

Chapter One

Introduction: Assumptions and Chapter Divisions

The subject-matter of this dissertation is the treatment of terrorism in Conrad's *The Secret Agent* (1907) and Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005). Generally speaking, terrorism means any act aimed at provoking terror. More precisely, it is a tactics to achieve a political goal. The tactics works because of human fear of sudden and unexpected damage on a large scale. There is no internationally accepted definition of terrorism. It is also because of the different perception of the people even between terrorist and freedom fighter. Defining terrorism, Alex Houen writes, "The definitions of terrorism put forward in the legislation of individual nation- states involve ambiguity" (7). Houen further writes, "Individual governments have been swift to ratify their own definitions, but when terrorism takes an international dimension, as 11 September clearly did, the problem remains" (8). In the same way, Schmid has also similar opinion regarding the definition of terrorism that terrorism is a broad term to define. Regarding terrorism, Schmid writes, "There are, as it were, five conceptual lenses through which we can look at terrorism. All of these forms are useful to understand better some aspects of some forms of terrorism" (2). Here, Schmid refers to the following five conceptual lenses as: acts of terrorism as/and crime, politics, warfare, communication and religious crusade.

Analyzing these above given definitions of terrorism, we can come to the conclusion that there is no internationally accepted single definition of terrorism. It is adopted and accepted in a wide range. So, this dissertation does not go into a definite definition of terrorism because it is a highly contested thing. A terrorist for one is easily taken as the freedom fighter for other. This dissertation does not intend to participate in such controversy but it goes by the perception that terrorism is resulted

to achieve a political goal. It is a political violence that induces terror and psychic fear among the public.

This dissertation is an attempt to look at the treatment of terrorism in two novels of two different time periods. The first novel is Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Agent* which belongs to the colonial period (early twentieth century). The second novel under consideration here is Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* which belongs to the postcolonial period (early twenty-first century). The basic theme of both the above two novels is the criticism of terrorism. Conrad is critical of the use of terrorism as a political tool because the terrorists' tactics which the anarchists in England replicated on the pattern of the tactics employed by the British administration in the colonies have started to hit back at the center of British imperialism: London itself. Therefore, Conrad uses the tool of irony to reduce terrorism and its practitioners - the anarchists. However, Conrad at places also gives a sense to his readers of the reasons that have compelled them to take to terrorism. This action of the novelist on the one hand, highlights the injustices and oppressions of the illiberal colonial regime and, on the other hand, it tones down the effect of the ironic attack against the anarchists. This toned down criticism gets reflected in the portrayal of the Professor whom Conrad describes with a poetically surcharged language. It is not for nothing that *The Secret Agent* of Conrad ends in ambiguity.

The clue to this dissertation's idea comes from Alex Houen's article "*The Secret Agent: Anarchism and the Thermodynamics of Law*" (1998). Alex Houen's treatment of anarchism in Conrad's *The Secret Agent* concentrates on how terrorism was tied to the question of Englishness during the first decade of the twentieth century, particularly in the wake of the first terrorist bomb attack on London carried out by the Irish Republicans. My work marks a departure from that of Houen's

position, in that it focuses on what it claims as "literary rendition": Conrad's representation of the threat of terrorism to London by the Irish Publicans and the Indian nationalists. This rendition, the dissertation argues, is quite different from the British discourse on anarchism in the decade of the twentieth century. Even as Conrad, by and large, agrees to the discourse, his translation of the then terrorism also privileges the standpoint of the terrorists, most notably that of the Professor in *The Secret Agent*. A similar privileging, the dissertation goes on to argue, is found in *Shalimar the Clown*, wherein the edge the criticism of terrorism is somewhat blunted when Rushdie attributes the terrorist acts by Shalimar to the injustice perpetrated by the American Ambassador. It is not for nothing that both Conrad and Rushdie hold the exploitative colonial regime (Britain) and the oppressive neocolonialism of America respectively responsible for terrorism.

The present study focuses on the two different novels: *The Secret Agent* (1907) by Joseph Conrad and *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) by Salman Rushdie, written during the colonial and postcolonial period respectively. Joseph Conrad (1857-1924) was a British-Polish writer who is regarded as one of the greatest novelist to write in English language. He is considered as an early modernist. His narrative style and anti-heroic characters have influenced even the great modern writers like T. S. Eliot, Salman Rushdie and others. Similarly, Salman Rushdie (b.1947) is a British-Indian novelist. He is one of the leading novelists of the twentieth century. His writing style often focuses on religion, fantasy and mythology. As Rushdie later become a target of Muslim extremists, the religion was very much a part of his upbringing. As a postcolonial novelist, Rushdie deals with the theme of religion, colonialism and other aspects in the novel *Shalimar the Clown*. But the major issue of my research work is to analyze how the both novels deal with the theme of terrorism and how terrorism

has been used as an ultimate political tool to fight against injustice for the marginalized people.

Shalimar the Clown is set partly in a small town named Kashmir. This novel is mainly based on the two events. One is the love story between the two major characters: Shalimar, a Muslim boy and Boonyi, a Hindu girl. And the event is the assassination of the American ambassador to India by the title character, Shalimar. The tragedy in the novel begins with the love affair between Shalimar and Boonyi. After their marriage, Boonyi gets influenced by the American ambassador and leaves Shalimar. She flies with the ambassador, Max Ophuls. Shalimar receives trainings from insurgent groups in Afghanistan and leaves for the USA. Getting access to Max as his driver, Shalimar finds a comfortable space to accomplish his task of killing the ambassador. He murders Max on the day he resigns his job of a driver. Shalimar evades the authorities and eventually returns to India's home with the intention of killing her. And the major issue of my research work is the rendition of terrorism in the novel. In other words, how the novel deals with the theme of terrorism is the main aspect of the research work.

Similarly, *The Secret Agent*, a novel by Joseph Conrad, is set in London in 1886. The story of the novel is woven around an attack on the Greenwich Observatory in 1894. The bombing outrage in the novel is masterminded by Mr. Verloc on the direction of Mr. Vladimir, the first secretary of the Russian Embassy. Mr Verloc is a Russian spy and ostensibly a member of an anarchist group. The group consists of the Professor, Comrade Alexander Ossipion, Michaelis and others. They produce anarchist literature in the form of pamphlets entitled F.P.[The Future of the Proletariat].The anarchists oppose the British government as the government has done injustice to the anarchists and the British people. The government is indifferent

towards the problems and actions of the anarchists. Regarding the reason why the anarchists oppose the British government, Howen writes, "The British government seemed actively uninterested in colluding with Europe over anti-terrorism, for example it did not send representatives of the 1998 Rome Conference which was aimed at producing common European anti-terrorist policies" (35). In the process of opposing the government, the plan of bombing outrage in Greenwich Observatory goes horribly wrong. Stevie, the brother of Winnie dies in the bombing. The death of Stevie ultimately leads to the murder of Mr. Verloc and the suicide of Winnie. Such events of bombings, pamphleting, murdering, suicides etc are the major concern of my study to analyze the novel as literary rendition of terrorism.

In this research work, the two novels: Conrad's, *The Secret Agent* (1907) and Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) are analyzed with the perspective of literary rendition of terrorism as the major aspect. These novels have been analyzed by the different critics from different perspectives. Some of the critics have analyzed and interpreted *The Secret Agent* connecting with the real event that took place in England in 1894 and others have linked it with culture and political violence. Interpreting the novel as a political violence, Cole writes:

The Secret Agent accords with many works of the three preceding decades in simultaneously taking seriously the political violence of anarchism and relentlessly denuding it of its most prized qualities. Its darkly comic tone and hyperbolic parody powerfully debunk the movement and its personae, and have led some commentators to see it primarily as a reactionary fable. (311)

Political violence is used as a weapon by the anarchist to fight against the injustice of the government. The novel ridicules the government and the people in power.

Similarly, another critic, Christian Haines has remarked the novel as a novel of crisis. Focusing on the social and political aspects of the novel, Haines writes:

There are a number of ways that that *The Secret Agent* is a novel of crisis. One, of course, is the ostensible content of the novel, the threat of anarchism to liberalism. In this approach, which situates itself largely in relation to the dynamics of plot, the novel is a struggle to register, negotiate, and resolve social and political chaos. (89)

Here, Haines emphasis on the chaotic situation created by the British Imperialism. The ostensible content of the novel itself refers to the crisis and chaotic moment created by illiberalism of the British Empire.

In the same way, focusing on the ironical aspect of the novel, *The Secret Agent* (1907), Skinner writes:

The Secret Agent is a complex and darkly comic novel, partly rooted in fact and characterized by Conrad's ironic narrative style. It has been chosen as the focus of this article for two main reasons: first, personal preference and familiarity with the text; secondly, because of its central police plot, which has not so far received the attention it deserves from police scholars or legal commentators.(421)

Here, Skinner's major emphasis lies on the ironical aspect of Conrad. The major characters in the novel, especially the police characters are ironically presented. They do not perform their duty sensibly. Their duties versus their responsibilities.

Likewise, Hugh Epstein focuses on the Englishness of the British regime as the major aspect in the novel which Conrad has ironically presented. Regarding the novel, Epstein writes:

The Secret Agent, sadly, serves rather to exhibit how penetrating is

Conrad's novelistic irony in comparison to the claims of the polemical essayist when it comes to depicting the characteristics of Englishness.

So, the struggle of the anarchists in the novel is all against the Englishness of the British Imperialism. Conrad ironically presents the activities of the British regime.

Moreover, in the article, "*The Secret Agent: Anarchism and the Thermodynamics of Law*," Alex Houen concentrates on how terrorism was tied to the domination of the British Imperialism during the first decade of the twentieth century. In the article, unlike my research work, Houen is more critical to the British government in his writing as he writes:

But if effective government is shown to depend on blurring the distinctions between crime and law ,bureaucracy and the individual , and public and domestic, this also threatens governmental and legislative stability, by creating zones of unconscious and randomness.(1007)

In the same way, the postcolonial novel, *Shalimar the Clown*, has also been interpreted differently by the different critics. Patricia Fernández-Kelly interprets the novel from the racial viewpoint. Regarding the novel, Kelley presents his views as:

Rushdie's outrage over the depersonalizing actions of extreme Muslims is tempered by his understanding of the effects that such actions can have on young, vulnerable men. 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)

Kelley is in the opinion that the military intrusions enhance more chances to all the Muslims to be united against the postcolonial American arrogance.

Similarly, by praising Rushdie especially for his art of sketching his character, Jonathan Levi expresses his opinion as:

There are few writers who can pull off such an act. But Rushdie defies gravity and dispatches his characters on journey leading up to the association, lady away from the dazzling, but all the while guiding as an examination of this precarious high wire we find ourselves walking in the 21st century."- Jonathon Levi, The Los Angeles Times.

(www.complete.review.com)

Likewise, another critic Matt Thorne links the novel with the theme of war.

