out of hundreds of cases, where local issues are responsible for communal violence.

As such, the present research work will focus on terrorism as a global issue, followed by communal issue as a local, as well as global issue. In doing so, it will not cross the frontier of the text, but will go as far as the U.S. and Europe and again back to India and Kashmir.

II. Terrorism: Local to Global Scenario

Violence or the threat of violence, especially bombing, kidnapping, and assassination carried out for political purposes is terrorism. It is an act forced upon through the use of power upon innocent people, who, practically has nothing to do with the inhumane act. According to Daniel Benjamin terrorism was "first used in France to describe a new system of government adopted during the French Revolution" (123). Benjamin further writes that in those days terrorism meant 'Reign of Terror.' However, this reign of terror was intended to promote democracy and popular rule by ridding the revolution of its enemies and thereby purifying it. However, the oppression and violent excesses of the terror transformed it into a feared instrument of the state. From that time on, terrorism has had a decidedly negative connotation.

The word, however, did not gain wider popularity until the late 19th century when it was adopted by a group of Russian revolutionaries to describe their violent struggle against Tsarist Rule. Terrorism then assumed the more familiar antigovernment associations, almost similar to that of today. Terrorism then became the deliberate creation of the terrorists for exploitation of fear for bringing about political change.

All terrorist acts involve violence or equally important the threat of violence. These violent acts are committed by nongovernmental groups or individuals, i.e. by those who are neither part of nor officially serving in the military forces, law enforcement agencies, intelligence services, or other governmental agencies of an established nation-state.

Terrorists attempt not only to sow panic but also to undermine confidence in the government and political leadership of their target country. Terrorism is therefore designed to have psychological effects that reach far beyond its impact on the immediate victims or object of an attack. Terrorists mean to frighten and thereby intimidate a wider

audience, such as a rival ethnic or religious group, an entire country and its political leadership, or the international community as a whole.

Terrorist groups generally have few members, limited firepower, and comparatively few organizational resources. For this reason they rely on dramatic, often spectacular, bloody and destructive acts of hit-and-run violence to attract attention to themselves and their cause. Through the publicity generated by their violence, terrorists seek to obtain the leverage, influence, and power they otherwise lack.

Terrorism is by nature political because it involves the acquisition and use of power for the purpose of forcing others to submit, or agree, to terrorist demands. A terrorist attack, by generating publicity and focusing attention on the organization behind the attack, is designed to create this power. It also fosters an environment of fear and intimidation that the terrorists can manipulate. As a result terrorism's success is best measured by its ability to attract attention to the terrorists and their cause and by the psychological impact it exerts over a nation and its citizenry. It differs in this respect from conventional warfare, where success is measured by the amount of military assets destroyed, the amount of territory seized, and the number of enemy dead.

Terrorists typically attempt to justify their use of violence by arguing that they have been excluded from, or frustrated by, the accepted processes of bringing about political change. Commenting on this issue Bruce Fuller writes:

They maintain that terrorism is the only option available to them, although their choice is a reluctant – even a regrettable one. Whether someone agrees with this argument or not often depends on whether the person sympathizes with the terrorists' cause or with the victims of the terrorist attack. The aphorism "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom

fighter” underscores how use of the label terrorism can be highly subjective depending upon one’s sympathies. (130)

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

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

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

In broader terms the causes that have commonly compelled people to engage in terrorism are grievances borne of political oppression, cultural domination, economic exploitation, ethnic discrimination, and religious persecution. Perceived inequities in the

distribution of wealth and political power have led some terrorists to attempt to overthrow democratically elected governments. To achieve a fairer society, they would replace these governments with socialist or communist regimes.

Radical environmentalists have sabotaged logging operations and the construction of power grids to protest the spoiling of natural wilderness areas. Extremists who oppose legalized abortion in the United States have attacked clinics and murdered doctors and other employees in hopes of denying women the right to abortion.

National governments have at times aided terrorists to further their own foreign policy goals. So-called state-sponsored terrorism, however, falls into a different category altogether. State-sponsored terrorism is a form of covert warfare, a means to wage war secretly through the use of terrorist surrogates as hired guns. The U.S. Department of State designates countries as state sponsors of terrorism if they actively assist or aid terrorists, and also if they harbor past terrorists or refuse to renounce terrorism as an instrument of policy. State sponsorship has proven invaluable to some terrorist organizations by supplying arms, money, and a safe haven, among other things taking these organizations to the global scenario. Bruce Hoffman commenting on state sponsorship terrorism writes:

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

Finally, governments have paid terrorists handsomely for their services. They thereby turn weak and financially impoverished groups into formidable, well-endowed

terrorist organizations with an ability to attract recruits and sustain their struggle.

