

TRANSCULTURAL HOSPITALITY IN POSTCOLONIAL DIASPORIC 9/11 NOVELS

A Dissertation

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

ENGLISH

By

DADHI RAM PANTHI

PhD Regd. No. 34/2073, Magh

Kathmandu, Nepal

August 2023

**LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION**

We certify that this dissertation entitled “**Transcultural Hospitality in Postcolonial Diasporic 9/11 Novels**” was prepared by Dadhi Ram Panthi under our guidance. We hereby recommend this dissertation for final examinations by the Research committee of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University, in fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in ENGLISH.

.....

Prof. Beerendra Pandey (Ph.D.)

Supervisor

.....

Associate Prof. Sharad Chandra Thakur (Ph. D.)

Co-supervisor

August 2023

## APPROVAL LETTER

This dissertation entitled “**TRANSCULTURAL HOSPITALITY IN POSTCOLONIAL DIASPORIC 9/11 NOVELS**” was submitted by Mr. Dadhi Ram Panthi for final examination to the Research Committee of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University, in fulfillment of the requirements for the **Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English**. I hereby, certify that the Research Committee of the faculty has found this dissertation satisfactory in scope and quality and has therefore been accepted it for the degree.

.....

Prof. Kushum Shakya, PhD

Dean and Chairperson

Research Committee

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,

Tribhuvan University, Nepal

## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this Ph.D. dissertation entitled “**TRANSCULTURAL HOSPITALITY IN POSTCOLONIAL DIASPORIC 9/11 NOVELS**” which I have submitted to the office of the Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University (TU), is entirely my original work prepared under the supervision of my supervisor and co-supervisor. The ideas and information borrowed from different sources in the course of writing this dissertation are duly acknowledged and credited. I would also declare that no part of the contents of this research has ever been published in any form before. I shall be solely responsible for any unethical evidences found against my declaration. I would assure you that the research has been prepared following academic principles and research ethics.

.....

Dadhi Ram Panthi,

Tribhuvan University

August 2023

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have come in the present shape without the guidance, encouragement, and support from many scholars, friends and relatives.

First of all, I must thank my supervisor Prof. Dr. Beerendra Pandey for his continuous support, encouragement, inspiration, and valuable guidance as overall examiner. He used his every effort to make me familiarize with the issue of transcultural hospitality and its application to the analysis of selected primary texts right from the beginning. Similarly, I would like to thank my co-supervisor, Associate Prof. Dr. Sharad Chandra Thakur for his academic guidance both in mechanics and content not only as co-supervisor but also as previous examiner. I am also grateful to Prof. Dr. Dhruva Bahadur Karki whose feedbacks and suggestions as a reviewer and previous examiner became a great support in improving the dissertation. Dr. Karki's insights drawn from International Conference (held in 2022, at CDE, TU) as presenter and convenor encouraged me a lot in strengthening my dissertation. I am equally thankful to Associate Prof. Dr. Rejendra Chapagain of Saraswati Multiple Campus whose overall observation and constructive feedbacks as another reviewer helped me to strengthen the issue of transcultural hospitality.

I am equally grateful to Prof. Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, Prof. Dr. Anirudra Thapa, Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Prof. Dr. Ramchandra Poudel from whom I have been inspired from their Mphil classes. Their valuable suggestions and encouragements helped me a lot in avoiding plagiarism and finalizing topic of this dissertation. Prof. Dr. Jiblal Sapkota, the Head of Central Department of English was the key scholar who inspired me to do PhD. from Nepal and encouraged me accordingly. I am always thankful to him for his hospitable guidance, encouragement and support as mentor and previous examiner. Likewise, I would like to thank

Prof. Dr. Shreedhar Lohani and Prof. Dr. Arun Gupto for their valuable time in improving the dissertation. Associate Prof. Dr. Anju Gupta's support as mentor and previva expert from CDE, T.U remained ever inspiring. I would like to thank her and I am also in-debted to her. I would like to thank the whole team of Central Department of English both faculties and staffs whose positive vibe became the key source of my dissertation. I am equally thankful to ever dedicated, sincere and responsible faculties and staffs of Dean's office, T.U. Prof. Dr. Kushum Shakya, the Dean and the chair of Research Committee and Prof. Dr. Dubi Nanda Dhakal, Assistant Dean (PhD Section) are the key sources of inspiration during my PhD dissertation. I feel proud to find Prof. Dr. Dubi Nanda Dhakal as previva examiner as well. Similarly, I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Tara Prasad Bhusal (Assistant Dean, Examination Section), Dr. Govinda Prasad Sharma (Assistant Dean, Administration Section) and Dr. Chiranjivi Acharya (Assistant Dean, BCA Section) and the entire team who played positive role in order to strengthen my dissertation. My special thanks go to Vijay Ghimire, Samrit Tandukar and Anita Khanal for providing friendly environment and sharing updates of my dissertation as Dean's staffs. I would highly appreciate the active presence and support of scholars of various disciplines and positions in my final viva defence including internal examiners and reviewers Prof. Dr. Dhruva Karki and Associate Prof. Dr. Rajendra Chapagain, previva expert Associate Prof. Dr. Anju Gupta, HOD of Central Department of English Prof. Dr. Jiblal Sapkota, former HOD of Central Department of International Relations, Prof. Dr. Khadga K.C., HOD of Central Department of Gender Studies, Prof. Dr. Bindu Pokharel, former Dean Dr. Bhim Raj Suwal representing Central Department of Population Studies, HOD of Central Department of Nepali Prof. Dr. Khagendra Luitel, the external viva examiners Prof. Dr. Abhi Subedi and Prof. Dr. Shreedhar Gautam, the dissertation co-supervisor Associate Prof. Dr. Sharad Chandra Thakur, the dissertation supervisor Prof. Dr. Beerendra Pandey, Dean of Humanities and

Social Sciences Prof. Dr. Kushum Shakya, Assistant Dean Prof. Dr. Dubi Nanda Dhakal, the Rector of TU Dr. Shivalal Bhusal and many more without whose encouragement the dissertation would not come in present shape. I am highly thankful to them all. Therefore, I should proudly claim that Dean's Office has been the centre for hospitality for the novice researchers like me. Thus, I always feel proud of the whole team or members of Dean's Office of Humanities and Social Sciences, TU whose encouraging insights became a mile stone for my dissertation from their frequent guidance and support.

I would also like to acknowledge the official and academic support from Pashupati Multiple Campus, Chabahil and Mahendra Ratna Campus, Tahachal during draft preparation of my research. I would like to thank the entire teams of both institutions. Similarly, Social Science Baha, T.U. Central Library and American Library became the key learning destinations while preparing my dissertation. I am very much thankful to the entire members of them all. I am also thankful to the entire team of UGC (University Grant Commission) of Nepal for providing me the insight of dispassion as well as financial support for dissertation binding and typing.

Last but not the least, this dissertation would not have come in the present form had I not got physical, emotional as well as economic support from my family, relatives and friends. Among them, I would like to thank my Father Tulsi Ram Panthi though he may be unnoticed about my research, mother Tika Panthi ever encouraging one, uncle Lalmani Panthi, brothers Top Lal Panthi, Meghnath Panthi, Punaram Panthi, Humlal Panthi, Gopal Panthi, Tara Prasad Panthi, Netra Prasad Panthi and their entire families whose financial as well as emotional support remained incomparable. My wife Mina Pandey and her support became conclusive from the beginning to the end. My lovely daughter Eshana Panthi and little son Evaan Panthi remained key inspiring sources. My lovely sister Pabitra Panthi, brother-in-law Shyam Dahal and his entire family, Father- in – law

Prof. Umanath Pandey, mother-in-law Uma Pandey, brother Dr. Rajesh Panthi, sister-in-law Mira Pandey, and entire family, Susma Pandey, Bishnu Bhusal and entire family, Susma Poudel, Rabin Pandey, Nabin Pandey, father-in-law Tamlal Pandey, brother Shiva Pandey and the entire family members were always with me for inspiring directly and indirectly. Finally, I would like to thank my friends, colleagues, seniors and juniors former Campus Chiefs of PMC Bishnu Prasad Panta and Prayag Raj Bhattarai, Assistant Campus chiefs Chandra Panta, Phanindra Acharya, Kalyan Dahal, Campus Chief of PMC Binod Panta, my colleagues and teachers Prakash Bikram Raut, Parban Bhattarai, Pranab Bhattarai, Maniratna Parajuli, Birendra Dahal, Gobinda Dhungana, Bishnu Basnet, Bishnu Sapkota, Harihar Chapagain, Dr. Bishnu Kumar Khatri, Dr. Ganesh Adhikari, Rama Dutta Panta, Rama Adhikari, Suman Ghimire, Mandira Kafle, Ramma K.C., Shanti Risal, Tankamaya Pokhrel, Laxman Adhikari, Achyut Dahal, Ram K.C., Kamal Rai, Ghanashyam Raj Kafle, Surendra Dhital, campus chief of MRC Gehendra Dahal, former Campus chief of MRC Krishna Dhakal, English Lecturers of MRC Prof. Dr. Rishi Rijal, Gobinda Katwal, Dr. Shiva Ram Pandey, Dr. Balaram Adhikari and my ever inspiring landlords Basu Pandey and Parbin Neupane and their entire families. I would like to thank them all who supported me directly or indirectly.

Dadhi Ram Panthi



## ABSTRACT

Postcolonial diasporic novels on the subject of 9/11 have come up in response to the novels on the events of September 11, 2001 by the mainstream white American writers. Instead of addressing the trauma of the victims, the white American writers, as the review of the critical responses to their literature (in chapter 2) shows, engage in profiling Muslims and other immigrants as terrorists. Monica Ali's *Brick Lane* (2003), Hari Kunzru's *Transmission* (2004), Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) and Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007) respond to the prose of profiling them through an emphasis on transcultural hospitality. This research critically engages with postcolonial response to 9/11. The postcolonial diasporic novels present a counter-discourse to the profiling of Muslims as terrorists. This study assumes that a new post-9/11 ethics, which emphasizes on transcultural hospitality, comes out as an anti-dote to the discourse of Muslims profiling. In other words, the dissertation has attempted to explore how postcolonial, diasporic 9/11 novels embrace the ethics of transculturalism. Such ethics in the selected novels, as the dissertation shows, comes out as a striking counter to the discourse of cultural trauma in the mainstream American fictional representations of 9/11. However, cultural trauma is not the focus of this research. Discussion of cultural trauma is limited to the review of the mainstream writings on 9/11.

The dissertation incorporates various scholarly reviews made on 9/11 writings, and also on trauma and violence based on 9/11 literature. The objectives are threefold: first to show, through the review of literature, how us versus them binary has been found to have contaminated 9/11 trauma discourse in the mainstream American literature; second to explore, through comprehensive analysis of the aforesaid novels, how South Asian diasporic postcolonial novels subvert the

language of otherness; and third to argue that these texts, instead, stress on transcultural living and hospitality to the other.

The dissertation has been organized in eight chapters. While the first chapter introduces issues, areas of the research in order to build up major argument and design of the dissertation; the second chapter surveys of previous scholarships based on the review of the literature on 9/11. And the third chapter analyzes relevant theories essential for textual analysis. The fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh chapters focus on textual analysis of Ali's *Brick Lane*, Kunzru's *Transmission*, Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*, and Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* respectively. Finally, the eighth chapter incorporates four novels' reflection placing the selected novels in reverse order first. Second, it highlights significance of proven facts in normal order. Third, it connects primary texts with methodology placing primary texts again in reverse order. Fourth, it specifies the findings based on set objectives. Fifth, it focuses on contribution to new knowledge along with research gap and also specifies limitation, and sixth, it ends with recommendations for further research.

An application of the theoretical framework of transcultural hospitality to the above novels reveal their understanding of shared intimacy, new world order of glocalization, and end of both racial stereotyping and fakeness. Through these novels, these four writers condemn conditional hospitality of the westerners, uncanny exposition of the so-called globalism, and multiculturalism. They also expose western world's fakeness and its transmission through media, vulnerable positioning of autoimmunity and deep-seated racism

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION</b>	ii
<b>APPROVAL LETTER</b>	iii
<b>DECLARATION</b>	iv
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	v- viii
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	ix-x
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	xi-xiii
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	xiv
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO POSTCOLONIAL 9/11 FICTION: DESIGN OF THE DISSERTATION</b>	<b>1-14</b>
Introducing the Issue	1
Background	1
Postcolonial 9/11 Fiction	5
Research Questions	8
Major Argument	8
Objectives of the Argument	10
Method of Research	10
Chapter Summaries	13
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW ON TRANSCULTURAL HOSPITALITY IN POSTCOLONIAL DIASPORIC 9/11 NOVELS</b>	<b>15 - 87</b>
Introduction	15
Review on 9/11 Terrorism Discourse in General Critical Writings	15
Review on 9/11 Trauma Discourse in General Critical Writings	22

Review on Selected Novels and 9/11 Literature in Miscellaneous Scholarly Journals	34
Review on Selected Texts and 9/11 Literature in the texts published from the Western World	60
<b>CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE RESEARCH</b>	<b>88- 127</b>
Introduction	88
Transculturalism and Transcultural Identity	90
Unconditional Hospitality	93
Ethical Hospitality	99
Postcolonial Hospitality	102
Transcultural Embrace and Intercultural Identity	109
Glocalization, Diasporic Identity and Transnational Identity	116
Critiquing Globalization and Western Hospitality	118
<b>CHAPTER FOUR</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>RESISTING RACIAL STEREOTYPING IN MONICA ALI'S <i>BRICK LANE</i></b>	<b>128- 165</b>
<b>CHAPTER FIVE</b>	<b>166</b>
<b>TRANSCULTURAL HOSPITALITY IN HARI KUNZRU'S <i>TRANSMISSION</i></b>	<b>167- 200</b>
<b>CHAPTER SIX</b>	<b>201</b>
<b>HOSPITALITY IN SALMAN RUSHDIE'S <i>SHALIMAR THE CLOWN</i></b>	<b>201- 250</b>
<b>CHAPTER SEVEN</b>	<b>251</b>
<b>ENVISIONING TRANSCULTURAL HOSPITALITY IN MOHSIN HAMID'S <i>THE RELUCTANT FUNDAMENTALIST</i></b>	<b>251- 273</b>

**CHAPTER EIGHT**

**274**

**CONCLUSION: CRITIQUE OF TRANSCULTURAL HOSPITALITY IN POST 9/11**

**FICTION**

**274- 280**

**WORKS CITED**

**281- 29**

## **List of Abbreviations**

AIDS- Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome

BBC- The British Broadcasting Corporation

CNN- Cable News Network, Inc.

FBI- Federal Bureau of Investigation

HIV- Human immunodeficiency virus

H-1B- Temporary (nonimmigrant) Visa Category

IMF- International Monetary Fund

ISIS- Islamic State of Iraq and Syria

MDMA- Methylenedioxymethamphetamine, commonly known as ecstasy or molly, is a psychoactive drug primarily used for recreational purposes

NOIT- National Institute of Information Technology

N2L2- Naughty, Naughty, Lovely, Lovely

Qtd- Quoted

STEM- Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics

9/11- September 11, 2001

**CHAPTER ONE**  
**INTRODUCTION TO POSTCOLONIAL 9/11 FICTION: DESIGN OF THE**  
**DISSERTATION**

**Introducing the Issue**

The main issue or subject of the research is transcultural hospitality, the notion of embracing all rather than stereotyping which is developed through the dissertation as a new phrase embedding the element of transculture, a way of self-transformation rather merely being aware of one's own culture and the element of unconditional hospitality, the hospitality of visitation in the context of global immigration based on host-guest relation. The western world's hosting of South Asian immigrants, mainly the Muslims as guests has been problematic in post 9/11 phase which is depicted through fictions and novels written by mainstream American writers; however, the focus of the dissertation is interrogation of stereotypical fiction writing trend and othering the differences. Instead, the dissertation calls for developing hospitable trend in fiction writing in the line of embracing all as fictionally recommended by the selected primary texts or novels of Postcolonial South Asian diaspora -- Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*, Hari Kunzru's *Transmission*, Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* and Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*.

**Background**

Nine Eleven (9/11) refers to the September 11, 2001, attacks on the twin towers of New York's World Trade Center and Pentagon. Four hijacked planes were crashed into these locations causing the death of nearly 3000 people. The fictional responses to the event of 9/11 by American writers began to arise rapidly from the immediate aftermath of 9/11. However, their responses came in the light of binary opposition imagining the Americans as "Us" and the

Muslims as “them” or “other.” Most of these responses, according to the critic Richard Gray, do not succeed in interrogating the trauma of 9/11:

What is a problem [...] is that this – the game as sanctuary, the willing suspension of disbelief – adds next to nothing to our understanding of the trauma at the heart of the action. In fact, it evades that trauma, it suppresses its urgency and disguises its difference by inserting it in a series of familiar tropes. (28)

Gray makes this argument with reference to works like Don DeLillo’s *Falling Man* (2007), Claire Messud’s *The Emperor’s Children* (2006), Ken Kalfus’s *A Disorder Peculiar to the Country* (2005) and Cormac McCarthy’s *The Road* (2006). Mita Banerjee accuses John Updike’s 2006 novel on 9/11—*Terrorist*—of “racial profiling” (19). Critical consensus on 9/11 novels by Mainstream white American writers seems to be that white American writers are not free from the language of the racial profiling of Muslims. Similar tone can be found in other 9/11 novels like -- Frederic Beigbeder’s *Window on the World* (2003), McEwan’s *Saturday* (2005), Lynne Sharon Schwartz’s *The Writing on the Wall* (2005), Jonathan Safran’s *Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close* (2005), Jay McInerney’s *The Good Life* (2006), Alexie Sherman’s *Flight* (2007), Joseph O’ Neill’s *Netherland* (2008), Amy Waldman’s *The Submission* (2011), Jonathan Franzen’s *Freedom* (2010), Adam Haslett’s *Union Atlantic* (2009) and many more.

In *Windows on the World* (2003), the French author Frederic Beigbeder imagines the world which is beyond comprehension even for the Americans. In this novel, two small sons are having breakfast with their father sitting in the restaurant named Windows on the World on the 107<sup>th</sup> floor of the World Trade Center in the morning of the September 11 attacks. After the attack, their existence remains there no more. The British author McEwan’s *Saturday* (2005) is a novel based on fate. It is written against America’s 2003 invasion of Iraq. The novel presents



modern life as an illusion. Here, a neurosurgeon Henry Perowne and his wife are shown living the life of illusion. Lynne Sharon Schwartz's *The Writing on the Wall* (2005) presents the protagonist Renata who suffers a lot by the frequent occurrences of unexpected events in her life creating uncertainties ahead. Jonathan Safran's novel *Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close* (2005) is narrated by Oskar Schell, a nine year old son who has discovered his father's key after he dies in 9/11 attack. He desires to see the world untold so far by his father and wants to get new information. Jay McInerney's *The Good Life* (2006) is the novel that tells to reexamine who we are and to re-evaluate our activities. The novel is written dismantling the trend of Bildungsroman. Ken Kalfus's novel *A Disorder Peculiar to the Country* (2006) is taken as a black comedy in which a couple's divorce looks further complicated by 9/11 attack. Claire Messud's *The Emperor Children* (2006) is a novel by American author in which three friends from wealthy family background live and struggle in Manhattan for survival. John Updikes's *Terrorist* (2006) came stereotyping the Muslims. Here, Ahmad has been presented as a terrorist. Ahmad's mother Teresa Mulloy has been sexually abused by Jack Levy, an American white. Jack Levy's affair with Teresa has been taken positively but Ahmad's flirt with Joryleen, the girlfriend of Tylenol is taken negatively. As a result, Ahmad has to fight with Tylenol as he is accused of flirting with Joryleen though he is innocent. Ahmad controls his sexual passion following the religious principle of Islam and protects his chastity. Furthermore, Ahmad is presented in the role of truck driver. He is assigned such role with the aim of developing skills or strategies to act as terrorist. *The Road* (2006) also represents Muslims or others as stereotypical way, instead of embracing the differences. *The Road* is the literary piece of Post – Apocalypse or the novel of post 9/11. The novel presents Muslims and the strangers as terrorists or cannibals and white Americans pure as God. Here, a family suffers from terrorism. Their son is protected

by a new family. The new family's unexpected appearance is taken as the presence of God or Jesus Christ. Although the novel does not explicitly mention who the terrorists are and who the cannibals are. However, it can be easily assumed that the terrorists are the Muslim hijackers of 9/11. In this way, the issue has been presented in such a way that only Muslims are to be blamed for the loss and creating the world of cannibalism. Don DeLillo's *Falling Man* (2007) clearly illustrates stereotypical representation of Muslims, East and Arab. Such stereotype is shown through the role of Muslim and non-Muslim characters. For instance, Amir and Hammad have been presented here as terrorists or hijackers. In contrast, Keith Neudecker, his ex-wife Lianne and their son Justin are shown being traumatized. Similarly, Alexie Sherman's *Flight* (2007) explores the idea of how American exceptionalism has been functioning in America in post-9/11 phase. The major character Zits (Michael) has been presented here as a terrorist. He is brought up in a foster home. He revolts against foster mother's injustice and runs away from there. He is arrested and kept in prison. There he makes friendship with Justice. As both are released from there, they take training of shooting people. Zits attempts to attack in a bank as terrorist. After that he has been transformed in various identities. He is transformed from Zits (Michael) to FBI agent Hank Storm, from Hank storm into Indian boy; from Indian boy to Gus or Indian Tracker; from Gus to Jimmy (pilot); from pilot to his own father and from his own father to his own body. His mother is already dead who is Irish. Zits is 6 years old at that time. In this novel, Zits represents a true voice of the Indians. Joseph O' Neill's *Netherland* (2008) interrogates both American dreamers and America as a dream land. Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011) is about blind contest in which a Muslim architect Mohammad Khan is made winner. This contest is designed to demoralize the Muslims rather than becoming friendly to them. Jonathan Franzen's *Freedom* (2010) presents a Midwestern Suburban family in which parents and children

both are shown losing track. Adam Haslett's *Union Atlantic* (2009) is the novel of violent vision in which two dogs are made to speak to each other.