Regarding the novel, Thorne expresses his view as:

Rushdie addresses many geological, philosophical and theological questions in the novel but this is not polemic. There are intensely passionate antiwar passages, but they some have don't impact as the main narrative in quite the way they might"- Matt Thorne, -

Independent on Sunday (www.complete-review.com/review/rushdie/salimar)

Another critic Azzam, in his dissertation entitled, "The Alien Within: Postcolonial Gothic and the Politics of Home" mainly concerns about the realistic, satirical and gothic aspect of the novel, *Shalimar the Clown*. Highlighting on a number of aspects of the novel, Azzam writes as:

Shalimar the Clown is concerned with the Indian nationalism and sectarian conflict: the politics and religious extremism; the oppression of women; nostalgia for one's homeland; and popular culture. What distinguishes *Shalimar* immediately from his previous works, though, is an almost excessive textual quality—the novel combines realism,

magical realism, satire, and gothic, all the while making liberal use of the mythical and folkloric. (174)

In the same way, focusing on the violation of human rights in the novel *Shalimar the Clown*, Anker writes:

While *Shalimar the Clown* in many ways reads as an extended plea for the acknowledgement and prevention of violations of human rights, it offers an overwhelmingly bleak forecast for the achievement of these aims and the ideals of social justice. (98)

Another critic, Mitchell puts emphasis on the importance of tolerance and polyvocability among the Kashmiri people. Focusing on the allegorical aspect of the novelist writes as:

In *Shalimar the Clown*, Rushdie uses allegory to express the importance of tolerance and polyvocability. His allegories construct the notion as a polyvocal entity and illustrates what is lost when polyvocability is lost in nations. He creates characters who represent nation, then uses the objectification of characters by other characters to symbolize how the diversity of the nation is denied. (114)

Thus, the critics have put on their views on the different aspects of the novel like social, economic, allegorical, political, cultural, racial and other aspects. The novel is not glanced as the literary rendition of terrorism as the major aspect. So, in this research work, both the novels are analyzed through the perspective of terrorism. Though the clue of the dissertation comes from Alex Houen's article, "*The Secret Agent: Anarchism and the Thermodynamics of Law*", my work marks a departure from that of Houen's position as my dissertation claims, "literary rendition": Conrad's representation of the threat of terrorism to London by the Irish Publicans and the

Indian nationalists. this rendition is quite different from the British discourse on anarchism in the decade of the twentieth century on which Houen focuses on.

Writing almost century after Conrad, the point that Salman Rushdie seems to be making through *Shalimar the Clown* is that the scourge of terrorism will continue as long as hatred, revenge, ideology and fanaticism are out of control in the society. He seems to go even beyond Conrad in suggesting that it is injustice by the power center perpetrated on the margin, which is the real cause of terrorism. A muted sense that arises from *Shalimar the Clown* is that terrorism is a tool of resistance at the hands of the marginalized. Rushdie's novel, like that of Conrad, points toward compelling portrait of the conditions that give birth to terrorism.

As far as the matter of assumptions and chapter divisions is concerned, the first chapter consists the brief introduction of the term "terrorism", a short introduction of the novelists and the novels and also the review of literature of the two novels. Similarly, chapter two too dwells on the psychological mindset of the anarchists. However, the gap between the narrational voice and the psychological world of the anarchists is quite marked in *The Secret Agent*. Although there is a wholesale ironic reducing of the anarchists, Conrad's perceived sympathy towards the Professor (the main terrorist) is somehow felt.

The third chapter contains the analysis of *Shalimar the Clown* along the lines set down in the preceding paragraphs. It shows that even though the novel offers a less than successful depiction of its protagonist, Shalimar, the terrorist; the function of terrorism in the novel serves to introduce only ambiguity about theoretical and artistic explanations for the causes of terrorism. However, in spite of the ambiguity, the text succeeds in implying a pressing demand to fathom the psychological mindset that underlies the use of terrorism as a political tool.

Chapter four, which concludes the dissertation, identifies the purpose of both Conrad and Rushdie in taking up the subject of terrorism as giving an insight into the compelling reasons for the rise of terrorism.

Chapter Two

Anarchism in the Colonial Metropole: Conrad's Ironic Response to Terrorism in

The Secret Agent

The term "anarchism" refers to the activities of the people who believe that the government should be abolished. Hence, the people involved in anarchism are anarchists. According to Oxford English Dictionary, "anarchism is the unofficial or unauthorized use of violence and intimidation in the attempt to achieve political aims" (145). So, it is a doctrine rejecting the government. It is an ideology that rejects the need for a system of government in society and proposes its abolition. Similarly, the term "terrorism" refers to the activities of the people who use violence to try to achieve political aims. Hence, the people involved in terrorism are terrorists. According to Oxford English dictionary, the term terrorism is defined as, "the use of violence and threats of violence, especially for political purposes". According to Peter G. Shilston, the center of anarchism was Russia. Russian anarchism was of two distinct kinds, those with an optimistic view of human nature, who had an idealized vision of small, peaceful communities with no need for central government, and those who believed in the necessity of revolutionary action. Russian radicalism, including anarchism was a matter of interest in Russia. Russian universities expanded greatly and provided with plenty of scholarships and were open to anyone who could pass the exams. But these educated young people had no official role in Russia. There was no such thing as a legal opposition to the Tsarist regime. The anarchists were regarded as anti-government and the universities were always a focus of disturbances, strikes and protests. Another critic, Sarah Cole has also similar view regarding the origin of anarchism. Cole presents his views regarding anarchism as:

Anarchism was not a British born phenomenon and was fundamentally

international in spirit. Its roots ran deepest in Russia, though fundamental thinkers came from all over the continent; there was a great deal of itinerancy among anarchists. (310)

The given extract regarding the concept of terrorism gives a hint that it is an international phenomenon though its roots can be found in Russia. It is a social movement. As quoted by Alex P. Schmid, Boaz Ganor, the Director of International Policy Institute of Counter-Terrorism, defines terrorism as, "An objective definition of terrorism is not only possible; it is also indispensable to any serious attempt to combat terrorism" (39).

The term terrorism was common as at the turn of the nineteenth century. Terrorism can simply be defined as a criminal act that influences the audience beyond immediate victim. It is unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to threaten a government or its citizens to meet certain political or social objectives. So, terrorism is the use of violence to achieve a political goal. Violence is the means to gain the targeted objectives. The persons involving in terrorism are terrorists who commit violence to draw the attention of the people. Regarding terrorism, Louis Decker expresses his opinion as:

Terrorism, as it is constructed in Western discourse, signifies all that is horrific concerning the violent tactics of "our" enemies, especially those enemies who "hide out" in the Middle East and neighboring regions. (179)

The term terrorism was common as anarchism in the nineteenth century. In this extract, Decker addresses terrorism as a violent tactics of the Westerners who especially hide in the Middle East to carry out their act of terrorism. Here, Decker hints to the Westerners as the enemies who are concerned with the violent activities

and hide out in the Middle East.

In the same way, Cole defines anarchism as ‘the word anarchy means against authority’ (306). Anarchism opposes all forms by which one person can hold power over another. Anarchism opposes the defining institutions of formal power and authority like the government, church and the legal system. Cole further writes about anarchism as "the theory of anarchism developed in the early 1860s largely out of the writings of French philosopher Pierre Joseph Proudhon and the activities of the Russian Mikail Bakunin" (306). The theory of anarchism was common in England in the 1880s when the novel was written. Thus, we come to the conclusion after analyzing the two terms 'anarchism' and 'terrorism' that both terms are synonymous to each other. Both refer to the political activities done against the government. In spite of the differences between the two, at the beginning of the twentieth century, anarchism was understood as what we today call terrorism. So the terms 'terrorism' and 'terrorist' are preferred in this research paper. How Conrad presents terrorist activities in the novel through the depiction of major characters and events and how he presents his views regarding the contemporary British society is the major aspect of this research work.

The novel has its roots in factual event. In the novel, Conrad indirectly focuses on the actual explosion in Greenwich Park on the 14th February 1894 which killed the bomber, a man named Bourdin (Skinner 424).The connection of the event in the novel can be co-related with the real event which can be more clearer from the extract below:

February 15, 1894, was the most interesting afternoon in the otherwise dreary history of Greenwich Observatory. Earlier in the day, Marital Bourdin, a skinny anarchist, travelled by train from Westminster to

Greenwich, concealing a small bomb. As he ominously ambled through Greenwich Park, towards the Observatory, something happened-no one knows exactly what-and he blew most of himself to shreds (Colas-www. literature-study-online.com).

The novel was written at the time when terrorists' activities were increasing.

The novel is set in 1986. The anarchists' movements were started to be seen in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. The period was marked by a string of sensational acts of violence. There had been bombings, shootings and assassinations that riveted the public and were heavily reported by the press in England, America, and across Europe. Sarah Cole describes the anarchists' movements during the decade as:

In 1881, Czar Nicholas II was ambushed on the road and assassinated by a nihilist, two German anarchists Franz Rusch and Friedrich Reinsdorf, attempted to kill the German emperor in 1883 by blowing up his carriage . . . and in 1901 president McKinley of the United States was shoot and killed by a Polish man with loose anarchist ties.
(305)

Such bombing movements of the contemporary society had also fostered Conrad to deal with the idea of terrorism related events in the novel. In fact, anarchism embraced violence as a means to a peaceful end, in which the state and its oppressive mechanism would have melted away. The story of the novel is woven around an attack on the Greenwich Observatory in 1894. The plan was mastered by Verloc, a Russian spy working for the police and a member of an anarchist group. The very idea of explosion in the novel suggests the polarity and excess and the connection between bombs and revolution. In the novel, the bomb making Professor develops a public

imagination of the early 20th century.

Terrorist activities can be traced in the novel *The Secret Agent* by Joseph Conrad. The central character Adolf Verloc is employed by an agency which requires him to orchestrate terrorist activities and several of the characters deal with the theme of terrorism in the same way. A good example of anarchists' activities in the novel can be traced in the activities of Mr. Verloc and his friends including Michaelis, Comrade Ossipon, the Professor and others. They frequently meet and discuss about their plans and activities. Their anarchism related meetings, plans and discussions can be traced in the following extract:

The ideas that are born in their consciousness play an insignificant part in the march of events. History is dominated and determined by the tool and the production – by the force of economic conditions.

Capitalism has made socialism, and the laws made by the capitalist for the protection of property are responsible for anarchism. (42)

The capitalists' idealization drives the life of the general people. History is based on their conscious ideas which could not favour the life of the general people. Similarly, the social and law related activities in the society are also guided by the capitalists for the origin of terrorism. Here, Conrad focuses on the capitalists as the creators and the causative agent for terrorists and terrorism in the society. Mr. Verloc and his friends are also the anarchists created by the effects of such capitalism. Among the anarchists, Mr. Verloc, Comrade Ossipon, Michaelis and the Professor are the most prominent. Their anarchist activities are known to the police. The group produce anarchist literature in the form of pamphlets entitled F.P an acronym for the future of the proletariat.