Today, most people are of the opinion that it is the U.S. which is giving birth to terrorism around the world. Let be it be the present deteriorating situation in Afghanistan and Iraq and in various parts of the world, the role of U. S. has always been dual and doubtful. Further more, the U. S. also has listed seven nations responsible for spreading State Sponsored Terrorism around the world. According to Hoffman:

The U.S. Department of State has designated seven countries as state sponsors of terrorism: Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Cuba, North Korea, and Sudan. In the year 2000, it named Iran as the most active supporter of terrorism for aid to groups such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and Palestine Islamic Jihad. Although the former Taliban government in Afghanistan sponsored al-Qaeda, the radical group led by Saudi exile Osama bin Laden, the United States did not recognize the Taliban as a legitimate government and thus did not list it as a state sponsor of terrorism. (72)

The listing of the seven nations as terrorism sponsor has further widened the gap between the east and west; and among the developed and developing nations. However, the role of America, in claiming the 'War on Terrorism' too, is not free of biasness. Especially, in case of maintaining the 'Guntenamo Prison' in the Gulf of Cuba, her role has been largely criticized.

As such, today the world is virtually a deadly place to live in because it is not clear who are ruling and being benefited from the so-called wave of communalism. The terrorists groups are found, from somewhere in our local market to any place in the international scenario. There's not a place where the terrorist have not reached, as today's world has turned into a global villa, at least in the sense of terrorism.

Tension between Localism, Globalization and Terrorism

Within the sociological tradition the term *local* and its derivatives *locality*, and *localism* have generally been associated with the notion of a particular bounded space with its set of close knit social relationships based upon strong kinship ties and length of residence. There is usually the assumption of a stable homogeneous and integrated cultural identity which is both enduring and unique.

In this sense it was often assumed that members of a locality formed a distinctive community with its own unique culture – something which turns the location of their day-to-day interaction from a physical space into a place. Much of the research on localities which developed within urban sociology and community studies was influenced by two main assumptions. The first derived from nineteenth century models of social change in which the past was regarded as entailing simpler, more direct, strongly bonded social relationships, as we find in the paired oppositions: status and contract, mechanical and organic solidarity and community and association

Mike Featherstone one of the prominent critics on Localism and Globalism is of the opinion that the conflict between the local and undeveloped nations and the global world of developed nations is because of 'clashing of plurality' of ideas in defining nationality and communalism. He opines:

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

The density and multidirectional talk which takes place on the global stage take up a position as they increasingly find it impossible to silence the other voices or consider

opting out. Hence we have a plurality of national responses to the process of globalization which cannot be conceived as reducible to the idea generated by Western modernity. One of the problems entailed in mapping the contemporary global condition is this range of different national cultural blend, syncretize and transform, in various ways, the alleged master processes of modernity.

When we speak about locality, we should be careful not to presume an integrated community. There are problems with establishing and the extent to which localities were integrated in the past. We have to be aware of the location in time, space and social space of those who make such pronouncements and that they might be painting a nostalgic and over unified picture. It is also important that we do not operate with the view that localities are able to change only through the working out of a one-way modernization process entailing the eclipse of community and the local culture.

Usually when we speak about locality we have in mind a relatively small place in which everyone can know everyone else; that is, social life is based upon face to face relations. It is assumed that the intensity of the day-to-day contacts will generate a common stock of knowledge at hand which makes misunderstandings less frequent. It is the regularity and frequency of contacts with a group of significant others which are held to sustain a common culture. While the existence of such an integrated set of "core values" or common assumptions rooted in everyday practices may be overstated at both local and national levels. There is a dimension of cultural integration which must be referred to. This is the generation of powerful emotionally sustaining rituals, ceremonies and collective memories.

Globalization is a comprehensive term for the emergence of a global society in which economic, political, environmental, and cultural events in one part of the world quickly comes to have significance for people in other parts of the world. Globalization is the result

of advances in communication, transportation, and information technologies. It describes the growing economic, political, technological, and cultural linkages that connect individuals, communities, businesses, and governments around the world. Globalization also involves the growth of multinational corporations and transnational corporations businesses that see they functioning in a global marketplace. The international institutions that oversee world trade and finance play an increasingly important role in this era of globalization.