The above 9/11 novels, with some exceptions, are taken as the novels of the discourse of American exceptionalism, presenting American themselves pure and all others including the Muslims impure. This is done by employing the feature of the binary logic of us versus them. Richard Gray in *After the Fall: American Literature Since 9/11* (2011) argues that 9/11 American literature dramatizes the features of the "failure of language" and logic both after the fall of Twin Towers in America on 11 September, 2001. He further claims, "The event of September 11, 2001 opened up a ... bitter debate between writers of the First and Third Worlds" (85). It clearly proves that 9/11 American fictions create a bigger gap between the First and Third World rather than minimizing the differences.

### **Postcolonial 9/11 Fiction**

Postcolonial writers, writing on the same event of 9/11, take a different line of representation. While capturing the specificity of the violence and the trauma, they stress on multicultural living in their writings. Their writing interrogates "US foreign policy" and its negative impact "in South Asia from the Bretton Woods Agreement to the US-led war in Afghanistan" (Morton 337). In other words, since the Bretton Woods agreement of 1940s for valuing and exchanging gold with US dollar, to the the collapse of Bretton woods agreement of 1970s and birth of IMF (International Monetary Fund) and World Bank, and to the Us led *War on Terror*, American foreign policy became evil for the nations like Afghanistan and Iraq. For instance, Kiran Desai's *Inheritance of Loss* (2006), Hisham Matar's *In the Country of Men* (2006) posit the audiences in aesthetic engagement without blaming others or without blaming and generalizing the Americans as terrorists. They treat neither the Muslims nor the American

whites terrorists. In Kiran Desai's novel, a cook's son Biju returns in his home land India from America as he has been mistreated by Saeed, a Pakistani man. He searches so many other job alternatives in spite of his illegal status. Finally, he decides to return to India. The good aspect of the novel is that it presents no characters in stereotypical way. Hisham Matar's *In the Country of Men* (2006) depicts the pain and trauma of the people of Libya during the rule of Gaddafi, a totalitarian ruler rather than stereotyping the American whites. The novel is narrated by a 9 year old child Suleiman. The novelist has been able to show the change of Libya before 9/11 and in post 9/11 without blaming the white Americans terrorists although Gaddafi was killed by them. The common understanding or the existing scholarship of South Asian Diasporic writers on 9/11 is that they find death of reason or death of logic in 9/11 fictions written by the Americans. In other words, South Asian Diasporic writers' novelistic response seems to be the quest for transcultural living whereas the white American mainstream writers on 9/11 merely condemn and stereotype the Muslims and others as terrorists. The selected novels have been analyzed through different angles such as- migrants and their struggle, gender and sexuality, shifting identity, allegory of 9/11, aesthetic engagement and critique of current condition, changing western public perception of Pakistan, Bangladesh and India , 9/11 discourse, a depiction of failure of hospitality from the western world, critique of global fiction, postcolonial 9/11 fictions as contemporary dramatic monologue, subversion of migrant demonization, racial melancholia and interracial relationship, Muslim and American fundamentalism, resistance of war on terror, challenge against orthodoxy of post 9/11 novel, multiculturalism debate, challenge against binary logic of us versus them and so on. However, their analyses still lack the quest for transcultural home and transcultural hospitality so far. This dissertation is an attempt to fill this gap.

The selected novels Ali's *Brick Lane*, Kunzru's *Transmission*, Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* and Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* are the novels of diasporic nature. Ali has written in the context of how Bangladeshi immigrants are stereotyped in multicultural London. She shows family fragmentation and alienation among the Muslim immigrants due to racism. As a diasporic writer, she writes from London although her origin is Bangladesh. Kunzru, as a diasporic writer born in India, writes resisting fakeness created by America in the name of so-called globalization and multiculturalism. For him, so much fakeness is made in the process of working visa as a skilled worker in America. So many Indian immigrants, though having various skills, have been undermined just like Arjun Mehta, the protagonist in this novel. He shows Indians themselves are not terrorists. Rather they are compelled to look like terrorists because of being stereotyped. Salman Rushdie, as a diasporic writer, also writes about the loss of paradise of Kashmir for characters staying abroad. His transnational imagination is clearly shown through his embrace of Kashmir in order to achieve the goal that true globalization begins from below not from above. For him, true globalization should be renamed as glocalization both in form and content. Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* has been written to prove that America is a failure both in being true host and guest in globalized world. As a diasporic writer born in Pakistan, Hamid resists the notion of overgeneralization of the Pakistani Muslim immigrants as terrorists. The immigrants are stereotyped in spite of being highly qualified.

Footnoting on the grounding of transnational 9/11 novels, the postcolonial critic Daniel O'Gorman in *Fictions of the War on Terror: Difference and the Transnational 9/11 Novel* (2015) argues, "The ambivalence with which the novels approach the task of representing ... undercuts the 'us and them' binaries propagated in global framings of the war on terror" (114). It clearly

proves that the selected novels of South Asian Diaspora explore the theme of transcultural living because they focus on dismantling the binaries of us versus them.

### **Research Questions**

The dissertation has tried to answer the following questions:

1. Why is transcultural hospitality a major topic in diasporic postcolonial writings?
2. How has the topic been rendered into a dominant theme in a strategic manner?
3. What is the cultural-political purpose behind the strategy?
4. How does the strategic purpose come out as a counter-discourse?
5. How does the counter-discourse expose the limitations and fault-lines of the so-called multicultural America and / or the West?

### **Major Argument**

On the basis of selected novels, that is, Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*, Hari Kunzru's *Transmission*, Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* and Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, the dissertation focuses on the theme of transcultural hospitality which, it is argued, works as a counter-discourse to the mainstream fictional responses to the events of 9/11. The mainstream white Americans' fictional renditions of the trauma of 9/11, as the second chapter on literature review shows, is located from cultural trauma which uses considerable amount of the prose of otherness against the Muslim immigrants in America. The analysis proves that the selected novels expose the cultural traumas stemming from 9/11 events. The Americans come out as being trapped in the discourse of cultural trauma, away from which, the selected postcolonial novels project a transcultural living. This transcultural living stresses on the necessity of human interactions even after the communal chasm brought into the fore by the terrorist attacks. The analysis also shows that the discussed novels underscore the need to

embrace the “Other” and to appreciate difference -- only whereby a truly multicultural society, which America claims, it is, can be secured.

The prose of otherness which the novels under discussion foreground, helps towards making a case for postcolonial hospitality and transcultural living. This dissertation, which takes the selected postcolonial writings -- *Brick Lane*, *Transmission*, *Shalimar the Clown* and *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* -- as a counterdiscourse to the profiling of Muslims, argues that these texts maintain their positioning as write-ups on transcultural living. The thrust is on embracing the difference in multicultural America. Their prose is largely free from the notion of otherness and politics of profiling the Muslims as terrorists. The common feature among these four writers -- Ali, Kunzru, Rushdie and Hamid -- is that they all live in diasporic locations. As postcolonial writers, their works reveal a striking resistance to the undertones in Europeans’ and Americans’ fictional responses to 9/11 against transcultural living, particularly with reference to the immigrants from the third world. In their writings, emphases on transcultural living and the need for a true multicultural society become conspicuous. They harp on the need for an ambiance of transcultural hospitality in post 9/11 situation for an openness to difference and an end to the tendency towards the use of the prose of otherness. The argument of transcultural hospitality looks valid because its essence emerges from theoretical insights regarding hospitality and transcultural living as discussed in methodology section below. Their focus on unconditional hospitality, ethicality, mutual metamorphosis, life of inter-tribal pact and positive embrace help for living quality life with absolute welcoming of the differences dismantling the notion of otherness.

## Objectives of the Argument

The dissertation seeks to meet the following objectives in an effort to prove the main argument given above. The dissertation sets three main objectives in order to achieve the goal of transcultural hospitality which are as follows:-

- a. To show, through the review of literature, how us versus them binary has been found to have contaminated 9/11 trauma discourse in the mainstream American literature;
- b. To explore, through comprehensive analysis of the aforesaid novels, how South Asian diasporic postcolonial novels subvert the language of otherness;
- c. To argue that these texts, instead, stress on transcultural living and hospitality to the other.

By showing the fructification of objectives in the analysis of the selected texts, the dissertation tries to make the major aforementioned objectives look plausible.

## Method of Research

The method of research is basically textual analysis. Each of the chapters of the primary texts analyzes such textualities which yield meaning about hospitality, its antonym and transculturalism. For example, the chapter on Ali's *Brick Lane* focuses on the language of inhospitality used for two generations of Bangladeshi immigrants in Britain and the language of resistance against the inhospitable treatment by the second generation. Similarly, the next chapter on Kunzru's *Transmission* places the spotlight on the novelist's expose of the insubstantial hype of multicultural living in America and his implicit call for transcultural hospitality. The Chapter on *Shalimar the Clown*, however, dramatizes the inhospitable nature of the so-called multicultural American society through an analysis of character contrast between a subaltern from the third world and an elite from the first world. Finally, the chapter on Hamid's *The*



*Reluctant Fundamentalist* places the spotlight on the novelist's language of criticism directed at the stereotypical representation of the Pakistani Muslim immigrants in America.

The textual analysis follows deconstructive mode of hermeneutic interpretive angles of cultural theories of Mikhail Epstein's transculturalism and transcultural identity, Jacques Derrida's unconditional hospitality, Immanuel Levinas's ethical hospitality, Mireille Rosello's postcolonial hospitality, Dunja M. Mohr's transcultural embrace, Bernard Waldenfel's intercultural identity, Victor Roudometof's glocalization, Stuart Hall's metamorphic identity of diaspora, Jennifer M. Brinkerhoff's transnational identity and digital Diasporas. The analysis is further supported by the critical insights drawn from various critics of globalization. Such a design of the method of research is in line with the qualitative research methodology which requires the use of theories. The three major theories of transculturalism, unconditional hospitality, transcultural embrace along with other theories outlined above and briefly discussed below are intended to lend interpretive muscle to textual analysis which is the standard method in research in literature.

First, transculturalism has been defined as the essential component of transcultural living. According to Mikhail Epstein transculture refers to the liberation and self-transformation from culturology. A rule of thumb is applied to a truly transcultural individual. Second, Hospitality generally consists of conditional hospitality and unconditional hospitality. According to Derrida conditional hospitality is the hospitality of invitation whereas unconditional hospitality is the hospitality of visitation. Third, Immanuel Levinas, however, prefers ethical hospitality where sincerity and responsibility both in host and guest are required. Fourth, Mireille Rosello argues that hospitality is the matter of mutual metamorphosis where hosts and guests should show readiness to transform them. For that, "cannibalism" and "generosity" must be avoided either

from the side of the guests or of the hosts (Rosello 175). She also believes that western world is not still free from conditional hospitality. She observes that immigrants in the western world have been treated as neo- slaves. For instance, Muslim immigrants have been stereotyped by passing “Pasqua laws” from the parliament in France (Rosello 7). Rosello further argues “We are all hybrids” in the world of globalization, therefore we need “Cross-hospitality”, which is “ethically encoded” (62- 67). It shows Rosello’s ideas of hospitality function as the foundations of transcultural hospitality. Fifth, Dunja M. Mohr interrogates western world’s “Xenophobia”, fear of strangers and “Xenophilia”, fear of eroticism (X). In order to embrace the Other, there must be “recognition and acceptance in terms of equality and ... mutual openness” (X). Without developing the ethics of mutual openness, the differences are always stereotyped rather than being embraced. Surveying various texts such as Mahasweta Devi’s “Draupadi” and two anti-apartheid plays, *The Blood Knot* (1985) and *Sophiatown* (1986), she concludes her argument by stating that multicultural or multiracial society is a need now but this type of society should embrace the principle of reciprocity, multicultural cohabitation along with “unbiased” and “unmediated exchange”, “freedom”, and “dignity” (335). She accepts the diversity but such diversity should be the diversity full of reciprocity. Sixth, Mohr’s ideas are further supported by Bernard Waldenfel’s idea of interculturality in which he imagines the world of “all-embracing” (Waldenfels 10). Seventh, it is not the globalization but glocalization that should rule the world. Thus, Victor Roudometof defines “The word glocal is a neologism; that is, it is a new word constructed by fusing global and local” and “glocalization as a concept to explain a variety of real-life experiences and situations” (1). It is generally argued that glocalization begins from below not from above. In other words, glocalization gives primary focus recognizing local values. Eighth, the application of Stuart Hall’s notion of new identity, also known as

“metamorphic,” “unstable” or “contradictory” identity and the ninth, Brinkerhoff’s transnational identity or Digital Diasporas have been the key ideas in order to show changing identity of the immigrants living in diasporic situations (qtd. in Braziel and Mannur 233). Hall’s ideas of changing identity and Brinkerhoff’s transnational identity are interconnected with Mireille Rosello’s concept of mutual metamorphosis.

### **Chapter summaries**

The first chapter addresses the issue of the research, builds up the major argument and design of the dissertation. In doing so, it gives background of 9/11 fiction, introduces postcolonial 9/11 fiction, gives general overview of the selected novels, forms major argument, its validity and objectives, gives gist of theoretical framework, key findings in textual analysis and conclusion.

The second chapter engages the audience incorporating the ideas of various previous scholarships in order to maintain point of departure or research gap. The review is presented in three parts. First part deals with what has been said in general articles about terrorism, trauma, 9/11 and responses from Muslims. Many have argued 9/11 literature as the literature of mis-giving. The second part tells what has been argued about 9/11, terrorism and the Muslims in scholarly journals. This part comes out as the review insight with the theme of vernacular cosmopolitanism, militarization of Kashmir as the result of regressive US foreign policy in South Asia from the Bretton Woods Agreement, transnational terrorism, world of fear, connection and disconnection, debate about American model of globalism and multiculturalism after 9/11, challenge of the orthodoxies of the post 9/11 fiction, racial melancholia in America, limit of hospitality in a time of terror, 9/11 as endless discourse, uncertainties in post 9/11 phase and

debating America as homeland and hostland. The third part briefly tells why post 9/11 literature became Bush-Blair agenda and a plotting justice.

The third chapter makes a comprehensive study of the relevant theories essential for textual analysis such as - transculturalism, unconditional hospitality, ethical hospitality, postcolonial hospitality, transcultural embrace, intercultural identity, glocalization, metamorphic identity or diasporic identity, transnational identity and critical insights of globalization.

The fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh chapters focus on textual analysis along with the end of synopsis of each novel.

Chapter eight deals with conclusion incorporating summary of the main points restating the major argument, findings, new knowledge and limitation, that is, knowledge about 9/11 mainstream literature of the white Americans versus knowledge about 9/11 postcolonial perspectives , and opening the scope for future researchers regarding transcultural hospitality.

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW ON TRANSCULTURAL HOSPITALITY IN POSTCOLONIAL DIASPORIC 9/11 NOVELS

#### Introduction

This study intends to explore the theme of transcultural living in post-9/11 postcolonial novels written by South Asian diasporic writers. The analysis confines itself to four novels- *Brick Lane* (2003), *Shalimar the Clown* (2005), *Transmissions* (2004), and *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007) by Ali, Rushdie, Kunzru, and Hamid respectively. The quest for transcultural hospitality in these novels seems to have come as a striking contrast to the discourse of cultural trauma in the mainstream American fictional representations of 9/11. The following write-up reviews the related literature on 9/11 fiction, the aforesaid four novels and the books and articles selected for the theoretical framework of study. The review incorporates the issue in three major parts. The first part focuses on general critical writings based on 9/11 literature, trauma, and terrorism. The second part presents the reviews based on selected novels in miscellaneous journals. The third part focuses on the reviews made on selected texts and 9/11 literature. The reviews presented in this section are book based reviews published generally from the western world.

#### Review on 9/11 Terrorism Discourse in General Critical Writings

In “Introduction: Colonialism, Islamism, and Terrorism” Mustapha Marrouchi argues, “It is always hard to write the history of recent times, and still harder to write the history continuing present” because of “the moral obscenity that was wreaked on the U.S. has ushered in a new world of maximum damage, a world where fantasy cavorts with the real and death is the message” (6). He assumes that such complexity has been created because of “religious

orthodoxy” and “insecure”, “secular,” and “fragile ... ideal of global cultural understanding” (7). This all is happening because of “a colonial other in a position of inferiority to the westerner” or westerner stereotyping of the Muslims, for instance, the Algerians as “terrorists” (48). Because of such othering, he argues, “language has failed us” (10). It shows language of all is yet to come in order to embrace the differences.

About the essential features of terrorism, Austin T. Turk in “Sociology of Terrorism” states that “Studies of terrorism should be studied under (a) the social construction of terrorism (b) terrorism as political violence, (c) terrorism as communication, (d) organizing terrorism, (e) socializing terrorists, (f) social control of terrorism, and (g) theorizing terrorism” (271). Turk explores “terrorism becomes a social phenomenon” (271). He assumes:

Terrorist violence depends on which media one examines. For example, western, especially American, media reports generally Palestinians and their supporters for the ongoing violence between Arabs and Israelis, whereas non-western media reports in outlets such as al Jazeera generally blame Israel and supporters – especially the United States. (275)

In his concluding remark, he states that if “One another’s right to exist” is recognized the violence or terrorism would be minimized from the world (285). It proves that if the western media, for instance, follows the principle of multilateralism, the Americans would not be the target of bitter criticism regarding 9/11 and war on terrorism.

For some critics, real terrorists are those who frequently attempt to create fear using military forces. Regarding it, Sayyid Mustafa Al, one among the first scholars to write about 9/11, in his article “Mixed Message: The Arab and Muslim Response to Terrorism” argues that many Arab and Muslim countries are sympathetic with the victims of 9/11. However, according

to Sayyid, “terrorism cannot be defeated if those who fight it rely exclusively on military force” (177). The writer’s assumption is quite clearly expressed as he further claims “The notion of forced conversion is alien to Islam” (181). For instance, Taliban Regime in Afghanistan was challenged by U.S. military operation. They created fear among the Muslims not through dialogue and conversation but through military operations. He also claims, “Many Arabs and Muslims do not share the same definition of terrorism with the United States” (184). For instance, Al-Jazeera’s representation of the event 9/11 was different from the representation of the same event by CNN or BBC. Concluding his article the writer views, “nonmilitary solution” can be the best way to fight against terrorism. This approach can address and “promote the ideals of the American Revolution: Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, by all people” (189). The notion of nonmilitary solution approach of the writer seems tenable because it has the potentiality to strengthen harmony for transcultural living.