The colonial novel *The Secret Agent* (1907) revolves around a beautiful young

lady named Mrs. Winnie Verloc, her simple minded brother-Steve and her husband Mr. Adolf Verloc. The novel begins by introducing these characters and then the novel turns to be a mixture of love story, espionage and mystery. Mr. Verloc is not only a member of terrorist cell but also an agent provocateur for a foreign country that is implied to be Russia. Mr. Vladimir, the first secretary of the Russian embassy explains that Mr. Verloc has been a poor secret agent lately but can redeem himself by blowing up the Greenwich Observatory. Later on, Comrade Alexander Ossipon meets the Professor who describes the nature of the bomb which he carries in his coat all the times. If he presses the button, it will blow him up in twenty second and those nearest to him. As Winnie knows from the Chief Inspector Heat that her husband, Mr. Verloc is responsible for the explosion, she stabs him to death. She flies her home where she meets Comrade Ossipon and begs him to help her. Ossipon assists her but her revelation of her murder worries him and he abandons her. Later on, he discovers that she gets drowned leaving behind her wedding ring.

So, *The Secret Agent* is especially rewarding as a reflection on the culture of political violence at the turn of the century because the novel deals with the material realities of dynamic violence. It incorporates nearly all the tropes and strategies for representing terrorism that circulated in the contemporary culture. In the novel, Conrad has especially mirrored the reportage of the Greenwich bombing that occurred in 1894. So, the major concern of this analytical study is how Conrad deals with the theme of terrorism as the major issue in the novel. The issue of terrorism can be traced in the characters, plot, and events of the novel.

The Secret Agent is an account of the bomb attempt against Greenwich Observatory which was prompted by an actual incident in Greenwich Park in 1894. However, the novel's action takes place in 1886. In the novel, Conrad carefully

concentrates mainly on a few terrorists or revolutionaries who are depicted as sordid and futile. The major characters who are closer to terrorism by their nature, character or the action they involve are:

- i) Adolf Verloc ii) Winnie Verloc iii) Stevie iv) The Professor
- v) Michaelis vi) Mr. Vladimir

The theme of terrorism in the novel can be traced through the analysis of these characters. Adolf Verloc leads a double life as a shop owner and a secret agent. He is a secret agent employed in the Russian Embassy. He also owns a shop in the Soho region of London. The shop contains pornographic materials, stationery and contraceptives. In the beginning of the novel, the narrator describes the shop as, "The shop was small, and so was the house. It was one of those grimy brick houses which excited in large quantities before the era of reconstruction dawned upon London" (1).

Such description of the house and shop of Mr. Verloc provides knowledge to the readers about the setting of the novel. The narration even hints the readers to the date that goes back to the events of the real life at the time of Greenwich Bomb Outrage.

Further, the shop is a cover for Mr. Verloc for his activities as a secret agent. He has been a secret agent of the Russian Embassy in London and he has been drawing pay from this embassy for eleven years. Mr. Verloc's activities in the novel are even connected with the character and action of Mr. Vladimir. The novel centers on Mr. Verloc and his family. Verloc's controller, Vladimir, commands Verloc to commit a revolutionary outrage which will compel the police to take action and deport the foreign born anarchists. It is all planned because Vladimir is disgusted by the tolerant attitude of the British authorities towards foreign anarchist group. Mr. Verloc is the epitome of weakness in the face of his shrewd employer, Mr. Vladimir

who is fully aware of Verloc's weaknesses and exploits him by creating the condition of bombing in the Greenwich Park which is also clearer from the following conversation between Mr. Vladimir and Mr. Verloc:

I'll tell you what I think is the matter: you are a lazy fellow.

How long have you been drawing pay from this embassy?

Eleven years, was the answer, after a moment of sulky hesitation. 'I

have been charged with several missions to London while his

Excellency Baron Stott-Wartenheim was still Ambassador in Paris.

Then by his Excellency's instruction I settled down in London. I am

English'. (27)

Mr. Vladimir, the first secretary of the embassy, circulates a series of insults to persuade Mr. Verloc that he is in imminent danger of losing his long-lasting and profitable position as an agent provocateur. Mr. Vladimir threatens Mr. Verloc for not being smart in his job. He even threatens to deduce his salary. His threat is clear: either Verloc agrees to carry out the Greenwich bomb plot or he loses his job. Here, Mr. Vladimir's intention to succeed in his mission through bombings is itself ironic. Alex Houen in his journal writes, "Ironically, this is exactly what Mr. Vladimir has in mind for; a series of outrages to justify and provoke a call for more stringent surveillance" (996). Because of his weakness, Verloc becomes a pawn in the plan to destroy the middle class regime. Mr. Verloc is not a good secret agent in the eye of Mr. Vladimir. Despite his devotion to his work, he is called and threatened by Mr. Vladimir. Though he is English by birth, he works as a secret agent in the embassy of Russia. Mr. Verloc is a part of a group of anarchists. The group frequently meets and discusses about capitalism, socialism, poverty etc. and produce anarchist pamphlets-F.P. (The future of the Proletariats). The narrator describes the activities of Comrade

Ossipon, the ex-medical student as:

Comrade Alexander Ossipon – nicknamed the doctor, ex-medical student without a degree; afterwards wandering lecturer to working-men's associations upon the socialistic aspects of hygiene; author of a popular quasi-medical study (in the form of a cheap pamphlet seized promptly by the police) entitled *The Corroding Vices of the Middle Classes*; special delegate of the more or less mysterious Red Committee, together with Karl Yundt and Michaelis for the work of literary propaganda. (46)

In this extract, the background information about the personal character of Comrade Ossipon is provided. He is a doctor without a degree and has been involved in different professions. It also suggests a sign of failure in his profession which is also linked to his personal economic aspect. Moreover, he is a co-writer of the pamphlets produced by the anarchists. Economic crisis among the characters is another cause that they are involved in anarchism. Mr. Verloc had been economically victimized. Regarding his anarchist background, Ossipon remarks: "He was regularly married you know. I suppose it's with her money that he started the shop" (68). Economically, he struggles a lot to settle his household problem. His job and his shop are essentially important for him to sustain in the British society.

On the other hand, Mrs. Winnie has not married Mr. Verloc for love, but she needs a stable life to take care of her mentally disabled brother. Mr. Verloc's desire for bombing is partly determined by the sheer financial pressure of having to support Winnie, Stevie, and their mother. It is mentioned in the text as "It appeared that Mr. Verloc was ready to take him over together with his wife's mother and with the furniture which was the whole visible fortune of the family" (18). It is also obvious in

the given quote that Mrs. Verloc has been beaten excessively by poverty. In this sense, the novel is essentially a satire on British and European attitudes towards terrorism and counter – terrorism. In the novel, the attack is conducted by a secret agent of a foreign power in order to make the British change their liberal ways. So, the ironic response of Conrad through the characterization of Mr. Verloc in the scenario of colonialism is how the colonizers in the Metropole; London are responsible to create terrorism and how they utilize the innocent colonized people like Mr. Verloc for the completion of the mission.

Similarly, the traces of terrorism can be analyzed through the character of Mrs. Winnie Verloc and her brother Stevie. Stevie has been a victim of paternal brutality and gets hideously violent demise. Although he is juxtaposed with Winnie who as his older sister speaks with the apparent voice of reason, his criticism towards the duty of the police is quite remarkable and weighty in the novel. The following extract from the text can be an example: "Police," he suggested confidently. "The police aren't for that," observed Mrs. Verloc, cursorily, hurrying on her way (143). Stevie realizes for some help from the police and Winnie expresses her bitter remarks about the police. In Stevie's view, the police are a law-enforcement agency. They are the body with great power and ability to suppress evils in the country. It provides security by its helpful presence on the streets. Such is the understanding of Stevie towards the police. But the dutiful wife of the anarchist provides the voice of reason to Stevie. Conrad's ironic intent from the portrayal of Stevie is that police are far from able to fulfill their mythical role. After listening Winnie about the police, Stevie as a mentally disabled boy expresses his feelings regarding the duty of the police and its effects to the general public as, "Bad world for poor people" (143).

The police are helpless in their responsibilities and the anarchists are more

powerful. Even the mentally disabled boy Stevie does not believe that the police are dutiful. It is ironic in the novel to die such a mentally retarded boy in an explosion. Chief Inspector Heat perhaps speaks for all of the readers when he guesses about the death of Stevie after the pieces of the dead body are collected:

The man, whoever he was, had died instantaneously; and yet it seemed impossible to believe that a human body could have reached that state of disintegration without passing through the pangs of inconceivable agony. (78)

The tragic and injustice death of Stevie is itself an example of anarchists' movement in the text. Steive, though he is mentally ill, visualizes the physical suffering in others. Regarding his conscious state, the narrator describes as, "Steive knew very well that hot iron applied to one's skin hurt very much"(48). Moreover, the fourteen year old Steive sets off fireworks in the office where he was employed as an errand boy for destroying the place. Steive as an Anarchist has a slogan of his own "bad world for poor people" (143). This slogan is certainly an accurate description of the state of poverty in the metro pole- London and it also mirrors the kinds of messages about social injustices that anarchists and other revolutionaries work to disseminate. The state is indirectly responsible for the injustice towards the innocent boy, Stevie. The irresponsibility of the state is responsible for the rise of terrorism which is also an interpretation of the novel.

Indeed, Conrad presents Stevie as the innocent character as well as the spokesman for social justice. He is an innocent boy victimized by the anarchists' movement. The readers have sympathy for Stevie who gets blown up to bits. Ironically, Stevie is mentally retarded boy. The death of such innocent character in the bombing is itself ironic response of Conard in the novel.

Mrs. Verloc is always a prototypical submissive housewife but at the end of the novel, she really turns to be a real terrorist because of Stevie's death. The death of Stevie in the bombing outrage at the Greenwich Observatory affects Winnie as she had given him a maternal like love and care. Stevie's sudden death triggers Winnie to murder Mr. Verloc. To Verloc, his role in causing her brother's death is simply the occasion for potential legal troubles while for Winnie it is an occasion for grief. Mr Verloc attempts to encourage her assuming that Winnie is worried about their future rather than grieving for her brother as, "He waved his hand. He seemed to boast. He wished only to put heart into her. It was a benevolent intention, but Mr. Verloc had the misfortune not be in accord with his audience" (203).

Here, the narrator's point of view is clearly diverged from Verloc's, revealing the distance between what he believes his wife needs and what she is actually feeling. As Mrs. Verloc finds out that her brother was killed because of her husband's action, she takes a knife and kills her husband and leaves the house. Here, the death of Stevie has been the major cause of Verloc's death and both are the examples of terrorist activities. After Winnie leaves her house, she meets Comrade Ossipon who at first does not recognize Winnie as he assumes her to be a drunken woman. It is difficult to dismiss his impression about her presence: "It seemed impossible to him that she should be drinking. But one never knows" (219). Winnie feels validated by Ossipon's presence as she remarks: "You recognized me?" (219). Ossipon does not recognize her until she addresses him by his name. Here, Winnie's violent act of murdering is the proof that her violent character as a terrorist is lurking beneath the surface. Further, Winnie invokes herself as a fallen woman as she cries, "I was a respectable woman . . . Till he made me what I am" (221). Here, the readers can find Winnie's transformation from a respectable woman to an anarchist. She regrets

for her present condition. The point Conrad focuses is that the group of anarchists are not successful in their mission. It is also clear from the explosion at Greenwich Bombing where only the innocent character Stevie gets tragic death. So the anarchists' activities are being increased gradually. Winnie's violent action, character and herself destroying decisions are all resulted because of terrorism.