It is time that globalization is making the world a local market to live in, with equal share of opportunities and challenges. Mike Featherstone, one of the prominent writers on Local and Global issue points out this scenario as:

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

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

Featherstone intends to say that regardless of whether the home is real or imaginary, or whether it is temporary and synchronized or stimulation, or whether it is

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

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

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

Globalization has both negative and positive aspects. Among the negative aspects are the rapid spread of diseases, illicit drugs, crime, terrorism, and uncontrolled migration. Among globalization's benefits are a sharing of basic knowledge, technology, investments, resources, and ethical values.

(98)

The most dramatic evidence of globalization is the increase in trade and the movement of capital, which has further fuelled terrorism. Probably, the best examples is that of Afghanistan, where the U. S. funded the tribal leaders and urged the nationalist to fight against the Russian Imperialism. Bin Laden, a Saudi born fellow was one of them, engaged in struggle for freedom against the Russians.

However, globalization is not free from controversy. Very few people, groups, or governments oppose globalization in its entirety. Instead, critics of globalization believe

aspects of the way globalization operates should be changed. The debate over globalization is about what the best rules are for governing the global economy so that its advantages can grow while its problems can be solved. However, most governments are not able to address the real issues determining for the rise in communal issues, all over the world.

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

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

However, after the infamous 9/11 the world no longer is same. Since 9/11, the world seems to have concerned on two major agendas to deal with: communalism and terrorism. These two terms are so closely linked that, they seem to be synonymous with each other. Terrorism, at least for the west has its root in communalism and communalism is growing

because of the rapid globalization. If, it were not globalization, terrorism would not have reached to the height. The incidents in America, or in Madrid, or in a local market in Pakistan and Afghanistan all are linked to each other. No incidents are isolated with each other, as intimidation is intimidation at all excuses. *Shalimar the Clown* is just an example on how far can terrorism go and dominate the mind and the will of people, directly or indirectly.

III. *Shalimar the Clown*: From Communalism to Terrorism

Shalimar the Clown is an exciting drama, having its root in the east, from the strikingly beautiful province of Kashmir as far as to the far west of the globe. The novel covers Asia, Europe and America within its subject matter, that finds its origin in local hatred turned international. The story has its root in the womb of communal feelings and reaches out to leave its impact in the international level.

Shalimar the Clown is the story of the intention of the west, through Maximilian Ophuls – chief of the Global Anti-terrorist Squad of the U. S. He interferes in to the local issue personally inviting rage and hatred amongst its people and finally, ending up with global scenario of violence. Political conflicts are the internal parts of the novel, where local issues go like the facets of a coin. In this instance, western interest in Kashmir is ciphered by Maximilian, European-born Jewish-American ambassador to Kashmir.

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

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

Max interest in Boonyi is the symbol of west interest in the east. Here, Max is not self nor is a foreign individual but is the emblem of interest of the west in the east. He

represents the hegemony of west and Boonyi is the meek east that easily gets lured by the west and falls in trap. Boonyi is thus a product of America's love for the world, and when she speaks, she speaks in the voice of Kashmir. "I am your handiwork made flesh" (3), she tells Ophuls. She further laments her sufferings after being used and thrown by the west (Max).

You took beauty and created hideousness [. . .] Look at me. I am the meaning of your deeds. I am the meaning of your so-called love, your destructive, selfish, wanton love. Look at me. Your love looks just like hatred [. . .] I was honest and you turned me into your lie. This is not me. This is not me. This is you. (3)

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

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

Hence Max Ophuls, hero of the wartime resistance, whose parents have died in concentration camps, and who started his political career as an idealist and optimist,

finds himself, at the height of the Cold War, defending the American idea of a free world by manipulating religious factionalism in unstable regions, and engaging in covert, strategic arms deals with the Taliban and al-Qaeda. Ambassador Max Ophuls, the narrator observes dryly, "These days were supporting terror activities while calling himself an ambassador for counterterrorism" (272).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Shalimar the Clown gives us a vivid, if not always realistic, picture of Kashmir.