For some, terrorism is the matter of creating plot through fiction. Joseph S. Walker in “A Kink in the System: Terrorism and the Comic Mystery Novel” argues that emergence of kink in literature has created illusion in public life after 9/11 resulting in “a network of fiction” (336). 9/11 literature has not been friendly. Instead, it has worked for the creation of the plot against plot. He assumes that “plots reduce the world” making ourselves “killers” (336-337). He defines kink as “counter narrating voice such as DeLillo desired” (350). In a sense, a kink in literature has the power to create terrorism rather than hospitality in the world because it focuses on plot rather than harmony.

Some critics also argue for the protection of human rights for minimizing terrorism. Paul Hoffman in “*Human Rights and Terrorism*” posits that “abandoning human rights in the time of crisis is short-sighted and self-defeating” (932). He further writes, “By challenging the

framework of international human rights and humanitarian law ... war on Terrorism undermines our security more than any terrorist bombing” (933). The writer assumes “Human rights violations in the name of fighting terrorism undermine efforts to respond to the threats of terrorism, making us less rather than more secure in both the short and long run” (935). He further asserts:

No nation, no matter how powerful, can solve the problem of terrorism on its own. All governments need the voluntary cooperation of every segment of its society to be effective in preventing acts of terrorism. Without adherence to international human rights standards, such cooperation will be more difficult, if not impossible; to obtain at the international, national, and local levels (935-36).

He views that “Core human right principles” should not be abandoned in any type of war. He further opines “Abandoning these principles in the face of terrorist threats is not only self-defeating in the fight against terrorism, but it also hands those who would engage in attacks such as those of September 11 and March 11 an undeserved victory” (954-55). For the harmonious transcultural living, core human right principles must be respected by any nation especially the US.

Another perspective of the birth of terrorism is the result of the practice of adultery. Annabella Pitkin in “Shalimar the Clown in Salman Rushdie Loses His Cheerfulness: Geopolitics, Terrorism and Adultery” analyzes Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) by arguing that Maxmillan Ophuls, US ambassador to India and America’s counter-terrorism Chief’s adultery with young Kashmiri Boonyi Kaul, wife of Shalimar, “descend of Kashmir into intercommunal” and “state-sponsored violence” were the major causes of hatred of Shalimar against Max Ophuls (257). Hyper sexual masculine gaze of Max Ophuls upon Boonyi Kaul, a



Hindu woman and wife of Shalimar made him revengeful and fundamentalist. Shalimar justifies that he kills Max Ophuls not because of any other reasons but the only cause is that he becomes adulterous with his wife. Such openness in sexual matter destroyed the romantic family relation of Shalimar and Boonyi Kaul. In this article, the writer raises two major issues. First, foreign military intervention in Kashmir's internal matter has been uncanny on the one hand; and on the other hand, Kashmir's religious and cultural values have been destroyed due to intervention from the foreigners. Such unethical practices killed cheerfulness on Rushdie's face. She opines that terrorism cannot be solved unless the westerners embrace the cultural values of the easterners in positive light. She indicates that such sense of "darkness" in the heart of Americans, drives the Muslims "to make the next move in a battle" rather promising towards "redemptive ending" (262). Transcultural hospitality is always in the shadow in such adulterous and hegemonic environment.

For some writers, terrorism is not born naturally. Rather it is born out of certain hidden causes or agenda. Sadiq Jalal Azm in "Islam, Terrorism, and the West" analyses 9/11 through the lens of conspiracy theory. As conspiracy theory claims "nothing happens by accident". Richard Roeper in *Debunked! Conspiracy Theories, Urban Legends, And Evil Plots of 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (2008) argues, "Conspiracy theorists love the *argumuntum ad ignorantum*-the 'argument from ignorance,' which is the practice of arguing that a theory or belief is true simply because it has not been proved false beyond any shadow of a whisper of a doubt" (x). Similarly, Sadiq Jalal Azm claims that "Islamists did it, because they have a deep-seated vendetta against the world Trade Center after failing to blow it up in 1993" (6). Rather than justifying 9/11 as a sudden terrorist attack and labelling the Muslims quickly as terrorists, the Americans should have investigated why 9/11 happened. And again they should have enquired why the Muslims

attempted to blow up the World Trade Center in 1993. In a sense, civilizational clash seems to be the root cause of 9/11. If the root cause is civilizational clash, then why the Americans are uninterested to minimize such clash. It justifies that terrorism lies within self not outside. In that sense, Azm also blames the “modern violent Europeans” of being hegemonic towards the issues of the Muslims (14). In other words, Europeans are also not rational. They also follow the logic of *argumuntum ad ignorantum*. Azm illustrates his assumption by giving examples of stone and egg as “literary metaphor” to justify how conspiracy theory works (15). He illustrates:

If the egg falls on the stone, the egg breaks, and if the stone falls on the egg, then the egg breaks too. This is why, from the Arab-Muslim side of the divide, the west seems to discerning eyes so powerful, so efficient, so successful, so unstoppable as to make the very idea of an ultimate “clash” seem fanciful (15).

It clearly proves that terrorism from the world can not be minimized until and unless civilizational clash is minimized. Furthermore, the west should maintain friendly relation to the people of Muslim worlds rather than profiling them quickly as terrorists. About possible causes of Muslims’ unfriendly relation to the west, Azm views:

The relationships of Islam to the west, they are certainly not affairs of the pure spirit, or clashes of religious ideas, or of conflicting theological interpretations, or mere matters of beliefs, values, images, and perceptions. They are part of the normal affairs of history, power politics, international relations, and the pursuit of vital interests (15).

It shows the relation of the Muslims to the west can be improved soon by making a rethink with pure spirit. The article seems to be quite relevant regarding the research of transcultural hospitality with reference to 9/11 literature because power politics, international relations,

history and one country's interest to occupy the properties of others determine how inhospitable the Westerners are with others and what others expect in return from them.

Some writers also opine that the major cause of terrorism is American exceptionalism. Donald E. Pease in "9/11: When was American Studies After the New Americanists?" maintains that American exceptionalism, current in Americans by the end of the Cold War in 1990s, is the state fantasy out of which Americans have imagined their national identity. He examines how President George W. Bush succeeded in establishing a new state fantasy after declaring a War on Terror. Pease explains that Bush accomplished this through co-opting a fundamental identity, the myth of the virgin land, using ground zero to argue that America's Virgin land had been wounded by the attacks of 9/11. Even New Americanists did not overthrow this American orthodoxy at work in American exceptionalism, even though they are more liberal in "introduce [ing] cultural justice" in American studies than the establishment Americanists (78). In other words, America has not maintained cultural justice in post 9/11 phase although America has made tremendous shift from myth to rhetoric since civil war in Cecelia Tichi and Philip Fisher's observation, for instance.

Some writers express that transnational terrorism occurs out of ideological and civilizational clash. Kristopher K. Robinson, et al in "Ideologies of violence: The Social origins of Islamist and Leftist Transnational Terrorism" argue that terrorism is the result of ideological and civilizational conflict. Leftist terrorism prior to cold war and Islamist terrorism after cold war both are transnational terrorism because both were guided by ideologies and they both opposed the notion of international capitalism. However, the leftist seemed to embrace secular state but still faced the challenge of capitalism but Islamists faced the threats of capitalism and religious conflict both. They argue and name Islamist terrorism as "4<sup>th</sup> wave" and the main cause

is “civilizational Clash” between the westerners and the Islamists (209). Because of the declining western hegemony; the westerners are too much hostile to the issues of the Islamists and the Islamists tend to show superiority through religious matters. It can be easily assumed that terrorism is unlikely to disappear in such civilizational clash. They claim that the world is facing the challenge of transnational terrorism now as the world consists of two civilizational zones- Islamists and Non-Islamists or Islamists and the westerners. They define “transnational terrorism” as, “One form of this struggle between civilizations, and its increase is due to declining western hegemony and the resurgence of the world’s other cultures. Transnational terrorism should be concentrated in fault zones between the major world civilizations with targets defined by civilizational division. In arguing that declining western hegemony encourages these attacks” (2013). Thus, ideological clashes and civilizational clashes must be minimized in making the new home full of hospitality, transculture, and justice.

### **Review on 9/11 Trauma Discourse in General Critical Writings**

Numerous critics have found that 9/11 trauma discourse has been made on the basis of cultural trauma. As a result, the Western world has been able in playing the game of othering to the Muslims. Marc Redfield, in “Virtual Trauma: The Idiom of 9/11” raises the issue of Balkans. Regarding 9/11, Marc Redfield argues virtual trauma pervades in American society rather than the depiction of real trauma or the victimhood or subjectivity of the victims of 9/11. September 11 has been registered as cultural trauma. The writer’s assumption of the use of more general phrases such as “Ground zero” and “September 11” may not help to decrease traumatic effects. Rather they may be used as the tools of cultural trauma and may encourage creating other Ground Zero. He writes, “Ground Zero- both calls up and wards off the ghost of Hiroshima, remembering that other scene of destruction while also distancing demoting it by rendering it

another ground zero” (62). He assumes that the more ground zeros the Americans creates to prove themselves virgin and innocent or sacred, the more their sense of innocence is lost. He further argues:

The name “Ground Zero”, of course, reverses the direction of the targeting process: they targeted us. They struck with precision, hitting the symbolic center (of world Trade) and transforming it into a zero; but since- particularly, from the perspective of the nationalist discourse that was hyperenergized by the attacks- the “we” has survived, they also missed as they hit. The zero is a ground, American ground, the virgin space of a new beginning...they guarantee of a wounded innocence and a good conscience. (63)

For the writer, the name date “September 11” and the toponym “Ground Zero” are evidences to prove 9/11 as “Fetishistic” or “cultural trauma” (77). The dial of “the 9-1-1 emergency numbers”, equates with September 11 and they both become evil and haunting and traumatic. The nameless and faceless deads of September 11 has been incurable trauma for the Americans. Such traumatic experience becomes obstacle to create harmony for transcultural living. Some critics opine that American elite discourse has been prominent in Middle Eastern art since 9/11 or War on Terror.

Jessica Winegar in “The Humanity Game: Art, Islam, and the War on Terror” explores her ideas through Muslim art perspective. She demonstrates how American secular elite discourse on Middle Eastern art corresponds to that of the “War on Terror”. She also argues Americans’ stereotypical representation of the Muslims and Middle Easterners has intensified for the growth of “discursive division of the world into civilized “US” and the barbaric “them” (652). She is disappointed with the stereotypical gaze of the Americans in orientalist

representation. Regarding “Middle Eastern Art” or “Islamic art” Muslims are always in the foreground and “religion becomes the primary” in interpreting such art but the Americans are unlikely to tolerate such supremacy of the Muslim art. Thus, they develop the sense of antagonism against Muslims. Art and Islamic principles of the Muslims are inseparable in Middle East. However, “the war on terror” not only destroyed Muslims’ life but also destroyed their rich art in Bush’s administration. The Americans treat Middle Easterners as “cultural others” instead of embracing them (659). Instead of respecting Muslim “modernity” in the Middle East regarding cultural and artistic advancement, they have been treated as non-humans or others by the Americans. She views that art and artists from the Middle East must also enter into what he would call the “humanity game” (675). She objects to the way that “Middle Eastern Muslims” have been stereotyped and they have been treated as “un-human destructive terrorists” (677). The writer’s stress on humanity through the embrace of Muslims’ cultural, religious and artistic values gets with the thrust on transcultural living emphasized in recent postcolonial novels on 9/11.

Some critics even argue that Americans are changed both in thought and action since 9/11. In “9/11 and the Novelists” Cheryl Miller surveys Don DeLillo’s *Falling Man* (2007), Jay McInerney’s *The Good Life* (2006), Claire Messud’s *The Emperor Children* (2006), Ken Kalfus’s *A Disorder Peculiar to the Country* (2006), and Joseph O’Neill’s *Netherland* (2008) and they try, according to her, to understand the way the “catastrophic event” has change [d] the way “Americans think and act” (32). She, however, says that the novelists have not been able to comprehend the “impact” of the event on the Americans, particularly in human relations (33). The novelists, according to her, should have done a better job of dramatizing the “crippling deficiencies” in the relationships (33). Miller’s point is well-made because 9/11 is a monstrous

trauma and its impact on not just on human relations but also on multicultural living in America must be the focus of fictional rendering of the event.

For some reviewers, 9/11 literature has been born as a new genre. Annie McClanahan in “Future’s Shock: Plausibility, Preemption, And the Fiction of 9/11” tries to understand, with reference to David Foster Wallace’s short story “The Suffering Channel”, the fictional representation of America’s pre-emptive campaign to thwart off future terrorist attacks in the wake of 9/11. She takes “the legal history of the doctrine of preemption ... as an instance of the emerging genre of 9/11 literature” (42). She argues that Wallace’s story offers “a powerful critique of preemptive futurity” which is actually “the realization of a philosophy of the future tied to decades of imbricated economic and political interests, bursting into public discourse as a way to capitalize on confused notions about 9/11 as a historical event” (43- 59). Her expression of the preemptive doctrine looks tenable, given America’s fear of future attacks because of its neo-colonial domination of the world.

Some critics also argue that 9/11 mainstream American literature has given birth to public rhetoric. Margaret Scanlan in “Migrating from terror: The Postcolonial novel after September 11 ” finds “Public rhetoric” by “politicians, the press, and novelists” (265). She finds John Updike’s *Terrorist* (2006) give a stereotypical “view of Islam as a religion of violent fanatics” (265-66). She finds the same rhetoric underpinning in Don DeLillo’s *Falling Man* (2007), and Alexie Sherman’s *Flight* (2007). She, however, finds Kiran Desai’s *The Inheritance of Loss* (2006), Mohsin Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007), and Hisam Matar’s *In the Country of Men* (2007) offering an alternative view. These texts revise “the west’s vision of itself as a haven for the oppressed, a fortress of secular reason besieged by a fanatical orient, whose latest representatives are migrants bearing bombs and contagion” (267). What She seems

to imply is that the postcolonial novels merely dramatize the internalized conflict between the West and the East and therefore fail to “insist [...] on finding a living [Multiculture], breathing space” (277), which She thinks should have been the spotlight in post 9/11 novels. Her “desire” that post 9/11 novels should eschew the language of us versus them” (277), is well-taken because superiorization and inferiorization of a community can only exacerbate violence, whether communal of terrorists and is a “dangerous terrain” for transcultural living (277).

Bob Batchelor, in “Literary Lions Tackle 9/11” gives a general analysis of Don DeLillo’s *Falling Man* and John Updike’s *Terrorist*. He argues that these novels, by depicting the America’s feeling of trauma and its impact on thinking and behavior, “interpret” the event of 9/11 in such “new and meaningful ways” which media or history cannot (182). Batchelor’s implied association about the superiority of fiction or media or history is tenable because only novels can unfold a full demonstration of the interior impact of a historical event. Such discrepancy in depicting 9/11 trauma may create obstacle in imagining transcultural home.

Analyzing Claudia Rankine’s poem “*Don’t Let Me Be Lonely*”, Emma Kimberly in “Politics and Poetics of Fear after 9/11: Claudia Rankine’s *Don’t Let Me Be Lonely*” argues language after 9/11 has been “more divisive” that explores “cultural trauma” and “collective fear” (777). The divisive nature of language; she assumes, cannot preserve intellectuality; rather such trend might spread “fear”and “vulnerability” (778). About how fear might create vulnerability, she argues “Fear promotes fear. Fear limits our intellectual and moral capabilities; it turns us against others, it changes our behavior and perspective, and it makes us vulnerable to those who would control us in order to promote their own agendas” (778). In his concluding remark, he takes “active interpreters” as the best solution makers and they may help to connect with “the world around us”, rather than playing the role of “passive consumers, of cultural



images” (791). The article might help to enhance the scope of the research as it encourages us to be active interpreters; and its role is obviously great for transcultural living.

Richard Crownshaw in “Deterritorializing the “Homeland” in American Studies and American Fiction after 9/11” takes up the critique of trauma paradigm, with reference to the fiction of 9/11, as a domesticating concept - - a notion built up to evoke an affect of sentimental concern for homeland security. Such an evocation of affect has given rise to the “discourse of consecration”, culminating in the prose of what he calls “reterritorialization” (758). Keeping this line of critique in mind, he places the analytical spotlight on Don DeLillo’s *Falling Man* and Cormac McCarthy’s *The Road* to critically “Map [...] a deterritorialized America” (759). In *The Road*, he finds the consecration of time and space not only interrelated but also “crossing territory” in a way the “novel evokes the extraterritorial, the unhomely in the homely” truly throwing a flood of light on both territorializing and deterritorializing tendencies in American history (775). Such politics of territorialization and deterritorialization obstructs the Americans to embrace the differences.

After analyzing Don DeLillo’s *Falling Man* and Richard Drew’s photograph of the *Falling Man*, Rob Kroes in “The Ascent of the Falling Man: Establishing a Picture’s Iconicity” presents his awareness of a paradox. He argues that force of images give them iconic power; whereas language is non-photographic and it has the power of reflection and communication. He is aware of the fact that photographs or images directly affect the heart. For instance; Richard Drew’s *Falling Man* has the direct relation to our heart, not mind whereas Don DeLillo’s novel *Falling Man* has the power of reflection and communication and it has direct relation not to our heart but mind. Rob Kroes seems to be fully aware that heart has direct relation to the icon and the fiction with the mind. However, he seems to side with affect. The sad scene of “raining

bodies” was actually the “horror of the World Trade Center attacks” (4-5). He further argues that the image of *Falling Man* “continues to haunt” or that the affect of shock created by the image should be the spotlight of 9/11 artistic response which is a well-taken point (10). However; the dissertation’s major focus is on fiction rather than on images.

Catherine Morley in “How do we write about That? The Domestic and the Global in the Post- 9/11 Novel” Says that the major problem with American literature in general and 9/11 literature in particular has been the American writers’ obsession with America’s domestic sphere. As a countervailing trend to Don DeLillo’s *Falling Man* (2007) and John Updike’s *Terrorist* (2008), Adam Haslett’s *Union Atlantic* (2009) and Jonathan Franzen’s *Freedom* (2010) engage with the Middle East in terms of globalism, but these texts “ are steeped in the American relationship with the rest of the world” (731). As a welcome departure from both the trends, Morley refers to “border writers such as Cormac McCarthy, Christine Bell and Bharati Mukherjee who offer the best way forward, exploring “intercultural spaces” and such imagination of intercultural spaces for Morley, is nothing but “a deterritorialized, multiculturalist approach to the depiction of community, otherness, liminality and the traumatized subject in post-9/11 literary fiction” (718). The goal of the dissertation, however; is to create transcultural space rather than intercultural space.

In response to Rob Kroes’s “iconicity”, Alan Nadel in “*Falling Man*’s Descent into Meaning: A Response to Rob Kroes” argues that Richard Drew’s *Falling Man* conveys the meaning of “historical importance”, “mental shock”, and “trauma” (16). Rather than depicting “realm of mass circulation of images” as stated by Rob Kroes, Alan Nadel believes that images are used “to affect history rather than merely representing it” (16). Giving allusion of the falling of “Icarus”, and comparing this situation with Richard Drew’s *Falling Man* , Alan Nadel shows

the historical importance of 9/11 photographs, such as Richard Drew's *Falling Man*. He assumes that picture's "composition" cannot haunt to the audience; rather the audience are haunted by the history it informs them (16). In other words, over play of images should be minimized in order to persuade the audience towards history and literature.

Analyzing two American feature films- *25<sup>th</sup> Hour* (Spike Lee, 2002) and *Rendition* (Gavin Hood, 2007), Guy Westwell in "Reading the Pain of Others: Scenarios of Obligation in Post-9/11 US Cinema" argues that 9/11 has not only made American national identity "hardened" and "narrow" but has also "increased willingness to explore difference as it occurs both within the US and abroad" (815). Many 9/11 Hollywood movies announce "jingoistic" and "patriotic" responses creating the binary us versus them" (816). However, *25<sup>th</sup>Hour* and *Rendition* offer alternative perspective. The writer demonstrates, "*25<sup>th</sup>Hour* and *Rendition* refuse prevailing calls for revenge and xenophobic construction of otherness" (831). He also argues that these films challenge both "conventional modes of identification between "us" and "them" and "challenge to conventional western ways of thinking...of film making convention" (831). Instead of jingoistic valorization of Ground Zero, a dialectical relation seems to be quite appropriate in maintaining transcultural hospitality.