Winnie's murder of Verloc is completely comprehensible to recognize the depth of her feelings that she is a capable woman. She exhibits her capability only at the end of the novel. So, she engages in a self destroying action by murdering others and also by herself. Regarding the murder of Mr. Verloc and the suicide of Mrs. Verloc, Ossipon expresses his opinion as, "An impenetrable mystery . . . this act of madness or despair" (249). Here, Ossipon meditates over what Winnie has done. He cannot fathom it. The novel itself is unfathomable too; it is dense, twisting, sordid and ironic. To be clearer, Verloc shop can be taken as an example. Although Verloc, the titular secret agent, is the owner of a pornography shop, and much of the novel's action takes place there, pornography is nearly invisible in the narrative. The issues raised by this setting remain as hidden as the merchandise itself. None of the characters is finally a more genuine anarchist than the police spy Verloc. The irony is that the readers cannot detach themselves to loathe Verloc as a perpetrator of an outrage. So, in the novel, Conrad expresses his experiences and feelings related to terrorism. Conrad ironically presents the anarchists' activities. Conrad's irony reflects a pessimistic perspective of the British society. His pessimistic view of society envelops each character's personal relationship. Conrad's foreign anarchists are all foolishly ordinary. They are too lazy to work and live for dreams of power. Mr. Verloc, an apparently respectable married shopkeeper, has been a secret agent of the Russians for years. He passes information that protects visiting royalty and saves the

London police from embracement. He prides himself on protecting his clients but he is actually manipulated by his Russian paymasters and by Chief Inspector Heat.

Conrad's pessimistic view towards the British society can also be seen in the personal relationship of the characters too. Mr. Verloc is literally a shopkeeper. But in fact, he is depicted as a real terrorist. He even uses his family members in favour of terrorism. Stevie, who was like Verloc's son, is killed in the bombing outrage in Greenwich Park.

Conrad's portrayal of police characters especially Inspector Heat takes the readers beyond operational concerns about policing. The two main police protagonists are Chief Inspector Heat of the special crimes department and the Assistant Commissioner, Heat's superior, at the Home Office. The Assistant Commissioner can be considered more briefly because Conrad develops his character in less detail.

Conrad even undermines Heat's credibility by ridiculing his wisdom as:

But Chief Inspector Heat was not very wise – at least not truly so. True wisdom, which is not certain of anything in this world of contradictions, would have prevented him from attaining his present position. (76)

The government official, Chief Inspector Heat is not a responsible enough in his duty. His position gets contrasted with his duty. His lack of wisdom is then shown to have manifested itself in his reckless claims to the Assistant Commissioner that he had faultless knowledge of the anarchists' action and movements. Further in addition to being less than wise, Heat is shown to be driven by unworthy sentiments which are also revealed during his meeting with the Assistant Commissioner in the extract as:

The encounter did not leave behind with Chief Inspector Heat that satisfactory sense of superiority the members of the police force get

from the unofficial but intimate side of their intercourse with the criminal classes, by which the vanity of power is soothed, and the vulgar love of domination over our fellow-creatures is flattered as worthily as it deserves. (105)

The struggle between Chief Inspector Heat and the Assistant Commissioner undermines their position of each in the society. Because of their struggle, the work entrusted to them of protecting individual liberty and property is obscured and subsequently ignored. Inspector Heat cannot maintain his official duty. Neither can he satisfy his senior officer, the Assistant Commissioner. His operational concerns about policing are also futile. The misuse of power is all resulted because of the relationship of the police with the unofficial persons.

Another example of terrorism is distinctly seen in the character and action of Michaelis. His association with the anarchists and revolutionaries entangles him in other ascribed identities. He achieves a, "a groundless fame" from "people who wished to exploit the sentimental aspect of his imprisonment" (93).

Although Michaelis's intentions are clearly to liberate people from the power of the state, he gets caught up in the sort of public sensation that exceeds his actions or his role in the event. Despite his devotion as an anarchist, he gets no achievement at all. It is a kind of failure of the anarchists who were guided by the colonizers during the colonialism.

The conflict takes place among the individuals charged with public and private responsibilities. Each individual is self-interested and he does not have any obligation or moral duty to society. The laws, codes and regulations charging public officials with certain duties do not neutralize the desperate struggles for power. So, Chief Inspector Heat carries on a struggle to prevent his superior, the Assistant

Commissioner to prevent him from discovering his secret source of information. Chief Inspector Heat protects his informer, Verloc, from being exposed as the perpetrator of the Greenwich bomb plot. So, the nature and the character of Chief Inspector Heat is quite closed to the anarchists. On the other hand, the Assistant Commissioner has different objectives. He wishes to protect Michaelis upon whom Heat tries to cast suspicion as the perpetrator of the bomb plot. The Commissioner's motive is to keep on good personal terms with Michaelis's patroness, Lady Mabel.

Heat's plan is to pin the crime on Michaelis who as an anarchist and former prisoner, certainly belongs to prison whatever the degree of his personal involvement might be. But Heat and the Commissioner are not bad men. They want peace, happiness and security in themselves. In the end of the novel, they are no different from the terrorists they struggle against. It appears to be pride and enjoyment of power that guides Heat in his work. Regarding the police character in the novel, Karl Yundt has a different analysis. He claims: "The terrorist and the policeman both come from the same basket. Revolution, legality-counter moves in the same game; forms of idleness at bottom identical"(64). The government officials neglect their responsibilities. The narrator does not find any differences between the duties, responsibilities and action of the government officials and the anarchists. They have similar nature. The Assistant Commissioner's explanation to his superior, Sir Ethelred, at the Home Office presents only a partial understanding of the events surrounding the explosion in the park and Stevie's death. In the novel, the readers are presented with Heat's desire to resolve the mystery. "He would have liked to trace this affair back to its mysterious origin for his own information" (80). Yet, ultimately neither Heat nor the Assistant Commissioner resolve the affair despite their good deceptive skills and what they apparently think they have achieved. Here, the

Commissioner himself seems to be supporting the anarchists which is also a clue in the novel that Conrad ironically presents the British officials and at the same time his slight sympathy towards the terrorist can be felt.

In his way, analyzing the novel through the perspective of anarchism, we can find that Conrad is not only a social commenter but also an artist. The incongruity between the voice of the narrator and the psychological and social world of the characters is much more marked in the novel. Though the readers do not feel sympathy to the anarchists, Conrad indirectly puts some sympathy especially to the Professor and anarchism related actions in the novel can be traced in the character of the Professor. Analyzing his character, the readers can take him as a perfect anarchist. He has a grand vision of creating the perfect detonator. For his own protection from the police, he straps explosive to his physically deformed body. He also supplies Verloc with the necessary explosives for the bombing. However, the Professor's goal is not to destroy the middle-class regime, but all political orders "The weak, the flabby the silly, the cowardly, the faint of heart and the slavish of mind (243). His aim is to destroy what is in the interest of an unspecified future. It is an effort to overcome time. Regarding the efforts and action of the Professor, the narrator expresses his feelings as:

He quarreled with the authorities upon a question of unfair treatment. After he obtained a post in laboratory of manufactory of dyes, There, too, he had been treated with revolting injustice . . . The Professor had genius, but lacked the great social virtue of resignation. (69)

In the past, the Professor held a few jobs. He worked as a chemist too which would explain his ability to make bombs. But he always thought he was being treated unfairly. Because of the social injustice, he left his positions. Regarding his injustice,

the narrator states, "His struggle, his privations, his hard work to raise himself in the social scale, had filled him with such an exalted conviction of his merits that it was extremely difficult for this world to treat him with justice."

The Professor is convinced of his greatness, and he sees it as a horrible injustice when people do not respect him. He is self-conscious about how short he is in London, but reassures himself by feeling the robber ball in his pocket. He wants the world to acknowledge him as a superior person. So, he is a typical character in the novel. He is a little frail man who is obsessed with explosives. He is crazy and suicidal. He despises the others for their fanciful political goals and beliefs in a better way of life. He has the means to commit violent acts and for him only death has real meaning. He is totally negated by the government and the other hand his professional proficiency is highlighted in the novel He worked as a chemist too and possesses the ability to make bombs. Through his character, Conrad ironically presents the British government's perspective and treatment to the intellectuals in London in the nineteenth century. Hugh Epstein also agrees that Conrad ironically presents the people of the early twentieth century in the novel. Epstein presents his views about the ironic treatment of the novelist as, "Disengagement from Verloc is a much less certain experience than many accounts of the novel suppose for the reader who hears all the notes of Conrad's ironic presentation of his London inhabitants" (19).

The dissatisfaction of the Professor due to the unfair treatment and injustice led him to the path of an anarchist. So, the Professor is a positive character in the society as he is in favour of social justice. But he has been victimized many times by the social injustice. He was a genius person but the government failed to trace it. As a result, he has been a prominent anarchist. He even has the knowledge to prepare missile. In fact, he bears the characteristics of an anarchist. He even claims "I had to

know that much to prepare the missile" (p.69). This extract further highlights on the individual character of the Professor and his anger towards the state which is responsible for his present predicament. Thus, the novel is about a family tragedy set in a political context nearly a century ago. Still it illuminates the contemporary conditions of the twenty-first century.

Thus, Conrad's sympathy is seen in the character depiction of the character of the Professor. Conrad presents him differently from other character. He is obsessed with explosives. He is crazy and suicidal. He believes that any social rescue can occur only if the existing ideas are blown up along with the system itself. So, he attempts to build a perfect detonator. His effort to build a perfect detonator echoes the extreme stand of those revolutionaries who even manage the violent campaign to overthrow the unjust colonial order of the British government. By observing the character of the Professor, we can conclude that the bomb and the anarchists are the same as he always carries a bomb with him and because of which the police cannot arrest him.

In fact, especially through the character the Professor and Mrs. Verloc, Conrad means to say that their activities refer to the erosion of moral values in the British society which are the result of ill-governance. Such immoral activities can be traced by analyzing the ending of the novel when Winnie commits suicide after murdering her husband. Surfacely, Winnie can be taken as a character having positive characteristics .She has deep love and care to her helpless mother and mentally retarded brother-Stevie. She makes an enormous sacrifice for her mother and brother .She gets married to Verloc to assist them economically. In fact, she is ironically a darker character. Her passive obedience to social convention makes her mostly responsible for the death of her brother, her murder of her husband and her subsequent suicide. The murdering of husband, brother, self-suicide etc. are the clear

signs of the morally degrading society and at the same time the terrorist activities that Conrad overtly presents in the novel. So, the novel gives an ironic interpretation of the British Empire in terms of its horrific effect on the British society itself. The novel offers a savage and wounding account of British society with an erosion of moral values. In short, Conrad overtly criticizes the anarchists in the novel and at the same time he covertly sympathizes some of them as the means of improving the morally corrupted British society and the British government. To be brief about the character of Mrs. Verloc, though she possesses some positive characteristics like her maternal love towards her helpless brother, she is essentially a negative character, a terrorist.