At first it appears as a kind of harmony; Hindus and Muslims live in harmony, a tolerant tribalism ensures the marriage of the young lovers: Muslim Shalimar and beautiful Boonyi, the daughter of a Hindu pundit. When destructive, anti-social desires for sex, power and food arise, they are mediated by a ritual folk theatre and the elaborately managed banquets of "Thirty-Six-Courses-Minimum" (104). All this is undone by the twin forces of nationalism and religious fundamentalism. As usual in Rushdie's novels, these forces are not the enemies of enlightenment as much as they are the enemies of freedom, and that means they are the enemies of the natural. Having shown us the first Kashmir, Rushdie must also destroy it. And when he writes about the destruction of Shalimar's native village of Pachigam in a reprisal action by the Indian Army, the sloppiness that characterizes the rest of the novel disappears into contained, channeled prose:

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

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

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

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

(Dougary)

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

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

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

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

trying to shed light on politico-cultural issues:

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

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

When Boonyi Noman danced for him in the Pachigam hunting lodge in Kashmir he thought of those feathered dead-eyed show girl wreathed in Nazi cigar smoke,

flaunting their gartered things. He could not help from thinking him into the gestures of those old days, as:

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

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

Surely, Shalimar, the master entertainer, the man who had never been capable of venting anger, would not have turned so violent a murderer had his private life been not tampered by an outsider. The clown's transmogrification into a militant and his retaliatory revenge is the result of interference by the American ambassador and his "idiotic choice" (161). Therefore, before we blame someone for being aggressive and murderous, we need to know why they become so. Let alone and undisturbed, people generally do not have the motivation and cause to turn violent. On the broader perspective, what this thesis holds is that the rise of fundamentalist and aggressive

elements within the Muslim world might have been provoked into existence by the western assault on Islam. When insulted, bullied and exploited, the only option save going on putting up with the same is to revolt, to organize sabotage and ambush. This is one of the issues the novelist has frequently raised throughout the novel for the consideration of all.

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

But she is ill-at-ease at the thought of having duped, actually cuckolded, lover husband Shalimar the Clown. Instinctively even so ambitious a girl as Boonyi can perceive what is morally and practically right and wrong in the long run. She thinks of her husband Shalimar the Clown and is horrified again by the ease with which she had abandoned him. It is really difficult to get away without guilty conscience sometimes for having duped the people who put much trust upon us. Boonyi too is nagged on by the same state of conscience, as.

When she left Pachigam none of her closest people guessed what she was doing. *I reach out to you and touch you without touching you as on the*

riverbank in the old days. I know you are following your dream but that dream will always bring you back to me. If the American is of assistance will and good, people always talk lies but I know your heart is true. I sit with folded hands and await your loving return . . . (sic) and tore the letter into smaller and smaller pieces. They were the letters that humiliated both their author and their recipient, letters that had no business existing. (195)

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

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

Look at me, she was saying. I am the meaning of your deeds. I am the meaning of your so-called love, your destructive, selfish, wanton love.

Look at me. Your love looks jus like hatred. I never spoke of love, she was

saying. I was honest and you have turned me onto your lie. This is not me.

This is not me. This is you. (205)

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

The wheel had turned. In this moment of his story he was not the victim.

In this moment she, not he, had the right to claim kinship with the lost. I

never spoke of love, she was saying. I kept my love for my husband

though my body served you, Jew. Look what you have made of the body I

gave you. But my heart is still my own. (205)

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

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

Allegory of Boonyi became: destroyed, deserted and stripped of her dignity, she is dead for her villagers, her father and husband included. When she returns her village on a chilly day, she knows through her childhood mate Zoon that she has been given up as

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

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

The ostracizing crime Boonyi had committed was to shamelessly desert her fanatically loving husband to be the concubine of an aged man whom she wanted to use just as a means of opening a world of opportunities.

As it has already been discussed in the earlier sections, the western discourse on Islam has done much is presenting a bloody picture of the same in the minds of those who do not have an in-depth knowledge of the western domination of the east. The westerners, it seems, take it as their obligation to know the orient and speak for it. But, interestingly enough, the easterners are not in a position owing to historical factor of European colonialism to comment and describe the occident and occidentals.

Max Ophuls's ambassadorship to India has authorized him to speak on Kashmir. Now having lived a relatively secluded life for years, the one time Resistance veteran is tempted to share his idea regarding the embattled paradise of Kashmir. A talk show host is more than ready and happy to take in the ex-diplomat for sharing his war exploits and what not. But Ophuls, contrary to the host's expectation speaks only on Kashmir, the place which is inextricably linked to his life. Here follows the characteristic mourning of a westerner for the devastation of a former heaven on earth.

We who live in these luxury limbo, the privileged purgatories of the earth, have set aside thoughts of paradise,' Max was roaring into the camera in a series of high flown locutions, yet I tell you that I have seen it and walked by its fish-rich lakes. If thoughts of paradise do occur to us, we think of Adam's falls, of the expulsion of the Eden of the parents of humanity. However, I haven't come to speak of the fall of man, but the collapse of paradise itself. In Kashmir it is paradise itself that is falling; heaven on earth is being transferred into a living hell.