Analyzing two 9/11 films James Marsh's *Man On Wire* (2008) and Spike Lee's *Inside Man* (2006), through the perspective of heist genre, Hamilton Carroll in "September 11 as Heist" finds uncanny embedded in these films. After 9/11, the city of New York has been the city of absence. Such uncanny representation is depicted through "cultural anxieties" (835). Heist films apply, "temporal progression of before, during and after" (836). In other words, such films quite vividly depict the scenario before 9/11, during 9/11 and aftermath of 9/11. Heist films reflect unexpected and unrepresentable aspects of human activities. He further argues, "Heist takes place

against the clock” just like “A race against time” (837). In *Man On Wire* (2008), Petit’s successful wire walk, despite the challenges reflects “uncanny status of Twin Towers” that symbolizes “shock of modern” and also the symbol of “daring, bravery and superhuman” (839-40). In *Inside Man* (2006), he argues, “The film produces a dialectical relationship between known and the unknown, the familiar and the foreign” (845). He concludes that the towers should be analyzed in connection to history. For him “the towers themselves are made history” (851). The article highlights the relevance of dialectical relationship between the West and the East regarding the need for maintaining hospitality in the globe.

Lucy Bond in “Compromised Critique: A Meta-Critical Analysis of American Studies After 9/11” argues that hegemonic American narrative of 9/11 has worked as “ideological means of manipulation” (733). 9/11 American literature has been presented in such a way that only America suffered and they generalised others as if they did nothing wrong against the Muslims. But Americans represented themselves as if “Time had stopped, that history was over, innocence destroyed, the nation traumatized and America altered forever” (733). Lucy Bond further argues that representation of 9/11 has to be analyzed through “Meta-Critical” eye because its analysis has been incomprehensible, unthinkable, senseless, dateless and nameless regarding the representation of others. American literature has presented 9/11 just like “Space of falling” and experience “unclaimed” (Bond 740). She believes that “9/11 narrative” lacks “meta-analysis” in addressing the issues of both sides. 9/11 narrative seems to be hegemonic as it has failed to address the voice of others. Therefore, a convincing anti-hegemonic counter narrative needs to emerge as the essence of meta- critical analysis. Due to the lack of metacritical responses to 9/11 mainly from the west, transcultural living has been a far cry.

Taking a diametrically different line from Rob Kroes, Miles Orvell in “Against Iconicity: Photography and 9/11: A Response to Rob Kroes” argues that 9/11 artistic response should consider not the iconicity of an image but the panoply of images encapsulated in language. He says so because “the verbal context that explains and frames the image...furnishes the historical matrix of its meaning” (15). Orvell is not of the mark as the historical density overlaying or under-laying images cannot be overlooked. In other words, Miles Orvell responding to Rob Kroes’s “iconicity” or “photography” argues “image functions less as an icon than as an existential symbol”, “the visual representation of 9/11 is of historical importance not because of any one iconic image but because of the panoply of images associated with the event,” and “the process by which we understand any photographic image is somewhat different from what Kroes represents” (11). His assumption is that, 9/11 images should not be seen as “icon”, rather it should be seen as “existential symbol” (11). He concludes his argument by stating that 9/11 images or Richard Drew’s photograph *Falling Man* of 9/11 should not be seen as icon because icon represents particular or fixed event; but the same images should be analyzed as “the richest symbolic images” because symbolic representation of 9/11 trauma seems to be more powerful as it follows the principle of abstractness which is close to literature of 9/11 (15). The article seems to be quite relevant for the research regarding transcultural living as it highlights the importance of images because symbols may help to bring harmony in transcultural living; not the iconicity. If 9/11 images of falling men are seen through “iconic layer”, it may create more confusion and hostility among Muslims, Americans and others.

Sonia Baelo-Allue in “The Depiction of 9/11 in Literature : The Role of Images and Intermedial References” explores the message of “misgivings” after making a close reading of the novels- *Saturday* (2005) by McEwan, *The Writing on the Wall* (2005) by Schwartz, *The Good*

*Life* (2006) by McInerney because these novels “shattered our sense of reality” (184). Because of such misgivings, these writers had to give up writing on 9/11 in the initial stage. Similarly, she analyzes Frederic’s Beigbeder’s *Windows on the World* (2004), Jonathan Safran Foer’s *Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close* (2005), and Don DeLillo’s *Falling Man* (2007) as literary pieces of “Intermedial references” and presented 9/11 as “most mediated events in history” (186-191). She assumes that literature should have the capacity to fulfill the gap of such misgivings as she writes, “literature has the capacity to make us face the unspeakable, to act out cultural traumas, to work through them, mediating between our urge to know and our need to deny” (192). 9/11 literature should have expressed the unspeakable aspects of traumas rather than mediating the events merely through the lens of American spectacle. Such misgiving or misinformation obviously creates the wall to create harmony between the West and the East.

In this way, 9/11 Literature, in general articles of different writers, is depicted as the literature of misgiving which is explored as the literature having the themes based on and around conspiracy theory. In that light, 9/11 literature of the west explores and extends just the ideas of grand narrative of the hegemonic west. In order to strengthen American hegemony, the 9/11 mainstream American literature has given birth to various genres such as genre of kink as “counter narrating voice” to demonstrate mainstream 9/11 literature as the means of creating plot rather than harmony. It is also found that mainstream 9/11 literature has given birth to the genre of masculine gaze in order to feminize South Asia just like Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown* in which Maximilian’s gaze upon Kashmir is intolerable. The birth of the genre of state fantasy based on Donald E. Pease’s analysis shows 9/11 mainstream literature is constructed as the result of the failure of logic since the declaration of *Global War on Terror* by George W. Bush and his administration. Since then America’s notion of Virgin land collapsed and the state is moving

towards fantasy rather than rationality although they have created another myth of Ground Zero in order to look innocent. The genre of American exceptionalism “includes a complex assemblage of theological and secular assumptions out of which Americans have developed the lasting belief in America as the fulfillment of the national ideal to which other nations aspire” (Pease 30). According to this assumption, Americans prefer the principle of biblical literalism rather than liberalism or free will and they embrace the logic of “either- or” or the logic of “us vs them” binary. For the Americans, the notion of Virgin land has been replaced by Ground Zero after 9/11. For that they are planning to create another myth of Virgin land through Ground Zero. The 9/11 literature can also be defined as the genre of preemption because it makes Americans always alert about fear of “future attacks” due to “neo- colonial domination” of the world .

Another type of genre emerged in post 9/11 mainstream American literature is the advent of heist genre. Heist genre refers to the presence of unexpressed, uncanny and unrepresented so far. The presence of uncanny can be felt in cultural practices and human activities. The genre of jingoism refers to the genre of extreme nationalism. Most of the mainstream 9/11 American writers are playing the role of jingoists or extremists who present America totally innocent and the Muslims and others terrorists. Regarding the genre of territorialization, deterritorialization, and reterritorialization, it has been widely argued that Americans’ frequent attempt of defining themselves as sacred people of virgin land is the notion of territorialization. Their sense of loss of innocence declaring the *Global War on Terror* in Iraq is the act of deterritorialization and America’s attempt of re-defining themselves innocent declaring post 9/11 space and time as Ground Zero is their attempt of reterritorialization. This type of American fantasy of imagining themselves always pure and sacred people of virgin land is the problem of “American undercurrent of condescension” or the problem of America’s superiority complex for instance

(Hamid 55). Not only the literature of the mainstream white Americans of 9/11 has given birth to various genres, 9/11 has also given birth to new genre of iconicity in which the essential focus of the Americans is on icon rather than images or abstract description. Rather than conceptualizing broadly what the 9/11 images or fictions refer to, they engage to interpret the meanings being specific. Their major focus is on iconic representation of the paintings and images rather than conceptualizing literary texts in a broader way. For instance, Don DeLillo's *Falling Man* is a novel based on 9/11 and Richard Drew's photograph of *The Falling Man* is a picture of a falling man from twin towers on 9/11. The photograph focuses on specific event that may quickly capture the emotions from the audience rather than the message from the novel *Falling Man*. Since 9/11 Americans' main focus is on the genre of iconicity rather than the genre of novels. Because of these essential tenets of cultural trauma, transcultural quest seems to be lacking in 9/11 literature of the west. However, the literature of South Asian Diaspora on the same issue seems to be moving towards transcultural living; rather focusing on othering, the binary logic of us versus them.

### **Review on Selected Novels and 9/11 Literature in Miscellaneous Scholarly Journals**

Analyzing Ali's *Brick Lane* (2003), Ian McEwan's *Saturday* (2005), Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007), and Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011), Margarita Estevez-Saa and Noemi Pereira-Ares in "Trauma and Transculturalism in Contemporary Fictional Memories of 9/11" claim that the major problem of contemporary fictions regarding 9/11 is psychological or cultural trauma. They stress on living accepting new sociopolitical circumstances rather being trapped within the discourse of trauma. Their strong attachment on transcultural living seems to be quite relevant because such affiliation highlights the need to accept difference and commonality, communication and silence, failure and success. They also



argue for the “inevitability” of “transcultural positioning” to live the life after 9/11 scenario. They claim that the voices of others should be positively addressed rather than involving and playing the game of the “discourse of trauma” (268). They both focus on “transcultural thinking” (276). However, they make the audience aware that psychological and cultural trauma might create obstacles in creating transcultural home.

Yumna Siddiqi in “Power Smashes into Private Lives: Violence, Globalization and Cosmopolitanism in Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown*” explores the idea that the novel seems to have been written “Against the backdrop of international networks of diplomacy, capital and Islamic terrorism” (273). In that sense, Siddiqi assumes that “ideal of Kashmiriat” takes globalization of the existing model as problematic, as a result “elite vision of cosmopolitanism” also known as vernacular cosmopolitanism has been imagined in *Shalimar the Clown* (273). Siddiqi stresses on “Rushdie’s representation of a vernacular mode of cosmopolitanism” which is taken as “ideal of Kashmiriat ... a regional spirit of communal harmony and cultural syncretism” (295). Her allegation of “cosmopolitanism from below” seems to be the essence of the novel. Therefore, she supports Rushdie’s line as she explores, “Rushdie’s cosmopolitanism is appealing because it infuses cosmopolitan values with the premise of an organic community modelled on the ideal of Kashmiriat” (307). She claims that cosmopolitanism from below or vernacular cosmopolitanism seems to be quite appealing or attractive to listen but it may be quite challenging to achieve such ideal because of various challenges and contradictions. As an illustration of vernacular cosmopolitanism and its challenges she alludes:

Ultimately, the promise of a vernacular cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitanism articulated from the margins, exemplified by Kashmiriat, is destroyed in the conflict between an

aggressive Indian State and the various Islamic factions of the so-called Kashmiri *Muj*, an Americanization of *Mujahideen* (freedom fighters), who make Kashmir their battleground. (299)

On the premise of such grounding, she concludes that “indeed, Rushdie’s own threatened physical existence exemplifies the limits of elite cosmopolitanism; and for the many subaltern migrants whose existences are economically and legally precarious, the ideal of vernacular cosmopolitanism is entirely utopian” (308). The good aspect of the article is that it helps for opening the door for transcultural home but what she lacks in her argument is that she does not say anything about how hospitality can be prevailed in transcultural home; and in her own expression “elite cosmopolitanism” seems to utopian thought (308). Instead of being pessimistic about vernacular cosmopolitanism, it would be better if she suggested reading ethics of Immanuel Levinas as he stresses on responsibility and sincerity as essentials for transcultural home or vernacular home as imagined by Salman Rushdie in *Shalimar the Clown*.

Stephen Morton in “There were collisions and explosions. The world was no longer calm: Terror and precarious life in Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown*” claims that “militarization of Kashmir” is the result of regressive “Us foreign policy in South Asia from the Bretton woods Agreement to the US led war in Afghanistan following the attacks on America of September 11, 2001” (337). Because of this, he assumes, “Salman Rushdie attempts to find a literary form appropriate to describe the transnational social and political relations that underpin globalization” (337). On the basis of his claim, Morton concludes his assumption stating that *Shalimar the Clown* has emerged “Against the history of American foreign policy in South Asia” (353). About how Rushdie has been able to depict such bizarre scenario, Morton writes:

By framing Shalimar's murder of Max Ophuls as a 'Kashmir story' rather than an 'American story', Kashmira grieves for Kashmir against the political norms and 'alien cadences of American speech'... which defines Shalimar's murder of Ophuls as a terrorist action against America's global political sovereignty. In doing so, Rushdie offers a political elegy for Kashmir that highlights the limitations of American foreign policy in postcolonial South Asia from the Truman administration to the Bush administration, and mourns the lives of many Kashmiris, whose deaths have been overshadowed by the cold war and the US led war on terrorism. (353)

In this article, Morton clearly proves the issues he has raised. However, he does not provide what postcolonial positioning should be regarding 9/11 and its aftermath. The novelist's quest is, in fact, transcultural living embedded with transcultural hospitality. In that sense, it would be better if Morton explored that Shalimar the Clown not only speaks the voice of resistance against US foreign policy rather it emerges with the solution of the quest for transcultural hospitality.

Patricia Fernandez-Kelly in her article entitled "On Shalimar the Clown" argues that although Salman Rushdie became the "victim of Muslim extremism" he has been able to show sympathy towards them through the narrative of *Shalimar the Clown* (471). As an evident Patricia writes:

Salman Rushdie, whose stature as a victim of Muslim extremism is believed by some critics to have overshadowed his reputation as a writer, gives us a remarkable book, no less worth reading for its literary ambition than for its insights into the making of the terrorist mind. This is an achievement doubly impressive because Rushdie, a man who spent nearly a decade hiding from the murderous fatwa issued by Ayatollah Ruhollah

Khomeini, now weaves a narrative, unflinching but not lacking in sympathy, about the labyrinthine forces that shape the assassin and the suicidal bomber. (471)

She further elaborates that Kashmir was “a silver of paradise” where “Muslims and Hindus” would “co-exist raucously and peaceably” before the arrival of Max Ophuls, an American ambassador of the United States to India (472). In Patricia’s analysis, India has been presented as a “hybrid child conceived by the western power and a gorgeous but wasted land” (473).

Presenting “Islamic fundamentalism” as “heterogeneous within”, Patricia claims that this “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). She concludes her claim by stating that western arrogance has been the leading cause of “fading humanity” (474).

The article seems to be strong document or testimony of proving the western power as arrogant hegemony. However, Patricia seems to be unaware about what position the postcolonial nations should take after 9/11. The gap found in her argument is that she has not stressed on transcultural living.

Florian Stadler in “Terror, globalization and the individual in Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown*” claims that transnational terror networks have both regional and international impact. He assumes “*Shalimar the Clown* reroutes postcolonial concerns to highlight the destructive forces of globalization and terrorism” (191). He further states that *Shalimar the Clown* “Challenges old paradigms of nationalism and questions conceptualizations of postcolonial identity” (192). In that sense both globalization is also taken as destructive forces like terrorism. As a result, old paradigm of nationalism has been under challenge and the novelist questions upon postcolonial identity. The necessary gap that the article creates is that it tells more about globalization and its impact and challenges but it tells less about the construction of true

postcolonial identity. Regarding this dissertation, postcolonial identity should not be made the mystery; rather postcolonial identity should be taken as the ultimate goal for transcultural living.

In “Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown*, National Allegory, and Kashmiriat” Nalini Iyer argues that although many had expected *Shalimar the Clown* just as the national allegory of the *Midnight Children* but she has a point of departure from them and finds that the novel needs to be explored more rather than taking it just as national allegory or texts of “Libidinal Dynamics” as described by Fredric Jameson for the sake of dominating the texts of the third world (126). In her analysis, Salman Rushdie attempts to depict the actual scenario of the village of Pachigam in Kashmir rather than blaming the so-called capitalist first world or the so-called socialist second world. She explores:

Rushdie’s novel interrogates nationalism and globalization from the perspective of the ordinary people of Kashmir: the residents of a village named Pachigam, whose everyday life is disrupted by warring nation-states, competing religious and political ideologies, and the emergence of [a post – world war two world order] that made the Americans a super power. However, Rushdie’s concern is less with the state of the nation and more with the impact of these regional and international geopolitical issues on ordinary individuals. (127)

She disagrees with Fredric Jameson’s blame of third world literature as no literature has been criticized and she also has reservation with other two world who have “suspended” third world from the first world as well as second world. Iyer claims that these two worlds frequently attempt to exclude third world people and their literature assuming that it has been incomplete. In her opinion, Salman Rushdie attempts to address the voices of the voiceless subaltern of the third

world. She seems to be hopeful that Kashmiriyat can be flourished but global politics and lack of appropriate analysis of literature may frustrate literary critics. Regarding it, she concludes:

Perhaps, in the new millennium, Kashmiriyat can only flourish in the diaspora through characters like Kashmira and writers like Rushdie who nurture the idea but recognize the impossibility of its realization in the political world of the day. The narrative refuses to provide easy answers, thus frustrating literary critics who would rather have a well-made national allegory for their reading pleasure. (135)

Iyer is hopeful towards vernacular cosmopolitanism but she is unsure about how it can be achieved. She is missing to mention that postcolonial writers prefer transcultural home rather than the so-called global home of the west.

In his article entitled “Reconstructing Transnational Identities in Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown*” Mukul Sharma focuses on the “issues of mobility, identity crisis, transnationalism and global terrorism” (62). On the basis of the issues raised, he assumes that “the temporality of resentment negates the structure of revenge” because the narrative of the novel “continually blurs the dividing line between the personal and the political” (62). In his concluding remark he states that “Every character’s identity is reconstructed from national to transnational and their fateful nobilities from the East to the West reconstruct their lives” (72). Although the article raises the genuine issues of transnationalism, global terrorism, its main focus is on the reconstruction of transnational identity rather than focusing on how the postcolonial writers are attempting to create transcultural home through novelistic response to 9/11.

Richard Brock in “An Onerous Citizenship: Globalization, Cultural flows and HIV/AIDS Pandemic in Hari Kunzru’s *Transmission*” brings HIV/AIDS allegory in analyzing the novel *Transmission* because globalized world became fear factor like the AIDS pandemic in post

national, transcultural world of the western model. For him, the issue of the representation of globalization in post national or transcultural world of the so-called western model has been hegemonic. As a result the postcolonial migrants are compelled to live in fear, he assumes. To prove it, he thinks, the novelist presents the protagonist Arjun Mehta as the representative of South Asian migrant who is presented as the victim of global home because of his mistreatment in America through the means of capitalism, who finally returns to his homeland India. Before returning to India, he creates a virus named Leela virus and makes all computing system functionless. As America finds him doing so, they declare him of being most wanted terrorist. Richard Brock assumes that terrorism is the result of inhospitable treatment of the west and he interrogates the west whether they have been hospitable or not in the issues of the postcolonial migrants, mainly the migrants of South Asian diaspora. In his opinion, the global home has been unhome for the migrants or immigrants of South Asian diaspora mainly because of “the current inequalities in the global economy” and the situation it has created has been “unthinkable” (390). In his analysis, the novel seems to resist and “dismantle the global mechanism” as has been imagined by the west; although the injustice upon South Asian migrants in global home has been taken as “knife-edge between melancholy and hope” (390). The argument made by Richard Brock begins with high sounding. However, his concluding remark seems controversial because he finds global mechanism not just a problem but also a hope. On the one hand, global home has created unthinkable problems that Arjun Mehta has experienced in novelistic representation. On the other hand, people should also be hopeful regarding transnational home of the existing western model. In that sense, Richard Brock’s argument seems tenable. His lacking point, however, lies in that he has not expressed anything clearly about the ethics of transculturalism.

Hari Kunzru, indirectly indicates through the novel that not only the West but South Asian migrants also need to be responsible and sincere in transcultural living.