Thus, the main purpose of the novelist in the novel is to warn the British government against its ill-governance which is also resulted from the foreign influence. Conrad is not in favour of terrorism but means to say that the ill-governance is the major aspect to create terrorist activities in the country. Excessive domination, humiliation, corruption etc are the causes for the terrorist activities. Mr. Verloc designs the bombing outrage in Greenwich Observatory because of the domination of Mr. Vladimir and Mrs. Verloc murders her husband as she cannot bear his excessive domination on her and ultimately commits suicide. So, the purpose of the both novelist is to oppose such foreign influence and at the same time to maintain justice in the society. Conrad warns the British authority that the people can be compelled even to be terrorists and even give up their life like Mrs. Winnie in the novel. So, terrorism and terrorist activities in a deeper level in the novel function as a way to release humiliation, oppressed feelings and inferiority complex of the characters. It creates purgatory effect to supersede psychological inferiority of the oppressed characters. Such treatment to the people leads them to stay against the authority. Mrs. Winnie and the Professor in the novel involve in terrorist activities as

their ultimate liberating force from the social injustice.

Chapter Three

Treatment of Terrorism in *Shalimar the Clown*

The main concern of this chapter is to analyze how Salman Rushdie deals with the perspective of terrorism in the novel *Shalimar the Clown* as an ultimate tool to fight against injustice, suppression, humiliation and other evil aspects prevalent in the society. To analyze the terrorism related events, activities, characters and setting of the novel is equally important aspect of this research work. So, it is relevant to mention the term "terrorism" briefly. The term "terrorism" refers to the activities of the people who use violence to try to achieve political aims. Terrorists are the people who involve in anti-government activities. Terrorism has been a major issue to be discussed in the literary works of the twentieth century. The term "terrorism" has been defined differently by the different critics. According to Black Donald, "terrorism is a collective violence- a group project- and in this respect resembles rioting, lynching and vigilantism" (16). Here, Donald correlates between terrorism and violence. Violence itself is the use of force. It responds to deviant behavior of the authority. Violence might appear to be an unpredictable outburst or explosion. Regarding terrorism, Donald further presents his views as "pure terrorism is more warlike most collective violence including individual killings, by organized groups or mass killings by unorganized individuals" (16). So, terrorism is closer to murdering of the people than violence. Terrorism includes foiled plans, attempts, threats and murdering and torturing the people. Terrorism strikes across very long distances through social, cultural or economic dimensions. In the novel, *Shalimar the Clown*, the Hindus and the Muslims live together in a Kashmiri village named Pachigam before the arrival of Maximilian Ophuls, an American ambassador to India. He distorts the secret marriage between Shalimar and Boonyi. His arrival brings communal violence in the village

and Shalimar turns to be an assassinator and murders Boonyi and Max Ophulus. Thus, the major concern of this research study is to focus on how Rushdie deals with the theme of terrorism as a major political tool through the depiction of the major characters and events in the novel.

Violence is generally taken as the imposition of illegal power to harm the victims. In violence, people suffer in a different way or die. John Lawrence defines violence including biological, psychological and material damage. In his definition, violence includes, "the ideas of biological, psychological and material damage, severe physical restraint property destruction and psychological impairment" (35). Likewise, in social, political and religious context, it refers to the subjugated minority. Similarly, in the novel, the people in the Kashmiri village suffer from communal violence. They are subjugated by Max Ophuls whose subjugation is more clearly known by analyzing the character of Boonyi, Shalimar and India and also the whole people in the village.

This project work has attempted to interpret the novel through the perspective of terrorism by analyzing the major events and characters in the novel. The novel is made up two narratives: one is love story between a Muslim boy and a Hindu girl. Another narrative is about the assassination of the American ambassador by the title character, Shalimar. The novel begins with India Ophuls witnessing the murder of her father Maximilian Ophuls who was a former Ambassador to India. Then the novel flashes back to provide India's family background. It depicts the life of Boonyi, India's mother, in Pachigam, a Kashmiri village. Boonyi, a Hindu girl falls in love with a Muslim boy, Shalimar. After they marry, Boonyi starts an affair with Max and begets a baby, Kashmiri. Then he abandons her. Max's wife, Peggy claims the child and renames her India and takes her to London. Shalimar leaves the valley to join an Islamic terrorist organization. Then he kills Boonyi and Max. After her father's

murder, India investigates her history and learns about her mother and also adopts her mother's name for her, Kashmira. Then she gives evidence against Shalimar which leads to his imprisonment. Shalimar eventually escapes from the prison. The novel ends with Shalimar breaking into India's home to kill her while India prepares to defend herself.

The love story between Shalimar the Clown and Boonyi depicts Kashmir as a paradise with multi cultural faith, tolerance and harmony. Boonyi Kaul, the daughter of Pandit Pyarelal Kaul falls deeply in love with a Muslim boy named Shalimar. The lovers get approval of the society and get married. Boonyi cannot stay happily for a long with Shalimar. The act of terrorism begins from their love story. The arrival of Maximilian Ophuls, an American ambassador to Kashmir destroys the secret marriage between Boonyi Kaul and Shalimar. Max is enticed by Boonyi's deliberately sensual dance and she also gets influenced by him. When she meets Max Ophulus first, she had different feelings and expressions which Rushdie mentions as:

When Boonyi met Maximilian Ophuls's eyes for the first time he was applauding wildly and looking piercingly at her while she took her bow, as if he wanted to see right into her soul. At that moment she knew she had found what she had been for. (133)

Here, Boonyi is equally responsible to bring troubles for herself and for the whole people in Pachigam. She impressed Max Ophuls so much that he forgets to think that he is a married man. "She swung her hips for him and he thought, And I'm a married man. She swung her hips again and he ceased to think" (Rushdie, 141).

Max Ophuls also gets deliberately influenced by Boonyi's sensual dance he seduces her. He impregnates her and leaves her. As a result, Shalimar cannot bear her betrayal and takes a strong sense of revenge. He joins the insurgent force of

Afghanistan and becomes an assassinator. And finally, getting access to Max as his driver in the USA, Shalimar finds a comfortable space and slaughters the ambassador very brutally. In this sense, the murder story entails alternative definition of the term terrorism.

The issue of terrorism can be explored in the novel, *Shalimar the Clown*, in the context of characters, events, revenge, and cultural violence. The title character, Shalimar, is a Muslim boy who ultimately involves into terrorist activities because Boonyi betrays him. Boonyi was his childhood friend. She leaves him after their marriage. Max Ophuls seduces her. The peaceful and healthy environment of the Kashmiri village gets distorted by this event. It is all because Shalimar feels betrayal and humiliated after Boonyi leaves him. Then he turns to be an assassinator, a terrorist. So, terrorism in a deeper level in the novel is managed to release humiliation, oppressed feelings and inferiority complex of the characters. It creates purgatory effect to supersede psychological inferiority of the oppressed characters. Terrorism is considered as the liberating force for the major characters in the novel. The oppression and its effects in the context of Kashmiri village are so harsh that the people from the Muslim and the Hindu community cannot be reunited and maintain the harmonious relation like before. They cannot organize them against the oppressive character Max Ophuls and his dominating and humiliating actions.

The assassination of Max Ophuls by Shalimar can be viewed as a major terrorist attack though it is presented to be the case of personal revenge as Rushdie takes the readers back in time to find to explain why Shalimar killed Max. Shalimar was once a young happy Muslim boy who was completely in love with a young Hindu girl named Boonyi. They loved each other very much and were therefore allowed to marry by the villagers despite their different religions. But for Boonyi, life

in the tiny village in Kashmir is not enough. So, she leaves Shalimar and becomes the American ambassador's mistress. After she leaves Shalimar, he vows to kill her and any child she might give birth. Shalimar joins the various terrorist groups in order to learn the art of an assassinator. Later on, as an assassinator, he murders Max in America. This murder has a dominating issue in the novel. So, the act of murdering can be taken as an apt example of terrorist activity. The transition of Shalimar from an innocent Muslim boy into an assassinator also makes him aware of the illegitimate wrong doings of the US colonialism. Regarding his intellectual sincerity regarding the US policy, Anker writes:

In addition to its condemnation of the American criminal justice system and foreign policy, Shalimar evinces a deep skepticism about legal process in general and demonstrates the ease with which the law can be manipulated to legitimate wrong doing. (105)

Shalimar the Clown is based partly in a small town named Kashmir. This novel tells the story of a Kashmiri village named Pachigam where the inhabitants gradually get caught up in communal violence. Regarding their cultural unity, Kelley writes, "There, Muslims and Hindus coexist raucously but peaceably- everyday an opportunity for conflict but also for reinvention" (472). Kashmir is an imaginary town where the people are very happy in a harmonious environment. Kashmir is named itself as a paradise. Describing the influence of Boonyi's mother on her, Rushdie hints Kashmir as a paradise, "Her mother had been Kashmiri, and was lost to her, like paradise, like Kashmir, in a time before memory" (4). Shalimar, the title character in the novel, is a Kashmiri villager on whom the whole plot and the story of the novel revolves around. Although a number of narratives and incidents in the novel revolve around Kashmir, the novel opens in Los Angeles, USA and ends at the same

place. Shalimar, a Muslim boy, falls in love with a beautiful Hindu girl named Boonyi in Kashmir valley. The village elders also agree to convert their sacred love into marriage. After the socially accepted marriage between Shalimar, a Muslim boy and Boonyi, a Hindu girl gets distorted by the arrival of Max Ophuls, an American ambassador to India; Shalimar spends the rest of his life to take revenge on the people who were the cause of his unhappiness. Shalimar receives trainings from insurgent groups in Afghanistan and leaves for the USA. Getting access to Max as his driver, Shalimar finds a comfortable space to accomplish his task of killing the ambassador. He murders Max on the day he resigns his job of a driver. "His throats had been slashed so violently that the weapon had all but served his head" (Rushdie, 40). Shalimar evades the authorities and eventually returns to India's home with the intention of killing her. So, the arrival of Max Ophuls as an ambassador in India and Boonyi's betrayal to Shalimar are the major events in the novel which ultimately lead Shalimar towards the path of terrorism.