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

While talking about how the west has described and dominated the east, we come across the notion of orientalism which Edward William Said has discussed at some length in his book of the same title. The west has always treated the east as its surrogate, its inferior. As Rushdie also writes in *Imaginary Homelands*, Orientalism "Provided justification for the supremacist ideology of imperialism" and to justify the western

occupation of the east, the myth of oriental simplicity, backwardness and savagery has been perpetuated (66). In the present context, the west has continued to disparage the east for having Islam as the major religion there. Islam, formerly condemned as a perverse religion, is now critiqued for being intolerant and aggressive to other system of faiths. This grand practice of describing and re-describing, this Orientalist discourse, may be at work in a very subtle level even in the novel *Shalimar the Clown*. Rushdie's discontents with the mandatory and strictly binding teachings of Islam might have given birth to a deep rooted aversion inside him. In that case, it comes as no surprise that Rushdie leaves no chance to portray Islam in a very negative, debased way. May be Rushdie, the renegade on Islam, is yet another write who is adding more engaging literary commentaries to the repertoire of Orientalist, in this case anti-Islamic discourse.

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

Like any other professional in this field, Max knew that there were no such things as complete security. The video tapes of the shooting of President Reagan were the illustrative tool that based demonstrated this. Here was the president moving from building to car. These were the position of the security details. All of the positions were ideals. [. . .] But the President had been shot. Potus was down. The most powerful man in the world, surrounded by the planet's security elite, was not secured between the door

of the secured building and the door of the armored car. Security was percentages. Nothing was ever one hundred percent. (39-40)

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

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

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

Shalimar, along with his two brothers, enlists the Jammu Kashmir National Liberation Front but he soon deserts that to join another organization which would help him in getting to the "last enemy" of his, Maximilian Ophuls (248). When he visits his mother at night after years, he tells of his final mission: "That last enemy, the invisible in the invisible room in the foreign country far away: that's the one I want to face, and if I have to work my way through all the others to get to him then that is what I'll do" (248).

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

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

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

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

reports to her father, the mullah has been preaching the religion of violence and suppression:

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

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

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

God spits on entertainment. I would also order the execution of the dentists, professors, sportsmen and whores. God spits on intellectualism

and licentiousness and games. If you hold the rocket launcher like that it will break your shoulder. This is the way to do it. (272)

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

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

So, Shalimar has become death himself. The organizations he works for kill people for the sake of Islam. But he does so as to reach his prey the ex-ambassador. Terrorism has become for him the channel through which he would be able to accomplish his personal goals in the cloak of Islamic holy war, the so-called *jihad*.

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

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

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

Pachigam was a mixture, with families of pundit background, the Kauls, the Misris, and the baritone singer's long-noses kin-Sharga being a local nickname for the nasally elongated even one family dancing Jews. So we have not only Kashmiriness to protect but Pachigaminess as well. We are all brothers and sisters here, said Abdullah. There is no Hindu Muslim

Issue. Two Kashmiri-two pachigami-youngsters 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 custom will be observed. (110)

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

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

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

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

changed immediately after his first bombing feat. Violence becomes revolting to him, as he comments:

The explosion, the gigantic excitement of the moment of the power, followed almost immediately by the violent involuntary physical reaction, a parallel explosion of vomit, taught him two lessons he never forgot: that terrorism was thrilling, and that no matter how profoundly justified it's cause, he personally could not get over the moral hurdles required to perform such acts on a regular basis. (162)

Human nature is and should be inclined toward the nobler motives of love compassion and understanding. Use of relational power and logical thinking is what differentiates human being from other animals. But owing to some or other weakness in their character, human beings do not always follow the proper path. They more often than not fall into the ditch of greed, vanity and sadism. They want to kill or suppress others, forgetting that others too might turn aggressive in self-defense. This comes true in the character of political and administrative level too. Hundreds and thousands of innocent Jews were brutally murdered in the eve of Second World War by the Nazis, which could not be justified in any sense. They invaded other nations and decreed barbarous rules upon the occupied territories. It was in this content that we need to understand Max's guerilla style bombing attempt. His cause was noble. But even then he could not accept violence as the legitimate way of countering violence in the long way. May be, there was no option than to adopt a violent path to fight the Nazi atrocities. But Rushdie' essentially anti-terrorist, anti-violence attitude presents the character Max Ophuls as being unconditionally against any further violent effort.