Ashley T. Shelden in “Cosmopolitan love: The love and the World in Hari Kunzru’s *Transmission*” posits that being cosmopolitan means maintaining “ethical relation to other” (348). Shelden further argues that love cannot be separated from cosmopolitanism. Hari Kunzru’s *Transmission* explores the idea of “cosmopolitan love” (348). He claims that Kunzru’s cosmopolitan love refers to the idea of critical cosmopolitanism that the novel intends to explore. Shelden claims that supporting Kunzru’s cosmopolitanism means embracing the idea of Walkowitz as he argues, “thinking beyond the nation ... comparing, distinguishing, and judging among different versions of transnational thought; the testing moral and political norms ... and valuing information as well as transient models of community” (qtd.in Shelden 371). In Shelden’s opinion, Kunzru’s quest for cosmopolitan love refers to:

More collision than commingling, more division than fusion. None of the elements of cosmopolitanism exists in harmony with the others. Love is not just the subject of cosmopolitanism but its fundamental structure: riven from within, haunted by inadequacy, multiple, divided, and divisive. (372)

The argument made by Shelden after analyzing Hari Kunzru’s *Transmission* through deconstructive way seems to be a great scholarship in academia. However, he has not been able to prove how transcultural living can experience hospitality. He should have stated the responsibilities of both the west and postcolonial nations explicitly.

Emily Johansen in “Becoming the virus: Responsibility and Cosmopolitan Labor in Hari Kunzru’s *Transmission*” claims that *Transmission* has been written as the critique of globalized neoliberal culture. Johansen states that Hari Kunzru has imagined cosmopolitanism as “a new



model for global interconnectedness” resisting and replacing “the metropolitan city as the site of self-evident cosmopolitanism” (419). She also agrees with Hari Kunzru because she observes that Kunzru also opposes the notion of “Cosmopolitanism of capitalism” (419). Johansen also supports cosmopolitanism of new type although it is also dependent upon privileged cosmopolitanism. Kunzru’s model seems to be a better model as he states:

This model of cosmopolitanism is dependent upon privileged cosmopolitans’ self-reflective awareness of global others and their connection with and responsibility to these others. It privileges a persistent instability, modeled by the constantly moving and mutating computer virus. Kunzru counters the privileged forms of cosmopolitanism, typical of neoliberal globalization, which seek to administer the world alongside the forward movement of capital, with a cosmopolitanism that resists such rigid directionality. (419)

Presenting two protagonists Arjun Mehta and Guy Swift as “variants of global citizenship”, first as “Indian computer engineer”, declared as terrorist after creating computer virus and another as “a global advertising executive”, she opposes “global capitalist systems” and intends to embrace “virus-like cosmopolitanism” or “viral cosmopolitanism” because she believes that such new model of cosmopolitanism would work as “a secret garden” where “creative fertility” and “self-sufficiency” can be enhanced through “cosmopolitan possibilities” of global interconnectedness (429). This dissertation’s reservation in her argument is that how virus-like cosmopolitanism can create transcultural hospitality. If so, how the west agrees to accept such model.

Iwona Filipczak in “Immigrant to a Terrorist: On Liquid Fears in Hari Kunzru’s *Transmission*” argues that the so-called globalized world has been turned into the world of fear where third world immigrant workers are turned into global terrorists. The writer strengthens his

claim by bringing theoretical insight of “liquid modernity” of Zygmunt Bauman (67). He states that “Since 1960 ... Marshall McLuhan coined the term a global village” with numerous promises for the people (67). However, the same globalized world has created “fluidity and instability” and as a result people became compelled to live in “uncertainties and anxieties” (68). He concludes his argument thus:

*Transmission* ... highlights economic and cultural inequalities or even polarization in the globalizing world and views globalization as a phenomenon fraught with pitfalls and dangers rather than promises. The novel makes it clear that a sense of uncertainty and unpredictability is a common condition in the times of liquid modernity generating fears of different nature, and that stability and security may be still desired but illusory commodities. (75)

Filipczak finds problems not only in the construction of global home and its practice but also use of “new media” as a means of circulating or transmitting ideas and information. For that, it has made them easier for the global flow of the means of production. Therefore, he assumes that the process of globalization has been the process of promoting capitalism. In concluding remark, it has been argued that problem occurs when global becomes local and vice versa. Illustrating Arjun Mehta’s role in the novel, he writes, “For Arjun Mehta everything goes wrong in the world where local has become global, while global is local” (75). In fact, the construction of globalization itself is not wrong as Filipczak sounds so; but it has been made so by the so-called civilized west. His claim does not seem ultimate solution. According to him, the ultimate solution would be embracing Arjun Mehta rather than othering him. Arjun Mehta’s resistance as the quest for transcultural hospitality is not addressed in his article. This is the gap found in his argument.

Philip Leonard in *A Revolution in code?* Hari Kunzru's *Transmission and the Cultural Politics of Hacking* argues that hacking acts against neoliberal narratives of global inclusion. The novel, in his opinion, seems to have come against the ethics of "realist novel" (284). The so-called realist novels were assumed to have written as if they were capable of capturing the realistic picture of society. This novel, however, questions to those who frequently claim that even non-representable things can be represented in realist fictions of the west. The interesting thing in his argument is that even the protagonist Arjun Mehta has been disappeared towards the end of the novel after he has been declared as the most wanted terrorist by FBI as he created Leela virus that made all the computing system functionless. It seems to be true that global information system has been vulnerable and insecure in post national situations. But the so-called globalized west is not totally aware about it. For him, the novelistic representation is not just the resistance against globalization but it seems to be the great lesson to the west that they should be more responsible and sincere towards the issues of its citizens. Leonard's major focus is to represent the non-representable. However, he seems to be unaware about transcultural hospitality that Kunzru's *Transmission* seems to focus.

Phurailatpam Sanamacha Sharma in the article entitled *Contesting Globalization in Hari Kunzru's Transmission* argues that the novel "is a narrative of worldwide connections and disconnections, of interlocking disparate destinies, about the global stroller and plural places, about the clashes of virtual cybernetic culture and the real world. He puts professional nomads like Arjun and Guy in such a global technological landscape and contests globalization" (23). In that sense, he takes this novel "as a narrative of resistance against the onslaught of globalization" (22). It seems so because of the excessive practice of capitalism. As individual choices are violated in globalism, he believes, micro-resistance may bring U-turn sometimes, to challenge

“the dominant order of globalization” (33). This article is taken as the voice of resistance rather than the quest for transcultural living

Anna Hartnell in *Moving through America: Race, Place and Resistance in Mohsin Hamid's The Reluctant Fundamentalist* focuses on the “debate about US multiculturalism after 9/11” (336). In a sense, his idea is the idea of “resistance to the racism” for instance; Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* came against “the Bush administration's war on terror” (336). Hartnell takes “the history of African American resistance to white supremacy as a kind of metaphor for looking at global relations between the United States and the Muslim world” (346). Hartnell concludes that it is the need of time “to establish common ground ... East and West” (346). The good point in her argument is that she attempts to explore common ground to minimize the conflict between the West and the East. However, she has not stated that to achieve that common ground, both east and west should be hospitable to each other.

Peter Morey in “The Rules of the Game have Changed: Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and Post-9/11 Fiction” makes a claim that *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* “challenges the orthodoxies of the post-9/11 novel” using the rhetoric of clash of civilization and it has made the readers “deterritorialize[d]” (135-136). Borrowing British Prime Minister Tony Blair's phrase “the rules of the game have changed” which he expressed in a press conference in 2005 on the event of 9/11. Morey argues that both nation and multiculturalism are “questioned” after 9/11 (135). Morey seems quite clear in his argument as he claims that real victims of 9/11 are not addressed more as it should have been. Rather western world seems to be extra conscious about such violence in coming future. Regarding it, Morey writes, “The 9/11 attacks and their aftermath are still claiming victims around the world. It is just that they are not recorded or commemorated like those actually killed in the Twin Towers” (145). Morey's point of departure

from western policy can further be illustrated as he writes, “The task of world fiction, like *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, can be to record such experiences and keep the eyes of the hyper-conscious western world on the possible estranging effects of its violent and self-aggrandizing policies” (145). In this way, Morey depicts the problems of the Western world after 9/11 rather than raising the issue of transcultural hospitality.

Nishat Haider in “Globalization, US Imperialization and Fundamentalism: A Study of Mohsin Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*” raises “with the complex issues of Islam and the west, Fundamentalism and America’s war on terror” (203). Haider analyzes that Hamid makes America compelled to think about both parts of the story. He writes, “The novel ultimately poses the interesting stance that neo-liberalism exists as its own fundamentalism. Through the monologue of Changez, Hamid symbolically makes America hear the other side of the story” (229). He further clarifies that Mohsin’s novel is the “resistance to the neo-imperial designs of American fundamentalism” (230). He concludes that Mohsin Hamid’s novel “not only challenges the demonization of migrants, Muslims and Islam, but also allows the reader to think through and beyond the acts of violent and hyperbolic rhetoric associated with terrorism” (230). Haider’s argument seems to be quite appropriate solution of controlling violence and terrorism rather than addressing how hospitality can be prevailed in the globe both from the West and the East.

Delphine Munos in her article “Possessed by whiteness: International affiliations and racial melancholia in Mohsin Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*” explores the ideas of “interracial relationship” and “racial melancholia” in American society where the white majority has dominated the non-white minority groups (396). She concludes her opinion that “Changez’s final turn to fundamentalism leaves the lost ideal of whiteness unparalleled” (404). Her argument

seems tenable because she finds deep-rooted racist attitude in the Americans that has created conflict again and again. Instead of problematizing the white, she should have highlighted the quest for transcultural hospitality in the Muslims just like Changez's attempt in the novel.

Joseph Darda in "Precarious world: Rethinking Global Fiction in Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*" argues about the need of rethinking in global fiction. Darda takes *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* as "critical global fiction that challenges the idea of the "other" and the alien "elsewhere" so that we might imagine otherwise" (121). In his analysis, Hamid has proved that global fiction needs to address the voices of the others as well. Then the writing trend would be free from bias. This dissertation's point of departure with Joseph Darda is that he focuses on the need of critical thinking in writing global fiction but this dissertation's spotlight is on transcultural hospitality rather than the mere criticism of global fiction writing trend.

Sarah Ilott in "Generic Frameworks and Active Readership in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*" argues that *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* looks like "contemporary dramatic monologue" and readers are assumed to be the ultimate judges of this fiction (571). In her opinion, "Hamid's novel serves a double purpose: it activates the reader...yet it also resists closure or resolution and in so doing keeps the wounds of 9/11 open, ensuring that a state of critical evaluation-and a sense of the "thickness of history"- is retained" (582). Thus, the novel not only activates the readers and resists closure, but serves more for creating transcultural home.

Lindsay Anne Balfour in "Risky Cosmopolitanism: Intimacy and Autoimmunity in Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*" offers a sustained interrogation of the possibilities and limits of hospitality in a time of terror" (1). For her, the novel seems to "theorize hospitality" and it seems as if cosmopolitanism or western hospitality "opens to difference as others" but in practice "*The Reluctant Fundamentalist* suggests that if absolute hospitality is an

openness to whoever or whatever arrives, then included in that is a hospitality even to the one who comes to kill” (1). In her analysis, Mohsin’s novel seems to show “the complexities of hospitality in the context of post-9/11 geo-and cultural politics” (1). Her argument is that western hospitality has been too much conditional and the novel “represents hospitality’s abject failure” (10). She further strengthens her claim that western hospitality haunts whether it is a welcome or refusal. She concludes that Hamid has presented the scenario that western hospitality seems to be a welcome but it is also possible that it may bring death as well. For instance, the western guest that Changez is welcoming seems to have come to kill the host as something of metal seems to have kept under his jacket. The argument made by Balfour about the failure of hospitality in western world seems to be strong enough. However, she is not claiming that transcultural hospitality has been failure from the postcolonial world. This dissertation’s claim is that *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* is not merely the resistance of the western civilization regarding 9/11 and its aftermath; rather it is the claim that postcolonial writers’ response to 9/11 gives the sense of hospitality rather than othering which is represented in the novels written by the white American on 9/11.

Albert Braz in “9/11, 9/11: Chile and Mohsin Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*” argues that “discourse on September 11, 2001” has been endless (241). As an illustration, he gives reference of the event of September 11, 1973 in Chile. He claims that September 11, 2001 is the repercussions of the past. On the basis of it, it can be easily assumed that such events are endless. In that sense, Mohsin Hamid has been able to depict such endless discourse. Regarding this dissertation, Mohsin Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* should not be taken just for the sake of discourse; rather it should be studied as the quest for transcultural living because the

novel is the lesson not only for the westerners but also for the Muslims because they need to be responsible and sincere for imagining transcultural home.

In her article entitled “Alienated Muslim Identity in the Post-9/11 America: A Transnational Study of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*” Sobia Khan intends to explore whether it is possible to provide hospitality for the foreigners. Analyzing the conversation of Changez with American guest in Pakistan, she finds Changez trapped in the dilemma “in-between spaces unable to truly belong to, or let go of, either country” (159). She claims that:

Hamid ends the novel on a mysterious note, and thus, leaves the question of absolute hospitality open ended. Is Changez capable of offering the American interlocutor absolute hospitality, the kind he wished for himself? Hamid leaves the reader questioning if absolute hospitality is even a possibility. The larger question of the novel, will the foreigner ever be at-home in a new place, remains unanswered. (159)

Although Sobia raises a serious question regarding hospitality assuming that absolute hospitality cannot be granted for the foreigner; but regarding the the issue of the dissertation, Hamid does not seem so much pessimistic because towards the end of the novel he focuses more on intimacy and trust that can be maintained from both sides. Regarding it, Hamid argues, “you and I are now bound by a certain shared intimacy, I trust it is from the holder of your business cards” (Hamid 184).

Lisa Lau in “Post-9/11 re-orientalism: Confrontation and Conciliation in Mohsin Hamid’s and Mira Nair’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*” makes a comparative reading of the novel *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007) by Mohsin Hamid and Mira Nair’s film *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2012) and claims that “these texts represent changing western public perceptions towards Pakistan and vice versa” (1). She further argues that “Both novel and film



are informed by the post-9/11 distrust of the Muslim other” (1). The novel presents monologue whereas Mira Nair’s film presents a dialogue regarding 9/11. The novel and the film are taken as testimonies of cultural trauma of 9/11. She concludes that “Both film and novel depicts Pakistan and America as oppositions” (12). Doubting on western modernity, she opines, “western modernity is still reliant on orientalizing the East, which in turn is dependent on reacting against or responding to western perceptions to define even its modernizing self” (12). Her scholarly reading of the novel *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and Mira Nair’s film of the same title depicts the scenario of how the Americans are stereotyping the Muslims and claiming themselves modern. The film and the novel not merely paint the picture of civilizational clash of the Muslims and the westerners. Instead of re-Orientalizing the East, Mohsin Hamid attempts to prove that western modernity has been failure because of their embrace of conditional hospitality whereas the postcolonial nations or Muslims of the postcolonial nations intend to show themselves more hospitable than the westerners through the means of embracing unconditional hospitality.

Analyzing “*The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and *The Submission*” Aysem Seval argues that these literary pieces deal with “aesthetic engagements with the world of the tolerated other ... as a critique of the current condition” (101). Her article attempts to “seek[s] an alternative to the discourse of tolerance” (101). In her concluding remarks, she highlights about the “hypocritical nature of tolerance” (122). *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* is not just the depiction of tolerance and intolerance; but it attempts more to create transcultural hospitality.

Mandala White in “Framing Travel and Terrorism: Allegory in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*” argues that the novel’s most significant contribution to the body of post-9/11 literature is formal in nature” (1). For him, Post-9/11 literature “itself becomes an allegory of the

uncertainties of the post 9/11 environment” (1). He also takes Hamid’s narrative as “meta-allegorical project” that “provides a means for Hamid to allegorically explore the ways that permeable borders engender paranoia and fear of terrorism in the post-9/11 context” (1). In his analysis, the protagonist’s attempt of being fundamentalist seems his “politics” to some extent. However, his reluctant decision of being fundamentalist is because of “an economic mode of domination that is responsible for the vast inequalities within the globalized world” (2). In his concluding remark, he argues that Changez’s quest looks like “unsolvable mystery” and he also claims that Hamid “presents an unsettling allegory of the post-9/11 world, a space in which friends and enemies, paranoia and authority, activism and terrorism are increasingly indistinguishable” (14). The gap found in his argument is that he takes the post-9/11 world as unsolvable mystery. In fact, Hamid does not create mystery; rather he attempts to prove that Muslims want hospitality not terrorism.

Quratulain Shirazi in “Ambivalent identities and liminal spaces: reconfiguration of national and diasporic identity in Mohsin Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*” argues that shifting identities of postcolonial nations after 9/11 seem to create more instability rather than solution. Focusing on the objective of his study, he claims the need of “define[ing] nation beyond the geographical boundaries and in terms of the transnational and diasporic identities” (15). He finds ambivalent relationship both in homeland and hostland as represented by Pakistan and America. “Diasporic identity is also redefined in terms of the ambivalent cultural affiliations which a migrant holds due to his dual relationship with both the homeland and hostland” (28). Because of such “ambivalent sense of belonging to America and Pakistan” they need to redefine diasporic identity mainly after 9/11. This dissertation’s major focus is on transcultural hospitality rather than the mere formation of new identity regarding diaspora and postcoloniality.

Suzy Woltmann in “She did not notice me: Gender, Anxiety, and Desire in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*” argues about “gender and sexual identity in Mohsin Hamid’s 2007 novel *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, a post 9/11 text that explores the intricacies of community and terror” (1). In her analysis, the whole novel is the interplay between “sexual desire” and “sexual denial” (1). She analyzes the novel in two levels- “microcosm”, “an individual’s failed romantic relationship” and “macrocosm”, conflict of ideologies and nations. The striking issue in her argument is the issue of gender discrimination and its effect in “the American cultural imagination” (6). Her major focus is on gender discrimination rather than hospitality.

Mohamed Salah Eddine Madiou in “Mohsin Hamid Engages the world in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*: “An Island on an Island,” Worlds in Miniature and “Fiction” in the Making” argues that Mohsin Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* “reveals a struggle with difficulties” (271). This is because he has to deal with psychological, artistic, historical and geographical issues and has to respond accordingly. He claims that the novel “has cemented Hamid’s reputation” as Hamid seems to be “going against the grain of fundamental and dominant traditions through a reluctant ethos” (271). He assumes that Hamid has been able to prove that Muslims have creative talents, theoretical and philosophical insights and therefore the West should not generalize the Muslims calling them all terrorists. The argument looks great although Mohamed Salah Eddine Madiou has missed the issue that the Muslims or postcolonial migrants expect hospitality from the West and they are also ready to provide hospitality for the western guests.

Jane Hiddleston in “Shapes and Shadows: (Un) veiling the Immigrant in Monica Ali’s *Brick Lane*” claims that Monica Ali’s *Brick Lane* is “generating both enthusiastic critical acclaim and defensive anger” in the public (57). In Jane’s analysis, the novel has gained divided

response- some have congratulated the novelist as the novel has portrayed pathetic picture of the Bangladeshi immigrants in London's East End, on the other hand, some look aggressive as the novel has portrayed Bangladeshi community as "inaccurate and derogatory" (57). In that sense, the novelist seems ambivalent. Hiddleston concludes:

The novel is thus not a testimony offering reliable information but a linguistic operation, and it forces us to reflect on the difficulties of accessing its referent in an unmediated way. Its sketched outlines trace 'Shapes and Shadows', provisional forms, rather than determinate individuals or incontrovertible truths. (71)

To some extent Hiddleston's argument seems logical although she has seen ambivalence in Monica Ali's fictional representation of Bangladeshi community. Here, the gap, is that she tells nothing about Monica Ali's attempt of making the bridge for transcultural living.

Alistair Cormac in "Migration and the Politics of Narrative Form: Realism and the Postcolonial Subject in *Brick Lane*" explores the idea that Bangladeshi immigrants in London frequently struggle embracing freedom. However, they miss communal past of Bangladesh and are often haunted. As an illustration, Cormack realizes that Nazneen's consciousness of "collective form of life" of Bangladesh "remains interestingly unmappable by the realist narrative voice" in Britain (720). In that sense, Cormack's argument looks great in the sense that *Brick Lane* helps people to live the life of both communal consciousness and the life of present reality. It seems as if past makes present meaningful through the embrace of local (past) and global (present). However, his argument has nothing to say about transcultural living.