Rushdie establishes Kashmir as a culturally unified and harmonious region which is suppressed and destroyed by the outer influences. Both Boonyi and Shalimar from different religions represent Kashmir. Boonyi is named after the Kashmiri chinar tree. "This was the local word for the celestial Kashmiri chinar tree" (Rushdie46). Shalimar is also a reference to Kashmir, specially the Shalimar Garden's in Kashmir. In the beginning of the novel, Rushdie uses these characters to represent Kashmir as a culturally a unified and harmonious community where individuals from different ethnic and religious backgrounds live together harmoniously which can be reflected in the extract below:

"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 customs will be observed." Pyarelal added, when his turn came, "To defend their love is to defend what is finest in ourselves." (110)

Rushdie uses a beautiful love story between Boonyi and Shalimar in Pachigau, a small village in Kashmir situated in the serene surroundings beside the river Muskadoon, to establish Kashmir as a culturally a unified place. The people of this village lead a life of happiness and contentment. The acceptance of the marriage between the bi-religious couple is an example of their unity.

The seed of distrust and hatred and cruel dissection of the nation gradually take enormous forms and engulfs the whole village in its fire. Max, the representation of the United States is the destructive outside force to destroy the peaceful environment of the village. He steals Boonyi away from Shalimar. He also constructs Boonyi as a sexual object whom he can consume and dominate to fulfill his own desire. His treatment to Boonyi mirrors the United States' relationship with Kashmir. Just as Boonyi seeks help from Max to make her life better, Kashmir also sought American intervention to help to stabilize the situation in Kashmir. Instead of providing help, the United States indirectly and unknowingly exploits Kashmir. So, Rushdie's major attack in the novel is how the U.S. policies increased Islamic terrorism in Kashmir. Shalimar is a representation of Islamic fundamentalist terrorism. Similarly, the seduction of Boonyi by Max represents the corruption of Kashmir which is also a dominating issue in the novel. Saurav Kumar Singh, a critic also agrees on it. Singh writes:

Making the personal bleed into political, Rushdie has once again confirmed his concern for the modern world at large and Kashmir in

particular, lamenting the loss of love, innocence and brotherhood, and thus signaling the dawn of a new in disarray. (2)

Here, Singh focuses on the chaotic situation of Kashmir caused because of the communal violence.

In Kashmir, Max Ophuls is so powerful that in his the presence of, Boonyi cannot stay with her childhood sweetheart, Shalimar. She abandons her husband, Kashmiri home, parents and moral compass when she chooses Max. But Max takes Boonyi just as plaything. He leaves her after she gives birth to a child. Her second marriage turns to be hell not only to the lovers but also to the whole Kashmiri villagers. She is far from happy. She realizes her mistake rather too late that she wants to escape. She is so enticed by the influence of Max that she becomes ready to leave Shalimar and Kashmir at any time which is observed in the following extract below:

She knew then that she would do anything to get out of Pachigam . . . she would move faster than fortune." She wishes, ". . . get me away from here, away from my father, away from the slow death and slower life, away from Shalimar the clown." (114)

In fact, Boonyi is responsible to make Shalimar involve in terrorist activities. Her desire to escape from Shalimar, her father and Pachigam gives the story a tragic mode.

Boonyi's free and uncontrolled spirit ill-marks her love story with Shalimar and gives the story a tragic turn. Increasing influence of alien presence on the Kashmiri landscape slowly starts corroding and degrading the values of the valley, the 'Kashmiriyat'. This influence is seen after the arrival of Maximilian Ophuls on the scene, the representative of American interest. He is European-born; Jewish-American Ambassador to Kashmir who in his younger days fought in the resistance

against the Nazis, but who latterly has become a secret negotiator for American interests around the globe. "Max had passed his time discussing military history with Gaston Zeller and writing papers on international relations" (Rushdie 164). His involvement in Kashmir is registered through his impact upon the lives of Boonyi, whom he seduces, impregnates and abandons her. After the seduction of Boonyi, Ophuls loses interest in her. Boonyi is thus a product of America's love for the world. She realizes his selfish and trivial love. After her realization, she speaks in the voice of Kashmir which can be marked in the extract below where she speaks to Ophuls as:

I am your handiwork made flesh. You took beauty and created hideousness, and out of this monstrosity your child will be born. 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. (205)

Boonyi realizes her mistake. Max Ophuls's harsh behavior makes her realize it. In fact, Max loved her beauty. After giving birth to India, Boonyi loses her beauty which is also a cause that Max lost his interest in her. "One day she returned to Pachigam, obese, crippled by addictions, covered in snow her old friends did not include any trace of childhood love" (Rushdie, 236).

Boonyi had a fantasy lived in the shadow of the glamour and glitter of elite society. Boonyi had big dreams in her eyes that were terribly misdirected. The path she chose for herself, sooner or later had to lead only to one destination, and that was imminent disaster for her. Boonyi desires freedom from a middle class orthodoxy, but she discovers that the free world she had tried to build for herself was not free from the squalor of betrayal. Her disastrous desire invites catastrophe not only in her life

but also in the lives of the people related to her. She loses her Kashmiriyat and tumbles down the path of complete psychotic degeneration, waiting alone in the wilderness for death to truly free her. "It was her destiny to live among ghosts as a half ghost until she learned how to cross the line" (Rushdie, 240).

Rushdie makes a very pertinent point that Kashmir's problems stem from a Hindu-Muslim antipathy that has been brought into being by political processes and historical forces. Though this point is well made, however, the implication that Kashmir, before the 1940s, was a paradise like zone of tolerance and harmony seems a stretched idea. "This idea of Kashmir is nothing but the continuation of the same idea of idealized, multi-cultural utopias in Rushdie's fictions that are under threat from the forces of singularity and oppression" (Singh 6). In this respect, the Kashmir of *Shalimar* plays a familiar iconic role in Rushdie's imaginative universe. The problems in Kashmir, however, seem to present, too rooted in a long history of antipathies, for readers to suspend disbelief sufficiently in the interests of the broader symbolic scheme. Regarding the problems brought by the partition between India and Pakistan, Rushdie writes:

Then many rumors clamored at once. "Five hundred thousand tribals are attacking us, with Pak army soldiers in disguise commanding them!" - "They are only ten miles away!" - "Five miles!" - "Two!" - "Five thousand women raped and murdered on the Jammu boarder!" - "Twenty thousand Hindus and Sikhs slaughtered!" (86)

These events of rapes, murdering, and horrible rumors are also terrorist activities that Rushdie describes. Such activities have long history and the problem of Kashmir is also the same. This historical and geographical backdrop is significant because it marks a failure in US foreign policy to understand the ongoing conflict in Kashmir.

By setting the novel in twentieth century Kashmir, Rushdie draws attention to the competing narratives of cold war geopolitics, western imperialism and religious fundamental that circumscribe the region. Further, the connection of the novel with the partition of India and Pakistan can be traced in the in the extract below:

The partition of India and the escalation of violence from deployment of Indian troops in the Kashmir valley in October 1947 to Pakistan's co-operation with the Bush administration during 2001 war in Afghanistan form part of the historical background to *Shalimar the Clown*. (Morton 341)

Similarly, another most striking feature of terrorism in the novel is the effectiveness with which Rushdie conveys his sense of outrage at the systematic slaughter carried out in Pachigam by both Islamic insurgents and the Indian army. This outrage reaches to a climax twice in the novel, and on both occasions the narrator is left unable to do anything more than ask questions. On the first occasion – after a week-long unprovoked violence against Kashmiri Hindus during which the Indian army stood by because it helped to simplify the situation, Rushdie puts the question ‘why’ in strong words as:

There were six hundred thousand Indian troops in Kashmir but the pogrom of the Pandits was not prevented, why was that? Three and a half lakhs of human beings arrived in Jammu as displaced persons and for many months the government did not provide shelters or relief or even register their names, why was that? (296)

On the second occasion – after the Indian army takes revenge on the village of Pachigam for managing to hold out against them for so long – the question is ‘who’.

Who lit that fire? Who burned that orchard? Who shot those brothers?

Who laughed their whole lives long? Who killed the sarpanch? Who broke his hands? Who broke his arms? Who broke his ancient neck? Who shackled those men? (308)

Due to all these heinous atrocities, Pachigam ceases to exist as it was. Charged with harboring extremists, the village bears the full brunt of the atrocities of the armed forces. Everyone is suffered and their life is totally changed from the place where love had once bloomed and blossomed. "The village of Pachigam still existed on maps of Kashmir, but that day it ceased to exist anywhere else, except in memory" (Rushdie, 309). The furies thus, find a new home in the action of the armed forces meant for protection of people. Rushdie here indicates the pathetic situation of the people of Kashmir who have to bear the atrocities of both the terrorists as well as the forces primarily meant for their protection. Life for them has left no option open for them to live in freedom and without fear.

These questions that Rushdie raises are strong enough to shake anybody who is sensitive to these issues. These questions are not asked in vain; it is not merely formality. They have two constructive political functions to perform. Firstly the very act of posing the question of bearing witness to atrocity constitutes a potent political gesture that is a demand for attention to improve the situation. Secondly Rushdie's question-asking attitude also functions as 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 than hinders their progress. In this way Rushdie's novel asserts the need to recognize the honorable, even utopian, intentions behind the post-war allied efforts to bring about a global consensus regarding the welfare of common humanity all around the world. At the same time it also asserts the pathetic situation of the people in Kashmir who have to bear the violence of the

terrorists and the forces meant for their protection.

In the novel, we see the annihilation of the idea of Kashmir as it is caught among violent and opposing political interests. The small town Kashmir suffers and dies as the result of antagonism that are fostered and manipulated by distant national leaders in the pursuit of equally distant national ideals. The two Kashmiri protagonists, Shalimar Noman and Booniy Kaul are both born at the moment of partition and they come to act as mirrors of a post independence Kashmir. In the novel, Kashmir is simply a micro presented as the thorn in the side of India and Pakistani post independence optimism but in the novel it has much grander and more global role to play. Here Kashmir has been commemorated as a symbol to point out the inner fissures of the US capitalism led efforts to establish a global consensus and political and economical affairs in the wake of the Second World War. In the second place, Kashmir is used to announce the decisive abortion of the idea, promoted by American neo-conservative intellectuals.

On the other hand, in the novel, Rushdie addresses other elements of violence such as those given their most grotesque embedment in the attacks on New York in September 11-2001 and so many others including London and Mumbai. In *Shalimar the Clown*, Kashmiries' love for peace and brotherhood is smashed by the insensitive forces of Indian army, the Islamic insurgents from Pakistan and US interests. As a result Kashmir becomes the living firestorm of collision and explosion that unsettles its social and cultural fabric, its identity as well as the identity of people.

In the novel *Shalimar the Clown* (2005), Rushdie embeds a story about the militarization of Kashmir. In a broader sense, Rushdie attempts to describe the transnational social and political relationship that underpins globalization. As the narrator puts it, "Everywhere was a part of everywhere else. Russia, America,

London, Kashmir. Our lives, our stories, flowed into one another's were no longer our own, individual, discrete. This unsettled people" (37).