The counter terrorist activist of action of the Indian army is no less responsible in inflicting death and devastation upon the Pachigamis. When the novelist comes to the

point of describing the scene of destruction he no longer can maintain a detached position. He is too disturbed by the wreckage to perform the role of an objective or journalistic reporter. The disturbed psyche of the novelist while at the same time presenting a gruesome picture of the violence perpetrated by the warring sides who are less concerned about the will and opinion of the Kashmiris but claim to be working for the villagers.

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

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

The novelist uses interrogative sentences in volume to depict the nonplussed state of the villagers as well as that of the novelist himself whose very life was condemned to a continual threat for a decade though for a very different reason. He had a raised voice

for the freedom to believe and not to believe, to lead the life the way one wanted to but without interfering or intimidating others. Rushdie expresses his deep grudge against the murderer Shalimar Noman and not against Shalimar the clown:

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

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

At the end of the book, Shalimar is taken into the high profile of American Justice System. It is obvious that Shalimar will lose his case, as there are dozens of strong charges against him. However, the concern of the book is not if Shalimar is going to be punished, but is on the killing of ideals and motifs of east and west. A general query that arises after the assassin of Max, is are his ideals eradicated? The answer is, of course, no. It is because, Shalimar (the east) did everything to understand and destroy Max (the west) but the west (Max) never knew why he was assassinated by the east (Shalimar).

Thus the novel ends with showing chances of more vulnerable chances of terrorism in the offing. However, in the form of India/Kashmira – daughter of west (Max) and east (Boonyi) Rushdie hints towards a consoled world, as India in the novel is

shown sympathetic to the eastern values and at the same time understanding to the western mannerism, as well.

IV. Conclusion

Freedom is a universal concept. However, all person are not lucky enough to share its sweet fruit. *Shalimar the Clown* is a tale of fortunes, misfortunes and intervention of fundamental factors motivating the unlucky ones for avenge and bloodbath against the lucky ones. There are groups or communities that enjoy fewer rights, or are restricted with entrance into the political powers, who in turn often seek to violence as their weapon to make the respective authority and government to hear their voices. Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* is of lost luck, befallen misfortune and the concept of avenge from local grounds to international forum.

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

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

However, in a deeper level, Rushdie further says that it is personal biasness and enmity that is inviting chaos and disorder around the world. Terrorism is not born from

the womb of mother. Obviously, Shalimar became a terror because he wanted to avenge Boonyi and Max. He also wants to kill India – the illegitimate daughter of Max born of Boonyi. He gets trained by the extremists of Kashmir valley and becomes a deadly weapon of terror. However, deep within Shalimar, there is a tender heart that beats for love and he is less a terrorist and more a lover, in seek of revenge.

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

Works Cited

- Benjamin, Daniel, and Steven Simon. *The Age of Sacred Terror*. New York: Random House, 2002.
- Berten, Hans. *Literary Theory: The Basics of London*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Cawley and Dougary. *The Incredible Lightness of Salman Rushdie*. New York: MacMillan, 2006.
- Dougary, Ginny. "The Incredible Lightness of Salman." New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2006.
- Durian, Pierre Jean. *Common Wealth Fiction*. London: MacMillan, 1996.
- Featherstone, Mike. *Undoing Culture*. London: Sage, 1995.
- Featherstone, Mike and S. Lash. "Modernization, Modernity and the Specialization of Social Theory." *Global Modernities*. London: Sage: 1995.
- Fuller, Bruce. "Strong States, Strong Teachers." *The Globalization Teacher*. Ed 2nd. Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2001. 126-133.
- Ginny, Dougary. "The Incredible Lightness of Salman." *Readings into Salman Rushdie*. New Delhi: Sage, 2006.
- Hoffman, Bruce. *Terrorism*. New York: Microsoft Corporation, 2008.
- Leela, Gandhi. *Post-colonial Readings: A Critical Introduction*. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2005.
- Rao, M. Madhusudan. *Rhetoric in Shalimar the Clown*. New Delhi: Blackwell, 2007.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Midnight's Children*. New York: Avon Books, 1982.
- - - . *Shalimar the Clown*. London: Vintage, 2005.
- - - . *Shame*. London: Vintage, 2005.
- - - . *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*. London: Vintage, 1991.
- Spanberg, Eric. "Rushdie and Shalimar the Clown." *Christian Science Monitor*. London,

Vol. 128 (2006) 14.

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

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