Francoise Kral in "Shaky Ground and New Territorialities in *Brick Lane* by Monica Ali and *The Namesake* by Jhumpa Lahiri", "envisage [s] the consequences of the new world geography on the psyche of migrants" (65). He argues that Monica Ali in her novel has reflected

“contemporary life in a world where a new geography has emerged as a consequence of increased mobility, new means of transportation and communication- changes which are bound to affect the psyche of migrants and their perception of their own experience” (65). He finds that Monica Ali’s *Brick Lane* interrogates:

The promises of virtual communities. They invite us to envisage the long-term consequences of the virtual everywhere-ness of immigrants, which may well result in a tragic nowhere-ness. The new geography and elasticity of the modern world works only for one category of citizens who like ... Chanu, can afford eventually to go back to their home country, but not for those like Hasina who have not had such opportunity. (75)

Kral further states that immigrants are suffered due to the side effects of globalization.

Globalization has compelled the immigrants to live in “liquid times” and as a result “borders and boundaries” are functioning in an “oppressive way” (75). The globalized world looks Kaleidoscopic and it has challenged communities of traditionally rooted. It looks like a combat between actual and the virtual. He concludes:

The Kaleidoscopic quality of the world geography, its conditional elasticity and flexibility, leave the contemporary subject at a loss, on shaky ground and struggling to find his or her bearings in a world where new territorialities have emerged at the crossroads between the actual and the virtual. (75)

Kral’s logic proves that globalization has drawn bizarre picture of immigrants and their communities. This dissertation’s reservation in his argument is that Monica Ali’s spotlight is on transcultural hospitality rather than making a mere critique of globalization.

Bidhan Roy in “From Brick Lane to Bradford: Contemporary Literature and the Production of South Asian Identity in Brick Lane” argues “South Asian diaspora has served as a

critical field of inquiry” (106). He quite clearly states that “South Asian diaspora” is emerging now as the process of “complex identity formation” (106). As a result, “South Asian Fiction has gained currency in recent years” (106). In his understanding, South Asian identity has not just been “fractured” after the emergence of the writer like Salman Rushdie and Monica Ali; but even the “British Society” itself has been “transformed” (121). In that sense, Monica Ali’s *Brick Lane* has been able to form new identity among the Muslim immigrants in Britain and also among the Muslims who are living and struggling in Bangladesh. The article looks quite relevant regarding identity formation among Muslim immigrants; but it does not concern and tell anything about how Monica Ali imagines for transcultural living.

By reading Monica Ali’s *Brick Lane* in deconstructive or metatextual line, Michael Perfect in “The Multicultural Bildungsroman: Stereotypes in Monica Ali’s *Brick Lane*” argues that the novel explores more about multicultural Bildungsroman in order to strengthen multicultural project rather than stereotyping. In other words, it is the novel of new identity formation, education and cultural awareness. In multicultural Bildungsroman, the protagonist’s psychological and moral growth is observed. Now, multicultural Bildungsroman is taken as a separate literary genre. In this novel, the protagonist’s “final integration into contemporary British society”, has been highlighted (109). In his concluding remark he claims that the novel “prioritizes the celebration of multiculturalism over the destabilization of the stereotypical” (119). The claim of Perfect Michael seems tenable and logical because a lot of changes have been occurred in Chanu’s family as he escapes in civil war of 1971 and goes in Britain from Bangladesh. In that sense, it can be taken as the celebration of multiculturalism. But how can it be taken just as celebration when all family members have been fragmented? Thus, the novel

allows the readers to move towards the quest for transcultural living rather than embracing multiculturalism.

Angelia Poon in “To Know What’s what: Forms of migrant knowing in Monica Ali’s Brick Lane” argues that the novel explores “the way knowledge is constructed” in migrants such as the protagonist’s struggle of assimilation in Britain’s society is highly appreciated because her struggle and its process can be taken as knowledge building or knowledge construction process whereas the novel “critiques hybridity”, for instance, Chanu’s dual mentality has been interrogated. She also argues that “migrant bodies experience the city as sources of alternative forms of knowing and meaning” (427). Poon concludes her argument by focusing “on a note of mobility” that creates optimism among the migrants (435). In that sense, she takes global home as an opportunity for knowledge building. Her argument looks great as it helps to construct knowledge, for instance Nazneen has been empowered through her struggle. However, her argument looks weak in the sense that it does not highlight how the knowledge of transcultural living can be constructed, for instance, Chanu feels uncomfortable and insecure in staying London any longer.

Sarah Brouillette in “Literature and Gentrification on Brick Lane” claims that the global home for newcomers has been unhome “with the transformation of rented homes into owner-occupied ones, as well as with dramatic increase in housing costs and displacement of working-class tenants” (425). In that sense, the novel is not just literature but its major focus is on gentrification, process of repairing and rebuilding. So it suggests mainly the “area leaders” to repair and rebuild home both local and global. Her argument may be helpful to patch up the holes; rather than imagining transcultural home and hospitality.

Mrinalini Chakravorty in “Brick Lane Blockades: The Bioculturalism of Migrant Domesticity” argues that minorities have been targeted in the home of multiculturalism and globalization. In other words, the conflict between the western hosts and postcolonial migrants as guests seems as if it is “race war” (503). She writes that Monica Ali’s effort is for the “assimilation into the opportunism and self-fashioning that Britain supposedly affords” (524). She also argues that “a robust future for migrants in Britain” has not been realized yet (524). Instead of addressing on transcultural hospitality, her attempt seems to be the quest for robust future in the same home of globalism.

Claire Alexander in “Making Bengali Brick Lane: Claiming and contesting Space in East London” argues that Monica Ali, through this novel, has been able to explore the idea of “construction and contestation of meanings around the iconic East London street, Brick Lane” (201). Claire further argues “By exploring Bengali Brick Lane through its narratives of past, present, and future, these stories attest to the symbolic and emotional importance of such spaces, and their complex imaginings” (201). In concluding remark, it has been argued that Monica Ali’s *Brick Lane* has created, “a way of looking outwards as well as inwards. Making Brick Lane- its pasts, presents and futures- is making space within the British national story, the story of the East End, the story of the Bengal diaspora. It is a story of making home” (218). Claire’s argument seems quite strong in the sense that Monica Ali’s *Brick Lane* is the novel of making home. This dissertation argues Monica Ali does not just imagine of making home; rather her core intention seems to be the quest for transcultural hospitality. Even the Brick lane or narrow London Street can be home if it embraces the principle of hospitality.

Ali Rezaie in “Cultural dislocation in Monica Ali’s *Brick Lane*: Freedom or anomie?”



posits that Bangladeshi immigrants' cultural dislocation as depicted in Monica Ali's *Brick Lane* has created confusion because she provides options; either for the assimilation in global home being liberal or staying in the same traditional Bangladeshi community embracing "a problematic and stereotypical picture of Bangladesh" eschewing liberalism (1). In her opinion, Monica Ali looks much more fascinated in western liberalism and she makes a critique of "non-western societies and cultures from a liberal point of view" (11). In other words, Monica Ali's attempt seems to be "a critique of the culturally relativistic views promoted by advocates of post colonialism and multiculturalism in the west" (1). Ali Rezaie's finding looks logical as she attempts, at least, to liberate the Bangladeshi immigrants from cultural orthodoxy to liberalism and democracy. However, she fails to notice that Monica Ali's attempt is also the quest for transcultural living. Rezaie should have made twin goals – the goal of cultural liberation and the goal of achieving hospitality in the western world. Instead of making critique of globalism and multiculturalism, Rezaie assumes that Monica Ali problematizes traditional Bangladeshi culture. In fact, Monica Ali's attempt is to make the bridge for criticizing the local community of Bangladesh.

Lydia Efthymia Roupakia in "Cosmopolitanism, religion and ethics: Rereading Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*" focuses on "western liberal ideals, with their emphasis on autonomy and instrumental reason, are usually treated as incompatible with the more communitarian values of non-western forms of society" (1). In her opinion, *Brick Lane* offers "the distinction between faith as a politics and faith as an ethics, and challenges of living across that distinction" (1). She insists on the need of reading the novel "as a call for an open moral attitude, a refusal to assume that one knows in advance what is right and what is wrong, or where the boundary between religious and secular experience should be drawn" (12). As a concluding remark, she claims that

*Brick Lane* helps the readers “to expand his/her thinking about the kind of pluralism that should mark 21<sup>st</sup>-century experience, rather than demarcating the line between irrational religion and secular reason” (12-13). For Roupakia, quest for moral values through the expansion of thought should be the true meaning of pluralism in twenty first century rather than wasting time on the debate of religion and non-religion. Her argument would have got more strength had she focused on transcultural living rather than repeating the same ethics of pluralism.

### **Review on Selected Texts and 9/11 Literature in the texts published from the Western World**

On the basis of critical spotlights of different critics and writers, it is argued that 9/11 literature of the West presented just whatness of the event and left the gap of whyness of the event. Because of such gap, the global home could not be the home for all. Some South Asian Diasporic writers and also the writers of Muslim dominated nations, on the other hand, seem to address the issue to fill up the gap and fulfill the quest for transcultural home. Although different writers have attempted to fill up the gap both from Muslim and non-Muslim world, they fall in the trap of cultural politics. Western writers have been more hegemonic and fundamentalist or they seem to be embracing the notion of literalism or endism whereas South Asian Diasporic writers seem to address the issue being liberal not literal because they assume that liberalism is the road to transcultural home. It is also argued that the defect of the transnational imagination of the west is that it works using the means of justice which has been plotted. Some writers and the critics of the Muslim world seem to raise voices of resistance to show the gap. However, the dissertation mainly focuses on the quest for transcultural hospitality that the Muslims or South Asian writers seem to be quite forward than those who write being biased from the west. In fact, American writers have attempted to embrace “Yankee hospitality” in the literature or fictions of

9/11. Yankee hospitality uses binary logic of ‘us versus them’ to create the bigger gap of otherness. The attempt of the dissertation, on the other hand, is to minimize the gap through the means of transcultural hospitality. It is clearly reflected as one engages to read critical lines on 9/11 literature in reference books of criticism published from the western world.

Phil Scraton in *Beyond September 11: An Anthology of Dissent* (2002) states that various writers have depicted war on terror as “the Bush-Blair agenda” because that worked as “betrayal”, revenge and “media-hype” (xii). He writes that war on terror was betrayal because it betrayed those who died in 9/11 and it was the “betrayal of nationhood and civilized values” (xii). The third reason of becoming war on terror as Bush-Blair agenda is that of the media-hype. In other words, it was the western media that represented Muslims as “traitors” (xii). In this context, Phil Scraton argues that American history after 9/11 became the history of betrayal and the history of media-hype. He further argues that war on terror “pathologizes victims, survivors and campaigners, using patriotism, loyalty and ostracism as a means of silencing” (232). This was the betrayal for him. Nationhood or transcultural living was in the shadow due to the excessive presence of nationalism or patriotism through media hype. Phil Scraton, therefore, makes an argument that history should be “rewritten” and “the next generation of terror strategists will emerge and develop their consciousness” (232). In a sense, both Americans and Muslims were betrayals because both could not address the voices of real victims. However, the Americans were to be blamed first because 9/11 attack happened mainly because of American interest in Arab resources. That seems to be the root cause of misunderstanding between the Western world and the non-west dominated by the Muslims. And another cause is that – instead of spending in healing in the wounds of the victims and helping the bereaved relatives and families of the victims, the Americans spent huge amount of dollars in declaring the war against

Iraq and Afghanistan where innocent civilians died. Such notion of revenge, othering, betrayal and media hype can be taken as barriers in creating the home for living together or transcultural living.

Some critics blame western journalism as it could not focus on why 9/11 happened. Barbie Zelizer and Stuart Allan in *Journalism After September 11* (2002) present the scenario that post-9/11 journalism has been complex or “elusive” because of the representation of who, what, where, when and how rather than focusing on “why?” the event happened; even the mainstream American medias focused on who, what, where, when and how of the attacks of 9/11. Because of this biasness; real trauma could not be expressed through American media. Barbie Zelizer and Stuart Allan assert:

One such question which appeared to be particularly awkward, and hence was only rarely asked, was ‘why?’ members of the public making their way through the September 11 coverage could learn much from what reporters told them about the ‘who,’ ‘what’, ‘where’, ‘when’, and ‘how’ of the attacks. The matter of ‘why’, however, remained elusive.’ (11)

The root cause of such journalistic representation, they argue, is affective public sphere and their interest on the dismissal of the content. In other words, the post 9/11 journalism is falling in the “contradiction between the demand for a more affective public sphere, or one that better balances head and heart in human affairs, and quick dismissal of its content.” (231). This type of journalistic representation that cannot be free from affective public sphere puts the nationhood and transcultural living in the shadow.

Some authors also believe that Western world has been inhospitable because of their frequent embrace of literalist attitude and Christian fundamentalism. Walter A. Davis in *Death's*

*Dream Kingdom: The American Psyche since 9-11* (2006) presents the scenario that America has lost innocence in the “global scale” through historical misrepresentation, excessive practice of capitalism and embracing the notion of Christian fundamentalism (8-150). Therefore, Davis argues that the Americans should change their historical notion from continuity into radical discontinuity; they need to liberate themselves from capitalist ideology; they should avoid biblical literalism and embrace liberalism; they should avoid superego and binarism; they should embrace metaphor and avoid biblical absolutism because literalism is the notion that stresses on the end of thought or it forces to disconnect with the differences, whereas use of metaphor creates the possibility to connect with the differences. Therefore, he believes that the root cause of terrorism is Christian fundamentalism or endism. The Christian fundamentalists assume that no one should question God, and they attempt to hate all complexities and they believe that all decisions are in Jesus’s hands. He disregards the notion of literalism and favours liberalism because literalists attempt “to keep the world at bay by reducing everything to the simplest formulas and mind itself to the most unproblematic blink of consciousness” (138). In this way, literalism seems to be the way of creating more ground zeros in future whereas liberalism seems to create transcultural home. For him, the best way to understand key events since 9/11 is the understanding and study of ideological clash of the Muslims and the Americans. The writer’s assumption may help to create and strengthen a common home for all the citizens of the world to live together.

For some thinkers, western thought has been polluted because of the birth of fog in western politics. John Brekman in *The Cultural Contradictions of Democracy: Political Thought Since September 11* (2007) writes “Since September 11, 2001, the fog of war has enveloped political thought...The fog grew thicker with the invasion of Iraq in 2003” (1). This is

because post 9/11 America or Bush doctrine or state played the role of “a sea monster” (6). The root cause of America’s role as a sea monster is its engagement in exercising Anglo-Saxon political imagination or role of monarch. Since 9/11 America has been playing the role of “the state of exception” (20). Because of American exceptionalism, the safe and innocent vision of Virgin land or the New World has been changed into ground zero. Brenkman further writes, “the trauma of September 11 tore away the illusion of American invulnerability and shattered those symbolizations, the virgin land was transformed into ground zero” (52). It seems quite relevant to state that America has forgotten the path of nationhood or transcultural living because of their rooted Anglo-Saxon political imagination. Before 9/11 from 1975 America had practiced the political imagination of salad Bowl avoiding the politics of melting pot. But after 9/11 America again forgot the path of transcultural home which is not good news because it may create so many other ground zeros in future.

Some critical lines prove that the *War on Terror* is the result of American internal crisis. David Holloway in *9/11 and the War on Terror* (2010) states that 9/11 attack and war on terror have been taken as “historical rupture”, “tactic”, “domestic crisis”, and “the living of trauma and crisis” (1-6). The depiction of the scenario of crisis is presented quite vividly as he writes:

9/11 and the war on terror were described as a national security crisis, an imperial crisis, a crisis in capitalist democracy and governance, a crisis in the relationship between US and Europe, multiple crises in the frameworks and institutions of international law and order...as well as a series of military and humanitarian crises, and a crisis in Islam. (6)

In his analysis, civilizational clash of the Americans is not only with Muslims but they themselves are in the trap of “new hegemony, of traditional power bases-conservative Republicans; the Christian Right, the elite political, military and corporate interests still

sometimes referred to , in a quaint echo of the early cold war, as ‘the military-industrial complex’ (158). Rather than avoiding the sense of hegemony, Americans after 9/11 are living in such “a period when old hegemonies renewed themselves forcefully in the rubble of 9/11” (Holloway 158). He constructs an argument that post 9/11 American fiction works as “hegemonic narrative” because it was constructed focusing on the principle of “American nationalism” disregarding nationhood or transcultural living” (158). Such patriotic notion of the Americans may hinder to strengthen transcultural living because “9/11 and war on terror did reconfigure ‘margins’ and ‘centres’ in contemporary American life” (158).

Some critical insights are drawn through deconstructive readings. Martin McQuillan in *Deconstruction After 9/11* (2009) argues that reading after 9/11 must be deconstructive. After 9/11 many writers have been engaged in writing through deconstructive way. They intend to embrace deconstruction rather than philosophy because they know that “deconstruction...reads. It reads the singular, the unique and the irreducible” (xi). Deconstruction has helped to read otherness or the voices of others. He further argues that twenty-first century is “unpredictable age” which is neither the age of Americans nor the age of Europeans (xiii). Such perspective helps to generate the idea that 21<sup>st</sup> century may be declared as the century of living together with co-operation.

From the incident of 9/11, some critics have called Americans as butchers. Jeffrey Melnick in *9/11 Culture: America Under Construction* (2009) takes post-9/11 scenario as the act of butcher. It has been made so by political leaders and media powers and many have claimed that the root of such butchery is Bush administration. The book explores that the Americans have manipulated their children through literature in such a way that their children are innocent and they have been victims. Instead they look indifferent towards the feelings of others or Muslims.

Because of such practice of the Americans, Melnick blames them of being butchers and their suppressive policy as butchery. In that sense, Americans have been taken as butchers and they can never recognize the significance of the victims or the Muslims. Such act of butchery has got no space in transcultural living.

In fact, America has been Godless after 9/11 for some reviewers. In analyzing three 9/11 novels- Ian McEwan's *End of the World Blues*, Philip Pullman's *Republic of Heaven*, Salman Rushdie's *The Quarrel over God*, and the essay and review collection *The War Against Clitche: Essays and Reviews 1971- 2000*, Arthur Bradley and Andrew Tate in *The New Atheist Novel: Philosophy, Fiction and Polemic After 9/11* (2010) make charge upon Americans as they have stressed upon the "speculation about a world without God" (2). They not only charge upon them but become quite critical to those who are strictly adherent to Christian Fundamentalism. In that sense, they oppose both the extremes-New atheist novelists and their works; and Christian Fundamentalists and their works. Personally, they express their view that there should prevail faith. But in the name of faith, no one should follow the path of extremism. About these two contrasting approaches, they write:

On the one side, Christian fundamentalism professes faith in the inerrancy of the Bible, in the Lutheran doctrine of *Sola Scriptura*, in the literal truth of Genesis and primacy of personal morality. On the other, the New Atheism offers an equally a-historical and decontextualized reading of the Bible and the Qur'an alone, insists upon the literal falsity of Genesis and the rank immorality of a value system that bases itself on revealed religious 'truth'. (4-5)

In their concluding remark, they make an overview "that neither religious nor atheist fundamentalism are going away any time soon. On the contrary, they feed off one another



symbiotically” (111). They have not seen great scope of atheist novels in future because they lack faith which is quite essential to run the world smoothly. The argument seems quite sensible as it can help to build and strengthen the ladder of transcultural home.

There is no any critic to appreciate western media after 9/11. Regarding such notion, Richard Grusin in *Premediation: Affect and Mediality after 9/11* (2010) argues that it is the western media that highlights even the minor event in larger scale. For instance, 9/11 has been highlighted more than what actually happened. Moreover, the war on terror in 2002 and 2003 in Iraq can be taken as the perfect example of premediated event in American history and literature. The sad truth is that “premediation became the dominant media regime” (Grusin 45). US invasion of Iraq, was in fact, “a future (premediated) war” (Grusin 45). Premediation is not the matter of prediction, rather, “Premediation is part of a heterogeneous media regime”, and it “does not do away with the real. Rather it insists that the future, like the past, is a reality that will already have been premediated...through continuous interactivity of the media” (47). Premediation does not concern “with the truth or falsity of specific future scenarios but with the widespread proliferation of premediated futures” (Grusin 48). In that sense, premediation is done to shape public sentiment in the present. Premediation, in a sense, refers to the notion of precensorship. (Grusin 49). Norris argues, “ Precensorship allows the Pentagon to determine in advance what will be seen or not seen, known and not known, shown and not shown, of the war. The effect is that military is able to program history in advance of preediting its possible narratives” (qtd. In Grusin 49). In essence, America after 9/11 has fallen in the trap of premediation, mediality and remediation. Mediality generally refers “to call attention to what media do” (Grusin 73) and remediation is the term of double logic. Remediation consists of immediacy and hypermediacy which are two contradictory logics. And premediation is media

regime. It clearly shows post 9/11 scenario of America is not the scenario of actuality; rather it has been how the western media defines. Such notion of media regime becomes a great obstacle in imagining transcultural living.