Rushdie's narrative of Kashmir seems to stage the impossibility of a national allegory for Kashmir. One reason for this might be that the ideal of Kashmiriyat exists only as an imaginary homeland in the de-territorialized, diasphoric imagination of Kashmir. The conflict over Kashmir can be traced back to the partition of India in 1947. Regarding the partition of India and Pakistan, Morton writes:

After the British left India in August 1847, Kashmir initially remained a Princely state under the autocratic rule of the Maharaj', a Hindu prince. However, during Lord Mount Batten's involvement in the negotiation of India's independence as the victory of India, he urged many of the leaders of Princely States to opt either for Pakistan or India. (341)

This extract portrays the complex and confusing state of postcolonial world. The division brought a sense of despair among the people. *Shalimar the Clown* is a novel of love, betrayal and agonizing struggle over the contested Himalayan region of Kashmir. In the novel, Rushdie reveals a deep thread of pessimism and despair. This novel is a devout celebrant of post colonial hybridity and diversity of cultural fusion and merging. Rushdie has brilliantly portrayed the recent tragic history of Kashmir. The portrayal of Kashmir has been done with great poignancy and sensitivity throughout the novel. While depicting the story of his characters, Rushdie also weaves the tragic story of Kashmir, its life and culture and the degeneration of this paradise into hell.

On the other hand, the themes of dislocation, survival, poverty, suffering, betrayal, oppression and search of identity are the other inevitable effects of terrorism

and terrorist's activities which can be traced in the novel. In this sense, the novel can be interpreted as a novel dealing with the theme of terrorism. The theme of dislocation, oppression and suffering, which come under terrorism and its effects, can be analyzed through the character of India, the daughter of Max Ophuls and Boonyi. India is born in New Delhi but soon after her birth, she is taken to England by Max's first wife, Peggy Rhodes. Regarding her dislocation, the narrator comments, "Peggy Rhodes had returned to England with a baby girl in her arm and a look on her face that made it impossible for anyone to ask after her husband or even to speak his discarded name" (Rushdie, 344). Here, India is separated from her parents after her birth. She does not have any information regarding her parents. She spends her life in abroad and her feelings, freedom, and fundamental rights are totally oppressed. Her realization of her dislocated position and her suffering are expressed in the sentence, "I live today neither in this world nor the last, and neither in America nor Astrakhan" (Rushdie, 9). Such confused state of the character, India, itself refers to the postcolonial confusion. Further, India's efforts are all centered for the quest of her identity. Insisting for the whereabouts of her mother, India speaks to Shalimar as "tell me about her, she cried. Tell me about my mother, who wanted to go back to you, who was ready to give me up" (Rushdie, 340/41). Further, her identity is linked with India and America. "The seduction of Kashmir by America (the seduction of Boonyi by Maximilian Ophuls) has produced a bastard child – India Ophuls - a hybrid being (Singh, 9)". She lives in America and loves her American father and searches for her real father and mother. Regarding India's mother the narrator states, "Her mother had been Kashmiri, and was lost to her, like paradise, like Kashmir, in a time before memory" (p.4). Kashmir's story tells us something different. She embodies the emergence of a new beginning from the chaos and turmoil of violence to the arrival of

a bright new dawn, full of hope and regeneration. Her presence is an indication that Kashmir will not be lost; it will emerge from the darkness into the light of true freedom and hope for its entire people, a new life. "She symbolizes this new beginning in her realization and acceptance of her true identity and ultimately in her emerging victorious by executing the hatred and violence of Shalimar" (Singh 9). She was no longer a prisoner of fury when she lets her arrow find its mark. In the end, as novelist says, "She was not fire but ice" (398).

In the same way, the theme of dislocation and suffering can be observed in the character of Boonyi who gets birth in Kashmir. She falls in love with Shalimar but can't stay with him after their marriage. She is eloped with Max Ophuls, who takes her to New Delhi. After she gives birth to her daughter, India, Max deserts her. Again she is not allowed to return to Kashmir. Rather she was sent away from Kashmir by her father whose message to Boonyi is, "Go up the mountain and die properly" (Rushdie, 227). Here, it is clear that Boonyi is dislocated from her birth place and she is suffered from her husband, lover, family, neighbors and from the villagers. In fact, her name refers to the earth and her suffering in a broad sense is the suffering of the whole people especially the Kashmiri people. "Her name meant "the earth", so that made him a grabber, Norman supposed" (Rushdie, 46).

Similarly, the theme of dislocation can be also observed in the title character Shalimar the Clown. He is a Muslim boy born in a Kashmiri village. After Boonyi betrays him, he joins the insurgent forces in Afghanistan and becomes an assassinator. He even leaves Kashmir and goes to the USA and makes a comfortable space to murder Max by being his chauffeur. Regarding his life, Shalimar states 'The bright sky vanished for me and a dark passage opened" (60). The transformation that we find in his character is itself a kind of dislocation. In the same way, Peggy Rhodes is

also dislocated and suffered a lot from her husband. She has discarded her husband.

Lastly, the theme of dislocation is also assisted by the setting of the novel. The events in the novel begin in the USA and capture the setting of different countries like in the USA, India England, France, and again the novel ends in the USA. The novel begins with the description of Max's daughter "India" who is confined in America by separating her from her mother. Regarding her condition in America, the narrator states:

Her mother had been Kashmiri, and was lost to her, like paradise, like Kashmir, in a time before memory. (The terms Kashmir and Paradise were synonymous was one of her axioms whichever one who know her had to accept.) She trembled before her mother absence, a void sentinel shape in the dark. (4)

The shift in the setting of the novel also creates a feeling of fear, terror, oppression, dislocation etc in the characters. Such feelings in India can be observed in the above given extract. The paradise like Kashmir in the novel is itself dislocated in the novel. The loss of harmonious cultural environment in Kashmir is like the loss of paradise for the Kashmiri people. Such theme of dislocation creates fear, terror, oppression etc. which are all the terrorism related elements.

Likewise, the love story of Boonyi and Shalimar gives birth to the story of Kashmir itself where Boonyi and Shalimar grow up. Rushdie describes the remarkably harmonious and tolerant society of pre – partition Kashmir where Hindu, Muslim, Jews and Sikh families lived together, ate together and shared their cultural values to one another. In the novel, through the description of a tragic love story between a Muslim boy and a Hindu girl and a story of assassination of the former American ambassador to India, Max Ophuls, Rushdie reveals a deep thread of

pessimism. In the novel, Rushdie perhaps intends to serve a kind of warning to the modern readers regarding the effects and activities of terrorism. Pitkin, another critic has also similar views regarding the novel as he writes, "The writing begins to feel, in fact, like reportage, like bulletins from a front. Perhaps this is exactly what Rushdie intends" (257).

In fact, Rushdie presents an account of the waste full struggle over the valley of Kashmir. The tragic tale of passion, adultery and revenge is also woven with the major story of Kashmir. The lost Kashmir in the novel can also be seen as a model for the ordinary yet remarkable capacities of human societies to include and accommodate many varieties of people to handle conflicts without violence. Rushdie draws out the context between the tolerant society Kashmiri lost and the violently polarized society that emerged to take its place. The scenes of murder, rape and cruelty etc. which Rushdie presents in the violently polarized society to convey something like despair.

In Kashmir, the tolerance of villagers has permitted the Hindu – Muslim love marriage of a dancer Boonyi Kaul, and an actor Shalimar. But later on massive state repression, inter-communal violence and increasingly fanatical religious ideologies turn the traditional magical vistas into bloody violence. In the novel, Rushdie manages to tell the story of these Kashmiri people in a superb way. He makes them all believable. By describing the people and events in Kashmir, Rushdie has also a political message about the destruction of Kashmir and also the destruction of the relations that lay among various religious groups of people. The Kashmiri people get the feelings of both peace and violence. Rushdie still manages to keep the story well-paced integrating political issues in the novel. In some ways, this can be seen as a retelling of the story of Paradise. Kashmir is presented as the Garden of Eden,

Shalimar and Boonyi can be compared with Adam and Eve and Max as the Evil / Devil who tricks Boonyi by taking her away from the Eden and into the world filled with possibilities for temptation and sin. Due to her huge sacrifice, she is allowed to return but Paradise has changed too, just like she has. The analogy between Boonyi and Adam and also between paradise and Kashmir can be traced in the extract, "If thoughts of paradise come to us, we think of Adam's fall. . . in Kashmir it is a paradise itself that is falling (28)." Singh also compares Kashmir with Paradise as he writes, "the implication that Kashmir, before the 1940s, was a paradisiacal zone of tolerance and harmony" (6). So, the novel explores how peaceful and tolerant countries like paradise can suddenly catch up in violence and conflict. It is also an attempt to discuss the factors that turn a paradise like place into bloody violence and also to understand what makes people become terrorists.

Further, the novel begins with an assassination and then circles back through time before ending near its beginning. The story begins in Los Angeles in 1991, where we meet the ridiculously slinky and glamorous India Ophuls. She is 24 years old and a proficient athlete and a brilliant student. She is planning a bright psycho – geographic documentary about LA. She has weekly boxing sessions. The central character, 'India', is an illegitimate child of Max Ophuls, a former United States ambassador to India. He is a US diplomat and has worked in the Kashmir Valley and ultimately gets murdered by his former chauffeur. So, it is not injustice to say that the novel delves deep into the roots of terrorism and explores the turmoil generated by different faiths and culture attempting to coexist.

Thus, Rushdie depicts the transformation of Kashmir from the poly – vocal and diverse community that orients itself around Kashmiriyat. He shows the fragility of social bonds and culture in the face of willful ignorance and violence. Rushdie's

purpose in the novel is to make the readers realize the value of what has been lost and the terror that such losses will continue as long as hatred, revenge, ideology and fanaticism are out of control. Rushdie does not provide any solution or specific form of hope. The novel ends on a cliffhanger, with adversaries poised in darkness, both Shalimar and India waiting for each other to make the next move in the battle that does not promise a solution for ending the chaotic situation. So, terrorism as a tool of resistance can be traced in the novel for release of humiliation, frustration and oppressed feelings. Terrorism has been an unavoidable and ultimate tool to attain recognition, revenge and freedom. The major role and cause for the provocation of violence is played by the arrival Max Ophulus in the Kashmiri village as an ambassador in India and his seduction to Bhooyani on which the whole plot of the novel is knitted. Hence, the major concern of this research study is to explore how the issue of terrorism comes together in the diverse political, social and cultural aspects in the novel.

Chapter Four

Conclusion: Terrorism in Different From: A Case of *Shalimar the Clown* and *The Secret Agent*

In this research, with the perspective of terrorism, *Shalimar the Clown* by Salman Rushdie and *The Secret Agent* by Joseph Conrad are studied. These novels represent different time and space, however, my dissertation has tried to prove how terrorism is directed in both novels. I have also attempted to rationalize the presumption that terrorist activities and violence have been the major tools to achieve the thematic aspects of the novels. Literary rendition of terrorism has been the major concern in both novels and it has been used as a political tool to fight against exploitation, loss of identity and it has also been a tool to avoid humiliation which is especially because of the foreign and political influence. Terrorism has also been an access to purgation in the both novels. Rushdie's novel like that of Conrad, points toward compelling portrait of the condition that give birth to terrorism. A muted sense that arises from the *Shalimar the Clown* is that terrorism is a tool of resistance at the hands of the marginalized. The function of terrorism in the novel serves to introduce only ambiguity about theoretical and artistic explanations for the causes of terrorism. However, in spite of the ambiguity, the text succeeds in implying a pressing demand to fathom the psychological mindset that underlies the use of terrorism as a political tool.