America's loss of innocence has been depicted in some critical writings. Richard Gray in *After the fall: American Literature since 9/11* (2011) makes an argument of the failure of language; that could not address the voices of others. He presents the scenario that 9/11 became a turning point or beginning of "a new era" and "a new period in history" in American literature. (2). It was also the turning point that indicated both the end of tradition and beginning of new era with new understanding. It also proves that "the homeland was no longer secure" and America remained "no longer home" (5). Thus, America became unhome after 9/11. The loss of innocence of the Americans resulted in ground zero after 9/11. Such degradation or fall of height is not only the fall of physical height; but it is more psychological and moral. The imagination of innocence or the imagination of virgin land has been replaced into the imagination of disaster, imagination of crisis and transnational imagination. In a sense, this is a failure of global home since 9/11 "Americans woke up to the fact that their borders were not impregnable" (11). It is also argued that it is their failure of reasons both "formally and politically" (16). The problem is that Americans are "haunted by fear" (21). After the end of colonialism America became first universal nation or global home and such notion was shattered by the attack of the Muslims in 9/11. It seems obviously true that America may arise from ground zero only if it intends to embrace the logic of transcultural living. Otherwise more ground zeros may happen in future.

Muslim travellers' experience of Middle East from past to present in America is not harmonious. Their relation can be compared with a pair of broken glasses -- one part broken and another part complete. It gives the clue that America looks positive with the Muslims of Israel

but negative mainly with those from Egypt, Saudi Arab, Iran and Afghanistan. Kamal Abdel-Malek and Kabla Mouna El in *America in an Arab Mirror: Images of America in Arab Travel Literature, 1668 to 9/11 and Beyond* (2011) make a detail study of Arab travellers or the travelers of Middle East to America in which it is found that America is playing the role of melting pot rather than Salad Bowl. It is proved through the experiences of different travellers in America from 1668 to 9/11, 2001. During the periods of 1668 to 9/11, America has represented the people of Arab as strangers; mainly Arab people have felt so after 9/11, although the book presents the travel experiences of Arab travelers of different periods. Before 9/11, Arab travellers or the travellers of Middle East in USA would feel themselves inferior while confronting cultural differences in America mainly because of civilizational clash. However, their travel experience after 9/11 is not of the similar sense. After 9/11, they are being treated strangers or as “Others” by the Americans. Arab people are being treated by the Americans quite negatively and they lack hospitality in visiting America after 9/11. Over surveillance upon personal affairs of Arab people has been the matter of uncanny. It is the fact that Columbus came to America in 1492. Egyptian Professor Wafaa Ibrahim in *One Hundred and Eighty Days in Yankeestan* (2002) explores “Natives were primitive, totally innocent ... or savages as Columbus called them when he saw them naked!” (qtd. in Abdel-Malek and El 178). Ibrahim blames Americans of making themselves too much materialistic; even to Jesus Christ as she asserts, “You Americans always think of material results and the words of Christ more than that” (Abdel-Malek et al. 178). In that sense, they have lost even the essence of Jesus Christ in the name of rugged materialism. In her opinion, the real natives or inhabitants of America were “people of great cultures like the Aztec, the Inca, and Maya”, but not “Red Indians” (179). In her understanding, the basic problem of the Americans is their gullibility to the promises of the Europeans. The famous writer Ghazi Abd Al-

Rahman Al-Qusaybi of Saudi Arabia in *Returning to California as a Tourist* (2002) has realized that America has lost its essence because of “the Advertisement Beast” (qtd. in Abdel-Malek and El 184). The originality of America has been replaced by the false reality of Disneyland. In the eyes of Arab women travellers, America has been represented as if it is the nation of superficiality-- they prefer to add more dressings even into their salad whereas the Arab people prefer the salad plain and greenery. The Arab Women travellers have felt that there is lack of hospitality even in the relationship among their children and parents. The use of 6<sup>th</sup> sense among the children of Arab in respecting their parents is what the American children lack in respecting their parents. Karima Kamal in *The Egyptian Girl in America* (1983) argues “America is truly a society without mask!” (Abdel-Malek and El 111). In the eye of Arab people, America is just like seductive female and America has played the perfect role to emulate. The Egyptian journalist or writer Rida Hilal in *Deconstructing America: 9/11 and Its Aftermath* (2003) makes a prediction that America may collapse one day just like the collapse of Soviet Union because America has moved from a “promised land” and its collapse would be from “implosion, not an explosion” (qtd. in Abdel-Malek and El 186). He also expresses “America is vulnerable from within; its melting pot, its values, its dreams, its social fabric, etc. by the laxity of the American institutions and the spread of violence, crimes, and the deleterious effects of all of this on the moral and ethical behavior of Modern-day America” (186). He expresses his deconstructive notion after he visited America in 1998. At that time, he found New York City as “the most beautiful” and “the richest in art and finance” but he was quite shock “for the attacks on her on 9/11” (188). In his understanding real America is more Eastern than the Easterner as he expresses “I definitely want to emphasize that Americans are not like the British, in fact, they are eastern at essence. Maybe they are more eastern than the easterners I know” (188). Yasir

Qantush, another Egyptian writer in *The Egyptian Occupation of America* (2008) views the Arabs or Middle Easterners should influence America through peaceful means. He argues, “I need a way to occupy America without any loss of life on our side” (qtd. in Abdel-Malek and El 214). An Egyptian writer Yusuf Maati in *Would You Like to Hate America?* (2003) imagines himself as the lover of real America. For him real America is as attractive as a beautiful lady. But he could not get true love from America. Maati becomes jealous by observing the love Affair of America and Israel instead. He observes that America makes good relation with Israel. But Israel is the enemy of Egypt. He eschews such tendency of America. Regarding it, Maati further argues “I even defended you saying that you have good intentions and that our common enemy, Israel, is a sly enemy, a deceitful enemy” (qtd. in Abdel-Malek and El 190). A Saudi Writer Nasir Al-Din Muhammad Al-Zamil in *Why Do They Hate Us?* (2004) argues that Americans do not show hospitality towards the issues of the people of Middle East, especially Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Iraq. He has realized that America has been failure in embracing the principle or “model of democracy, freedom, and human rights” (qtd. in Abdel-Malek and El 196). Instead, America has embraced “Yankee hospitality” in dealing with the issues of the people of Middle East (Abdel-Malek et al.196). From their overall analysis it is assumed that the world is eager to see and observe originality of the Americans. It is the bitter truth that Americans have lost their core values and have fallen in the trap of rugged materialism. As a result, they are compelled to live the life in yankee hospitality. It is, therefore, the urgent need for them now to develop and activate their sixth sense for transcultural living. In some criticisms, it is depicted that America has been failure in ethical and moral ground after 9/11.

Justice has been replaced by injustice and of morality by immorality in America since 9/11. Georgiana Banita in *Plotting Justice: Narrative Ethics and Literary Culture after 9/11*

(2012) presents the scenario of plotting justice in analyzing narrative ethics and literary culture after 9/11. The writer argues that 9/11 fictions have given birth to “ethical thought” rather than moral thought (1). Such thought has increased anxiety among those who intend to embrace universal moral values. Literary culture after 9/11 has been illustrated as the Fall of Berlin Wall or the Fall of Twin Towers is depicted as the fall of Berlin wall; which are both ethical terms. He further writes “Existing scholarship has ... neglected to position post- 9/11 literary culture within a broader historical context” (3). He suggests that history should be analyzed as “a new cross-historical, transnational light” (4). He analyzes that “Americans have denied moral superiority” after 9/11 (6). Justice has been plotted because they are involving in ethical act through forgetfulness rather than stressing on remembrance. For instance, Bush Administration’s invasions of Afghanistan in 2001 and in 2003 can be taken as perfect examples of deterritorialization. Post 9/11 literature has been full of moral panic because of the presence of politics. His argument clearly proves that “It is ethics...which is the ideological vehicle” (29). Because of the presence of ethics, surveillance and scrutinization prevailed in the world of globalization. Americans are also suffered from “moral panic” after 9/11 (31). In a sense, Americans have developed literary narrative trend which is “ethically untouchable” (56). Disagreeing with the ethicality of the American narrative, the writer argues that ethics is not an approach to literature; rather it may inflect narrative itself because of the lack of accountability. Such moral condemnation may create obstacles in building transcultural home.

The common understanding or the existing scholarship of South Asian Diasporic writers on 9/11 is that they find death of reason or death of logic in 9/11 fictions written by the Americans. The failure of logic or failure of reasons can be connected with the ideas of Freud as he argued “[even] the gods turned into demons” in *The Uncanny* (qtd. In Liao VI).

In analyzing Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005), Hari Kunzru's *Transmission* (2004), Monica Ali's *Brick Lane* (2003), and Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007), Pei-Chen Liao in *'Post'-9/11 South Asian Diasporic Fiction* (2013) argues that these novels "add to the genre of 9/11 fictions' transnational and transcultural perspectives through the lens of the uncanny/unhomely" (1). In her understanding global home has been unhome because of the presence of uncanny due to "Western narcissism and American imperialism" (154). As a result, life of immigrants has been unsafe and precarious. To address the voices of others, the Americans should rethink about the identity of the people who are living in global home. The problem, she has raised here, can be solved by avoiding American Centrism and embracing the ethics of transcultural living. In another book entitled *Post-9/11 Historical Fiction and Alternate History Fiction: Transnational and Multidirectional Memory* (2020) Liao argues, "American people have been living in a trauma culture of perpetual fear, constantly frightened of and threatened by violent events that happened, could have happened, or might happen to themselves and to others" (15). From this reference, it can be easily assumed that transcultural hospitality is a far cry in the literature produced by the main stream American writers in the context of 9/11 and in its connection based on transnationalism. She further argues that mainstream American writers in post 9/11 phase are being blind supporters of the populist US President Donald Trump and his administration. After Covid-19 of 2019, Americans even blame the natural disease coronavirus as "Chinese Virus" assuming it as "ethnic virus" of specific community or nation or western media frequently announced coronavirus of covid-19 as the ghost or metaphor of "Pearl Harbor" and "9/11" (188-189). Therefore, post 9/11 American literature is not coming as the literature of excellence. Rather it is full of cultural trauma.

Some critics have interrogated the failure of American – self since 9/11. Victor Jeleniewski Seidler in *Remembering 9/11: Terror, Trauma and Social Theory* (2013) writes that 9/11 was an “event that was going to be remembered in psychic/personal as well as cultural/collective terms” (viii). In his analysis, 9/11 became the major cause of American self-destruction; as he states “we need to understand that 9/11 worked ... as a tactic to induce American self-destruction” (x). The book presents the fall of 9/11 as “the end of American innocence” and the “end of American century” because it became the foundation to create otherness (xi). They have presented themselves good and others bad. Because of such binary, American fictions of 9/11 became the fictions of the prose of otherness. About such discrepancy, he writes what the Americans claim “we are good they are evil” (xii). In his concluding remark, he opines that living of post 9/11 has been “an Age of Global Fear” (179). He presents post 9/11 relationship of the Americans and the Muslims as vulnerable as “Bridges fall” and “Roads crack” (212). As a result, its impact has been severe in the public as well when he writes “civil life is more frayed, even more polarized, even nastier” after 9/11 (213). Because of such binary, transcultural home cannot be imagined.

Some critics also criticize about the decision of the Americans as they have chosen the wrong path of paradise since 9/11. In *Transatlantic Literature and Culture After 9/11: The Wrong Side of Paradise* (2014) Kristine A. Miller explores the idea of American exceptionalism since 11 September 2001. It also states that America has chosen the wrong side of paradise by waging war on terror rather than working for global peace. The book not only problematizes the issue of American exceptionalism but also deals with the issue of the need of global negotiation after 9/11. Miller (2014) writes, “Zooming gradually inward from “Empire” to “Cosmopolis” to “City” , the book reframes Ground Zero as a site of not only exceptional American trauma but



also ongoing global negotiations” (12). Miller further writes that different writers and artists have taken “9/11 as both a domestic and international difficulty” (13). In that sense, post-9/11 literature has been the literature of failure to some extent. Only critical understanding and negotiation may help to strengthen other countries’ relation with America. In Miller’s analysis, 9/11 has been taken “as a traumatic wound beyond words” and poststructuralist theory represents the attacks “as a dramatic media spectacle” (3). For the trauma theory, “there is no language” and for the poststructuralists “there is nothing but” (3). In other words, no language could express the trauma or wound of 9/11 and for the poststructuralists, 9/11 is nothing and something at the same time. “Transatlantic literature and culture have challenged ideas of American exceptionalism since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001” (Miller 3). Supporting the ideas of F. Scott Fitzgerald, Miller argues, “Americans are perhaps not actually in paradise but just ... side of it” (4). “Trauma theorists reject the fiction constructed by the media, reporting more or less national” (5). Focusing on the essence of Gray’s *After the Fall* and Martin Randall’s *9/11 and the Literature of Terror*, post-9/11 literature is represented as the literature of “a failure” because rather than focusing “transcultural issues” post-9/11 American literature aimed “to focus on domestic concern” or domestic trauma (8). They should have given more focus on transcultural living.

Some writers also blame America of creating fear rather than harmony since 9/11. Arin Keeble in *The 9/11 Novel: Trauma, Politics and Identity* (2014) presents conflictedness and disorientation in analyzing post 9/11 literary scenario. In his analysis, homeland has been conflicted because of the sense of fear in Bush administration. He became disoriented mainly after watching the television programme *Homeland* and the political drama *The West Wing*. He found that American national mood after 9/11 has been fraught. Such fear creates no harmony

but fragmentation in transcultural living. American writers take post 9/11 frames of memory through homogeneous and static perspective. However, Lucy Bond in *Frames of Memory after 9/11: Culture, Criticism, Politics, and Law* (2015) writes about the need of transcultural understanding among the westerners as she asserts:

Understands the theory and practice of memory as transmedial, transdisciplinary, and transcultural phenomena in and through which representations of the past slip and flow between discourses. ... Readings of the past can then appear homogenizing rather than heterogeneous – static rather than fluid. (10)

Contending the homogeneous and static representation of the frames of memory, Bond argues “Ground zero remains a site of controversy and contestation” (171). She states that “afterlife of the 9/11” has been “an important legacy” of “the ethics and politics of memory” (171). Because of the presence of ethics and politics in the frames of memory after 9/11, the global home has been uncanny for the immigrants or citizens of the globe. It shows there is an urgent need of transcultural home where people can celebrate heterogeneity and fluidity rather than homogeneity being static.

Instead of embracing the minority, the Muslims have been terrorized since 9/11. Regarding such scenario, Aroosa Kanwal in *Rethinking Identities in Contemporary Pakistani Fiction* (2015) writes about changing identity of Muslims through fiction and literature after 9/11. Quoting Arjun Appadurai, he writes that perceptions about Muslims have been changed “from a ... terrorized minority to a terrifying majority” (3). He further states that Pakistani identity has been reframed in the aftermath of 9/11. The writer’s major focus is on the literary representation of Pakistani Muslim Identity in UK and USA mainly after 9/11. Second generation writers, such as Mohsin Hamid and others have been attempting to “expand the

horizon of their fictional canvass to include the Muslim communities in the US and the UK, in order to foreground Islam's troubled relationship with the west after 9/11" (15). His main contention or argument is that the "paradigmatic shift in identity formation" of Pakistanis from territorial to non-territorial would not be possible in the absence of 9/11 (198). His understanding is that change of Pakistani identity is not just the matter of civilizational clash; rather it is because of change in political global scenarios after 9/11. Such identity formation is politically constructed. It has been widely argued that the progress in Pakistani literature after 9/11 has been "the sudden boom and Pakistani recognition" has been in rapid growth (200). The writer strongly supports the changes that occurred in Pakistani literature after 9/11; however, he believes that it is not the sudden move. Rather, it is a process of transition and evolution. He writes " This new wave of Pakistani writing exemplifies a process of transition and a constantly evolving literary tradition ; rather than what is often assumed by commentators to be a sudden boom in the aftermath of 9/11" (200). In his analysis, such "shift opens up further avenues for contextualizing Pakistani post-9/11 fiction in relation to tribal brutalities and conservative tendencies" (200). He does not seem to favour Islamophobia or Islamic extremism. Islamic extremism has been destructive not only for others but it also has been the cause of their own destruction. For instance, Taliban's unsuccessful murder attempt of Malala Yousafzai in 2012 proves that Muslims have problems in themselves as well. His position seems to strengthen the bond of transcultural living as he disregards the path of Islamic extremism.

The defect of 9/11 and its aftermath is the birth of binary logic since 9/11 and its aftermath, for some critics. Daniel O' Gorman in *Fictions of the War on Terror: Difference and the Transnational 9/11 Novel* (2015) argues that post 9/11 scenario is seen as the binary of "us and them" (3). On the one hand, America is falling into the trap of the rhetoric of making

themselves “us” and treating others as “them”. The controversial speeches of George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden both were against peace and harmony, for O’ Gorman. Instead of inviting people for global peace, they attempted to create more fragmentation in the world. In the support of military intervention both in Afghanistan and in Iraq, George W. Bush delivered his speech on 20 September 2001 stating:

‘[e]very nation in every region now has a decision to make: Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists’. ... This is not, however, just America’s fight. And what is at stake is not just America’s freedom. This is the world’s fight. This is civilization’s fight. (O’ Gorman 2-3)

Similarly, on 7 September 2001, as Osama bin Laden declared in his speech that the United States, “came out to fight Islam [in] the name of fighting terrorism. ... I say these events have split the whole world into two camps: the camp of belief and of disbelief” (O’ Gorman 3). The major controversy is that Bush and Blair took the issue in social, political and moral ground whereas bin Laden took it in religious ground. In that sense, post 9/11 scenario came to be divided into “ideological clash” (O’ Gorman 4). The novels written on the war on terror by Americans are mainly stereotypical representations of the Muslims - Such as *The Road* by Cormac McCarthy (2006), *Windows on the World* by Frederic Beigbeder (2003), *The Good Life* by Jay McInerney (2006), *Falling Man* by Don DeLillo (2010), *Tree of Smoke* by Denis Johnson (2007), *Terrorist* by John Updike (2006) and some fictions on the same issue by South Asian Diasporic writers such as- *Shalimar the Clown* by Salman Rushdie (2005), *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* by Mohsin Hamid (2007) and some others take a different line. The difference is that they are not the stereotypical depiction of the Americans; rather they are the attempts of finding a way out from the problem even by being radical. Thus, the writer is attempting “to

show how literature might help to challenge the reductive ‘us and them’ binaries often present in the framing of identity and difference after 9/11” (174). It seems to be true that hospitality does not emerge out of binaries; rather it flourishes only in transcultural practices that can be achieved in the embrace of transculturalism.

Some authors also opine that America’s capitalism has been playing the role of American exceptionalism since 9/11. George Fragopoulos and M. Naydan in *Terror in Global Narrative: Representations of 9/11 in the Age of Late-Late Capitalism* (2016) argue, “New York’s Twin Towers emerged as haughty symbols of American capitalism” (1). In their analysis, America’s exceptionalism is the root cause of othering. They state:

The buildings officially opened in 1973 and soon came to signify not only the dominance of America’s ideology of exceptionalism, but New York’s emergence as the center of Capital’s global reach. The towers survived a terrorist bombing on February 26, 1993, but they would fail to survive a second attack—one that killed three thousand people. (1)

Different writers, in this collection, find conversation of capitalism and art or dynamic interplay with late capitalism in twenty first century. They further assert:

A notably new kind of war emerged after 9/11: a war on Terror, as George W. Bush and members of his cabinet termed it. This war, Bush told Americans, would be a different kind of war, not only fought against another nation or an easily identifiable target. Rather, Americans would fight this war against an enemy that possessed a radically different ideology— one that involved resentment toward American freedoms, hatred of American successes, and anger about America’s standing in the world. (4)

The construction of “the Freedom Tower –two pools designed by Israeli-American architect Michael Arad and dedicated by us President Barack Obama on September 11, 2011 ... shows

evidence of the degree to which capitalism and art interplay with one another in the post-9/11 imagination” (5). The construction of pools, tower and museum quite clearly depicts the scenario that America “is unable to escape capitalism’s grip, and like the Freedom tower, the memorial comes to represent a society that endures as unchanged by 9/11” (6). Analyzing 9/11 through the perspective of deconstruction, they argue that 9/11 has created a condition of paradox in art and literature that shows “changing everything and changing nothing” (8). Regarding 9/11, the Americans blame Islamic al-Qaeda terrorists of being “fanatical fundamentalists” whereas the Muslims blame the Americans of being “Christian fundamentalists” (1).