In the novel *Shalimar the Clown*, the brilliant portrayal the tragic history of the Kashmiri village, Pachigam has helped the novelist to achieve his goal of depicting terrorism as a tool to fight against injustice in the hands of he marginalized people. How the peaceful and culturally harmonious relationship among the people in the village is destroyed by the effect of the American influence and how the foreign

influence compelled the people in Kashmir to get involved in terrorist activities is the major concern of this research study. Rushdie, while depicting the characters, also depicts the story of Kashmir, its people, their life, culture and the degeneration of Kashmir as a paradise into Hell. Lamentation for the loss of love, innocence, brotherhood and the raise of terrorism especially because of the foreign influence is also another aspect in the novel. In Rushdie's novel, the culturally harmonious environment gets distorted after the arrival of Max Ophulus as an ambassador in India. After Boonyi leaves him, Shalimar loses his identity in the village. The life of the whole villagers gets affected as Bhoonyi leaves Shalimar and flees with Max. "She was recklessly pouring out Pachigam's supply of good luck while the bad luck accumulated like water behind a dam" (Rushdie, 67). Bhoonyi's betrayal to Shalimar has far-reaching consequences. It changes Shalimar from an earnest idealistic youth into a dark assassin. He kills Bhoonyi and Max Ophulus without remorse. Shalimar also feels humiliated as she leaves him. He leaves the village, joins the Islamic insurgent groups and becomes an assassin. His journey of murder, destruction, and revenge eventually leads him to Los Angeles. He murders Bhoonyi in India and Max Ophulus in the US. He also thinks about murdering India. So, his struggle is all against exploitation, loss of identity, humiliation and betrayal. Not only Shalimar but also the whole villagers lose their identity and feel humiliated after Bhoonyi flees with Max. So, Shalimar's struggle is not confined within himself. His struggle is also the struggle of all the people in Pachigam. At the same time, his activities like murdering of the people are like of a terrorist.

Similarly, in *The Secret Agent*, the Professor, Mr. Verloc, Mrs. Verloc, and Stevie are the major characters who involve in terrorist activities. Their struggle is all against exploitation, humiliation, loss of identity and economic crisis. Among these

characters, Mr. Verloc has been a secret agent working for the Russian embassy for more than ten years. He is guided by Mr. Vladimir, the first secretary of the Russian embassy who explains that Mr. Verloc has been a poor secret agent lately but can redeem himself by blowing up the Greenwich Observatory. Mr. Vladimir threatens Mr. Verloc for not being smart in his job. He even threatens to deduce his salary. His threat is clear: either Verloc agrees to carry out the Greenwich bomb plot or he loses his job. So, it is clear that Mr. Verloc is guided by Mr. Vladimir. Further, Mr. Verloc is the main designer of the bombing outrage at the Greenwich Observatory. He designs it to save his job and to escape from humiliation. The bombing outrage is the result of the excessive domination of Mr. Vladimir, a secretary of the Russian embassy.

Similarly, Mrs. Winnie Verloc is another terrorist character in the novel. She marries Mr. Verloc especially to ascertain good future for her mentally retarded brother Stevie and her mother. She depends on Mr. Verloc to sustain her life economically. As the exploitation of Mr. Verloc to her is unbearable, she involves in terrorist activities. The death of her brother, Stevie, in the bombing outrage designed by Mr. Verloc is unbearable to her. So, she murders Mr. Verloc and ultimately commits suicide. Thus, the over exploitation of Mr. Verloc has made her a terrorist. Her struggle is against the loss of her identity, exploitation and economic crisis.

Similarly, the Professor is another example of terrorist in the novel. In the past, the Professor held a few jobs. He worked as a chemist too but he always thought he was being treated unfairly. "He quarreled with the authorities upon a question of unfair treatment" (Conrad, 69). Because of the social injustice, he left his positions. He is a typical character in the novel. He is a little frail man who is obsessed with explosives. He is crazy and suicidal. He is totally negated by the government.

Through his character, Conrad ironically presents the British government's perspective and treatment to the intellectuals in London in the nineteenth century. The dissatisfaction of the Professor due to the unfair treatment and injustice led him to the path of an anarchist. Conrad uses the tool of irony to reduce terrorism and its practitioners- the anarchists. However, Conrad at places also gives a sense to his readers of the reasons that have compelled them to take terrorism. The injustices and oppressions of the illiberal colonial regime are the major causes to give birth to terrorism. So, the terrorist activities in a sense are the compulsion for the characters in the novels. Such activities give release them from the humiliation, exploitation and inferiority complex. They involve in such activities as their ultimate weapon to fight against their excessive suffering. In the novel, *The Secret Agent*, Mrs. Verloc murders Mr. Verloc after she gets to the conclusion that she could not live with him and also to get rid of excessive exploitation.

Thus, terrorist activities in the novel appear as an agency through which the characters try to create their identity. It may range from individual to collective according to the context in which it appears. The struggle of Shalimar is both for him and for the villagers of the Pachigam but the struggle of the Professor is more or less for himself. Whether it appears individually or collectively, it is a medium to create identity and means to fight against exploitation. It also performs the task of purgatory force which helps to discharge humiliation and frustration accumulated due to the oppressed position. The terrorist activities are targeted against the oppressors.

The purpose of both Conrad and Rushdie is not to glorify and assist the terrorists and their activities but to improve the inhumane behaviour and injustice of the authority prevalent in the contemporary societies then. As a colonial novel, the influence of the foreign power can be observed in *The Secret Agent*. The foreign

power is remarkable to bring chaos in the people in society. Mr. Vladimir, the first secretary of the embassy, circulates a series of insults to persuade Mr. Verloc that he is in imminent danger of losing his long-lasting and profitable position as an agent provocateur. Mr. Vladimir threatens Mr. Verloc for not being smart in his job. He even threatens to deduce his salary. As a result, Mr. Verloc plans for the explosion in the Greenwich Observatory. Indirectly, Mr. Vladimir is responsible for Mr. Verloc's murder, Stevie's death and Mrs. Verloc's suicide. Similar is the case in the novel *Shalimar the Clown*. The influence of foreign power has created chaos in the life of the protagonists: Shalimar and Bhoonyi and also in the people in Pachigam. Max Ophuls, an American ambassador to India, is responsible to bring such chaos in the people and society.

Bhoonyi leaves Shalimar and flees with Max. Then, Shalimar leaves the village, joins the Islamic insurgent groups and becomes an assassinator and kills Bhoonyi and Max. After the arrival of Max Ophuls, the culturally harmonious environment in Pachigam gets distorted. The people in the village cannot be reunited as before. The oppression and its effects in the context of Kashmiri village are so harsh that the people from the Muslim and the Hindu community cannot be reunited and maintain the harmonious relation like before. They cannot organize them against the oppressive character Max Ophuls.

So, the purpose of the both novelists in the novels is to oppose such foreign influence and at the same time to maintain justice in the society. The novelists warn the authority that the people can be compelled even to be terrorists and even give up their life like Mrs. Winnie in *The Secret Agent*, and they can even take others life like Shalimar in the novel *Shalimar the Clown* than to bear injustice in the society. So, terrorism and terrorist activities in a deeper level in the novels function as a way to

release humiliation, oppressed feelings and inferiority complex of the characters. It creates purgatory effect to supersede psychological inferiority of the oppressed characters. Terrorism is considered as the ultimate liberating force from the social injustice for the major characters in the novel.

Works Cited

- Anker, Elizabeth S. "World Literature, Narrative Ethics, and the Discourse of Human Rights: A Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Virginia in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy". University of Virginia, (January, 2007).
- Azzam, Julie Hakim. "The Alien Within: Postcolonial Gothic and the Politics of Home." A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Arts and Sciences in Partial Fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy in English. University of Pittsburgh, 2007.
- Black, Donald. "The Geometry of Terrorism". *Sociological Theory*. 1307 New York Avenue NW, Washington 22.1 (2004): 15-25. Web. 2 Dec. 2014
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphor*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Cole, Sarah. "Dynamite Violence and Literary Culture." *Modernism/Modernity*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 16.2 (April 2009): 301-328.
- Epstein, Hugh. "The Fitness of Things: Conrad's English Irony in *Typhoon* and *The Secret Agent*". *The Conradian*. Joseph Conrad Society UK, 33.1 (Spring, 2008): 1-30.
- Fernandez-Kelly, Patricia. "On *Shalimar the Clown*, *Sociological Forum*." Wiley, 24.2 (January, 2009): 471-474.
- Houen, Alex. "*The Secret Agent*: Anarchism and the Thermodynamics of Law". The Johns Hopkins University Press, 65.4 (Winter,1998): 995-1016.
- - -. *Terrorism and Modern Literature; From Joseph Conrad to Ciaran Carson*: Great Clarendon Street: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Jackson, Richard, Maries Breen Smyth and Jeroen, "Gunning", Eds. *Critical*

- Terrorism Studies, A New Research Agenda.* London and New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2009.
- Lawrence, John. "Violence". *Social Theory and Practice* 1.2 (1970): 31-49. Web. 20 Aug. 2014.
- Microsoft Encarta Dictionaries. 2009 [DVD]. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation, 2008.
- Mishra, Bijaya and Bob H., "What was Postcolonialism?" in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphor*. Elleke Boehmer Rushdie, Nework: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Mitchell, Scott. "The Sweet Touch": Alienation and Physical Connection in the Works of Michael Ondaatje, Shyam Selvadurai, and Salman Rushdie, A Dissertation Submitted to University of Missouri-Columbia, 2010.
- Morton, Stephen. *Textual Practice*. Taylor and Francis Group, 22.2 (2008): 337-355.
- Pitkin, Annabella. "Salman Rushdie Losses His Cheerfullness: Geopolitics, Terrorism and Adultery". *Journal of International Affairs*. The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York, 61.1 (2007): 257-262.
- Salman, Rushdie. *Shalimar the Clown*. London: Vintage Books, 2006.
- Schmid, Alex P. Ed. *The Routledge Handbook of Terrorism Research*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2011.
- Singh, Saurabh Kumar. "Salman Rushdie's *Salimar the Clown*: Tragic Tale of a Smashed World." *Lapis Lazuli: An International Literary Journal*. ISSN 2249-4529, 2.1 (Spring, 2012): 1-10
- Skinner, Stephen. "A Benevolent Institution for the Suppression of Evil: Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Agent* and the Limits of Policing". *Journal of Law and Society*. ISSAN, 30 (September 2003):420-40.

Soanes, Cathroine with Sara Hawker and Julia Elliott. Eds. *New Pocket Oxford English Dictionary*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, YMCA Libra Building, 2005: 945.

www.complete-review.com/review/rushdie/salimar.

www.nytimes.com/2005/10/23.

www.salman-rushdie.com.

www.studymode.com.