Some writers even blame the Muslims of being fanatic and Americans of being fundamentalist. Liliana M. Naydan in *Rhetorics of Religion in American Fiction: Faith, Fundamentalism, and Fanaticism in the Age of Terror* (2016) analyses that the Muslims have the problem of fanaticism whereas the Americans have the problem of fundamentalism. Muslim fictions on 9/11 have been highly fanatical and the American fictions on 9/11 have been too much fundamentalist. Being too stick to Christian fundamentalism, on the one hand; and being too stick to fanaticism as Muslims; both are problematic. One religious faith as proposed by Christian fundamentalists and another radical faith as proposed by Muslim fanatic are two different extremes. Naydan further argues that writing after 9/11 has been the age of terror or the age of barbarism because of the inclusion of religion just like Christian fundamentalists or its lack such as Muslim fanatic. She investigates:

Within the context of rhetorical and global struggles involving faiths, fundamentalisms, fanaticisms, and secularisms, the literature of 9/11 and what DeLillo has called the Age of Terror emerges, and authors writing implicitly or explicitly about 9/11 address, via more or less informed ways, the problems that religion or lack thereof create. To write

literature after 9/11 may have been as barbaric as ‘to write poetry after Auschwitz’, to cite and appropriate Theodor W. Adorno’s well-known and eventually retracted remark.

(13)

She makes a claim that there must be negotiation between two extremes- the extreme of Christian fundamentalism and the extreme of Muslim fanaticism as he writes:

Yet in the texts I examine, negotiations between secularism, atheism, faith, fundamentalism, and fanaticism rarely strand anyone entirely. In many cases, these negotiations lead to opportunities for authors, fictionalized believers, and readers alike to redefine what it means to be a believer in America. (15)

Thus, the problem can be solved only by the embrace of “interfaith dialogue in an Age of Terror” and it might help to “see the development of new faiths, fundamentalisms, and fanaticism” (18).

These “new dialogic and ideological impasses” are taken as changing agents (18). In her concluding remark, she writes that Mohsin Hamid and Halaby have given emphasis on “the existence of market fundamentalism”, Don DeLillo, John Updike and Barbara Kingsolver on “relative insiders”, and Philip Roth on “relative outsider to America” (183). She suggests the Americans to stop the practice of the discourse of otherness regarding religion in the aftermath of 9/11. Her analysis seems to be quite relevant in creating transcultural home as his argument emphasizes in negotiating among faith, fundamentalism, and fanaticism.

Some also claim that Americans are trying to look innocent since 9/11. According to Lenore Bell in *The “Other” in 9/11 Literature* (2017) white Americans’ attempt of justifying their innocence is depicted in Jay McInerney’s *The Good Life*, Don DeLillo’s *Falling Man*, Jonathon Safran Foer’s *Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close*, John Updike’s *Terrorist*, Joseph O’Neill’s *Netherland*, Jarret Kobek’s *Atta*, and Amy Waldman’s *The Submission*. These writers

quite clearly “introduce[s] concepts of first world complacency, mortality salience, and innocence” (1). They write about the scenario of “two blood baths. The first was the carnage wrought by the terror attacks on the Twin Towers. But the second blood bath came from an unlikely source: a catastrophic influx of blood donations” (1). According to their claim both the loss of American blood in 9/11 attacks and also the scarcity of blood in hospitals for the victims of 9/11 attacks were American wounds. American nationalism or jingoistic nationalism has been created on such basis or understanding. This type of one sided notion of nationalism, in the eyes of Muslims, has been “bad nationalism” or “Ugly nationalism” (8). Their claim is that America was innocent before September 11 attacks but not after the attacks, although the white Americans may not agree here. About it, Jeneba Ghatt argues:

Before 9/11, America was a nation that welcomed all, and was more or less a land of the free, in its truest sense. We came and went as we pleased, for the most part, virtually unchecked and unmonitored. Since then, the country has had to grow up pretty fast, put up some guards and barriers to protect its citizens and inhabitants, ushering a brand new era of terror. (Bell 2017)

Thus, Lenore Bell makes a claim that white Americans frequently attempt to create a new sort of innocence which is their “traditional and contradictory” norm (15). They have been successful in doing so because of strong media support. Bell vividly argues that “America had not lost any innocence” rather “it was forging a new narrative” before September 11 (15). Before 9/11 “American blood played a larger role” in creating harmony for transcultural living (15). Before 9/11, America was salad bowl rather than melting pot. However, such environment ended after 9/11 attack and a big clash emerged; and it was not just the clash of civilization as stated by Samuel Huntington; rather it was more severe than that. Bell also claims that the new narrative



created by the Americans after 9/11 seems to be stronger and more insular for the Americans but such narrative is default and a departure from innocence for the writer because it is politically constructed rather than being apolitical. Transcultural home cannot be imagined in the absence of innocence.

Some European critics also attempt to justify 9/11 as the eighth wonder of the world. In this context, Svenja Frank in *9/11 in European Literature* (2017) takes 9/11 as dehistoricization. He quotes French philosopher Baudrillard's opinion that "By the grace of terrorism, the World Trade center has become the world's most beautiful Building-the eighth wonder of the world!" (4). He argues for the need of "United West fighting for the liberal values of freedom and democracy against any fundamentalist perpetrators" (9). He argues not only for European identity formation but also for maintaining transatlantic relations. He also mentions the idea of Habermas and Jacques Derrida as "collective outcry" and "Rebirth of Europe" as "a new unity" and "identity" (9). The Europeans took 9/11 as if they "called for a unifying re-definition" of "The fall of the Berlin Wall or the collapse of the Soviet bloc" (9). Svenja Frank further argues:

After the collapse of Soviet bloc, Atlanticism played a crucial role in the Eastern European states as a means to distance themselves from Russia. Russia's support of the war against Terror thus led to irritations in the process of national identity formation, as the former Soviet bloc states were now caught in the ambiguity between an Atlanticism which would bring these states closer to Russia and a Europeanism of the anti-Iran war league. (10)

In that sense, it has been quite common that "anti-Americanism" has been "a European core identity" after 9/11 (10). The Europeans have felt the need for a strong European identity after 9/11 on the one hand; and they have also fear of the Muslim states on the other hand (11). Not

only the Eastern Europe; but also the Western Europe is in the quest of diffusing fear after 9/11. Although Islam is the second largest religion in Europe after Christianity and the fourth largest religion in USA after Christianity, Buddhism and Judaism, post-9/11 Europe has felt more complexity politically, socially and intellectually. The Europeans are aware that 9/11 does not contribute a personal experience; rather it is a global media event (14). European media and semiotic theory have interpreted and represented 9/11 as “metaization” and “aesthetic reflections” (16). The Europeans have observed 9/11 in three different aspects- First, 9/11 as “metaization” and “aesthetic reflection” (16). They have realized that the event of 9/11 has been over-represented by poststructuralist and deconstructive French media and semiotic theory (16). Second, the reception of 9/11 has been taken as “a worthwhile field of investigation” (19). Third, Europe has felt the need of unique identity formation after 9/11. Despite their cultural heterogeneity or their historical, cultural; and linguistic diversity, 9/11 has been a great source of self-understanding for the European. They are compelled for self-understanding (19). It is quite clear that Europe has actually experienced historical, cultural and linguistic diversity rather than the Americans who still practice monoculture in the name of globalization (19). Different researches clearly prove that “European culture is far stronger than a much more general idea of a global western culture” (20). 9/11 or September 11 in US history, is perceived as “a caesura,” a pause or a rhythmic break (20). However, the Europeans reception of 9/11 is different because they have “integrated or received 9/11 attacks into their national histories” (20). This is a proof that the Europeans have included the voices of others whereas the Americans have excluded the voices of others. Representation and reception of others in the history of Americans is quite visible that the Americans perceived 9/11 as “dehistorization” and “bizarre turns” (22). The European perception of 9/11 quite clearly depicts that the major cause of the rise of

Islamophobia is the war on Terror (22). The common understanding of the Europe regarding their identity reveals quite vividly that Europe is in between the trap of USA and Muslim societies. They have been the victims of double others. The first is US and the second Muslim Societies (24). Svenja Frank compares 9/11 with the fall of Berlin wall as he finds both of these events as the issues of civilizational clash as stated by Huntington and he also argues that hijacked American Airlines carrying the enemy can be taken as the symbol of “Stranger within” or “inner cultural contradictions” (24). In the Understanding of Rolf G. Renner “Western society has lost its moral compass as a result of the war on Terror” (37). The European understanding of 9/11 regarding political layer depicts the understanding that the voices of both George W. Bush and Barack Obama were not favorable voices for others. He quotes Bush’s statement that, “This will be monumental struggle of good versus evil. But good will prevail” (40). Similarly, he also quotes Barack Obama’s comment on Laden’s death-“So his demise should be welcomed by all who believe in peace and human dignity... justice has been done” (40). The Europeans were “neither involved nor threatened” by the Muslims (42). The 9/11 attack in the eyes of Muslims was because “they completely rejected a hybrid fusing of cultures” (42). The semiotic representation quite vividly proves that 9/11 was much more mediated rather representing what actually happened. From the perspective of conspiracy theory, “9/11 became almost instantaneously a local, a national, and a transnational event” (107).

Birte Christ, in analyzing the works of fictions Frederick Beigbeder’s *Windows on the World* (2003) and Thomas Hettche’s *Woraus Wir gemacht Sind* (2006), argues, “Both novels ... reaffirm the marginal status of Muslims in Western Europe and to implicitly reject the idea of France and Germany as multicultural societies” (qtd. in Frank 217). He further asserts post 9/11 has given two types of responsibilities among the Europeans – responsibility of “transnational

understanding and understanding of one's national self" (Frank 246). In conclusion, 9/11 has made the Europeans aware "For national identity making-in literature from outside the US" (Frank 246). Regarding this dissertation, his ideas are quite relevant in building transcultural understanding because it is possible not through dehistoricization approach of the Americans; rather it is possible only by including the voices of others in national history just like the history of the Europeans.

In conclusion, the review of literature of the dissertation has focused mainly the discourse of 9/11 trauma and the discourse of terrorism based on 9/11. The 9/11 trauma discourse consists of psychological trauma and cultural trauma. Terrorism based on 9/11 literature also consists Arab world view of criticism and American world view of criticism. However, much of the critical lines of the literature review of the dissertation are of cultural trauma. As 9/11 literature takes the line of cultural trauma, othering is done mainly for Muslim immigrants. Because of the excessive play of othering, subjectivity of the real victims of 9/11 has remained in the shadow. In much of the reviews done so far have either focused on psychological trauma or terrorism. Some have written about psychological trauma and some about cultural trauma. Similarly, some have written about terrorism being biased. The gap in reviews of the dissertation catches up not just the play of trauma and terrorism. Rather the review made so far has opened way for alternative global structure, that is, transcultural living and transcultural hospitality. Thus, 9/11 literature of the west seems to be Bush-Blair agenda that has been exercised through media regime, butchery, plotting justice, over play of cultural trauma, American exceptionalism, binary logic and Christian fundamentalism. Christian fundamentalism is defined as "biblical literalism" or "the belief that every word of the Bible is to be taken literally as the word of God" (Davis 121). In other words, the practice of biblical literalism by some politicians like George W. Bush and

Donald Trump in post 9/11 phase has emerged as the counter contrast to all embracing logic of liberalism or free will. The literalist belief of the Americans refers to just the lip service of multiculturalism towards immigrants and others rather than embracing the belief in liberalism, a genuine way of embracing. Such hegemonic representation of the event may lead the world towards anarchy, chaos and unrest rather than strengthening the tie of transcultural living. In strengthening the tie of transcultural living, the following theoretical insights need to be analyzed along with the major claims raised by the writers of the selected fictions.

Thus, the gap found in this research is that criticism of 9/11 literature generally focuses on the language of 9/11 trauma discourse in fictions written by white writers -- American and British. But it does not give an insight into the why and how of the prose of otherness against the Muslim community in such fictional works. This dissertation digs into the why and how through an analysis of postcolonial novels on 9/11 and highlights the resistance to and conversely, emphasis on maintaining the ethos of multiculturalism in the selected postcolonial novels.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE RESEARCH

#### Introduction

The theoretical framework of the research lends interpretive muscle based on “phenomenological research” or “interpretative research, i.e the focus on individual perceptions of events” to the textual analysis (Biggam 169). In other words, the research applies deconstructive approach of hermeneutic or interpretation. The philosophical root of the method lies in subjective way of grabbing reality as for epistemology, the theory or science of the method. So far as the nature of knowledge or nature of social reality concerns regarding ontology, the dissertation follows the line of Interpretivism or constructivism. From axiological point of view, the research has been designed focusing on the importance of human value or social value. Thus, the textual analysis is done through interpretive angles of cultural theories of postcolonial nature.

The framework consists of transculturalism and transcultural identity, unconditional hospitality, ethical hospitality, postcolonial hospitality, transcultural embrace and intercultural identity, glocalization, diasporic identity and transnational identity along with some critical insights of globalization. As the research follows qualitative method, it has been found that Epstein’s radicalism, Derrida’s unconditional hospitality, Levinas’s ethicality, Rosello’s mutual metamorphosis, Mohr’s transcultural embrace, Roudometof’s glocalization, Hall’s metamorphic identity or diasporic identity and Brinkerhoff’s transnational identity or Digital Diasporas are applied to observe the primary texts for the purpose of research design.

Apart from key theoretical ideas, some critical insights of globalization have been used as the support for research design to analyze the primary texts. Patrick Porter’s global village as

myth of empire, Lechner and Boli's notion of globalization as the play of territorialization, deterritorialization and reterritorialization, Maximiliano E. Korstanje's inter-tribal pact, Gideon Baker's liberalism have been found essential prerequisites or methods or designs for interpreting and analyzing textual data.

The ideas of Jeffrey D. Sachs have been found quite relevant in order to conceptualize globalization, its optimism and fears from Paleolithic Age to the Digital Age of Twenty-first century. Jeffrey D. Sachs's critique of existing globalization and the need of its re-ordering through "the interactions of geography, technology, and institution" and his support of "E. O. Wilson's vision of "Stone Age emotions, medieval institutions, and godlike technology" proves that Twenty-First Century globalization should come blending physical and spiritual elements (214). These key theoretical and critical insights are the basic requirements to observe and analyze the selected novels.

Four novels have been selected in order to achieve the goal of transcultural hospitality as primary data to examine the existing socio-cultural practices in the context of postcolonial diasporic situation. These selected novels -- Ali's *Brick Lane* (2003), Kunzru's *Transmission* (2004), Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) and Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007) not only depict the stereotypical representation of South Asian diasporic immigrants living in the so-called globalized world primarily in America and London, the attempt has also been made to imagine alternative home of transcultural living. The dissertation involves the forms of qualitative data collection, analysis and interpretation under the framework of qualitative method based on interpretivism. Narrative epistemology becomes quite prominent in analyzing not only the primary texts but also the secondary sources and the sources selected for methodology or tool of analysis.

The qualitative data have been collected from the primary texts or the novels which were selected in order to fulfill the purpose according to the need and availability of socio-cultural aspects mentioned in the texts about India, Bangladesh and Pakistan in particular and South Asian diasporic situation on a broader level. Relevant qualitative data have been collected from the texts in order to draw the conclusion of transcultural hospitality. After the collection of textual evidences, the researcher goes through the process of analysis. For the analysis, textual evidences are observed first. Then they are connected with the ideas of critics or theorists and then they are examined with the major argument of the dissertation.

### **Transculturalism and Transcultural Identity**

Transculture is generally defined as the amalgamation of different cultures with the aim of creating diversity under the framework of globalization. However, its operational definition is context based. Regarding this dissertation, transculture is operationally defined focusing on the ideas of Mikhail Epstein. For Epstein, transculture is the notion of going beyond native culture through self-transformation in order to create the community of “salad bowl” not of “melting pot”. The salad bowl modality of transculture refers to the embrace of differences and the melting pot modality of transculture refers to the othering of the differences with the aim of cultural assimilation and integration of various popular cultures into dominant cultures.

In postcolonial context, transculture generally means going beyond one’s own culture or going beyond native culture. According to the dictionary of Merriam Webster the adjective “transcultural” means extending across culture. Some claim that transculture means avoiding orthodox practices of one’s own native culture or transforming them from culturology and also avoiding extreme practices of both globalism and multiculturalism in order to come to terms with a truly interconnected society of reciprocity. Roudometof investigates, “The terms



transculturalism, *mestizaje*, and creole emerged from within the Latin American milieu. In the 1940s Fernando Ortiz developed the notion of transculturalism” in order to show the situation of “interculturally mixed people (mestissage)” in the socio-cultural context of Latin America (13). He further investigates, “Transculturalism has been extended into hybridity ... In Ortiz’s initial formation, transculturalism entails a synthesis of two simultaneous phases: a de-culturing of the past and a mestissage of the present” (13). It demonstrates the features of cultural hybridization.

Mikhail Epstein’s idea of transculture is neither just “de- culturing” nor merely the “mestissage of the present.” He has a broader perspective than that. For him transculture is self-transformation and creating a rule of thumb. For Epstein, transculture has the agency to get rid of the two extremes -- culturology and globalism or multiculturalism. As Epstein argues:

Transculture is a way to transcend our “given” culture and to apply culture’s transformative forces to culture itself. Transculture is the second order of “culturology” of culture, its capacity for self-cultivation and self-transcendence. If culturology is the self-awareness of culture, then transculture is the self-transformation of culture, the totality of theories and practices that liberate culture from its own mechanism. (23-24)

It shows being aware only about our native culture is the matter of culturology. But the matter of transculture is broader than that because people need to show readiness for self- transformation without disregarding the origin in transculture. Transcultural practice is not only distinct from cultural practice, it is also different from multicultural practice. Regarding it, Epstein explores:

Transcultural practice is not a diminishment of or confrontation with our cultural selves but rather a way of expanding the limits of our ethnic, professional, linguistic, and other identities to new levels of indeterminacy and “virtuality.” Transculture builds new identities in the zone of fuzziness and interference and challenges the metaphysics of

discreteness so characteristic of nations, races, professions, and other established cultural configurations that are solidified rather than dispersed by the multiculturalist “politics of identity.” (25)

It shows both cultural practice and multicultural practice are not free from identity politics.

Envisioning the reason of practicing transculture, Epstein further explores, “Now that the boundaries of “native cultures” have become too narrow for humans, we are developing other new dimensions that we call here transcultural” (26). It clearly justifies that transcultural living is a broader space for uniting the people of various communities and origins.

Epstein argues that transculture is the liberation from native culture. Transcultural individuals are liberated individuals. Transculture embraces moral value of humanity that makes one culture open to other cultures. Epstein states that the so-called globalism or American globalism refers to “mass culture” and multiculturalism that refers to “pride of minorities” and both share a common feature, that is, “determinism” (329). It implies western model of globalization and multiculturalism both are American constructions. As one follows the notion of determinism, he argues, the free will remains in the shadow. Transculture highlights the need of transformation, end of determinism, embrace of cultural liberation, end of the pride of mass culture (globalism) and end of the pride of minority (multiculturalism).

In this light, Epstein’s transculture resembles John Cowburn’s idea of “Free will.” Cowburn states that even scientists are deterministic (24). Defining determinism he writes, “Determinism is a philosophical position according to which all human actions are predetermined” (144). In other words, “all human acts are determined” or “predictable” in deterministic thought (144). In the chapter “Science and Determinism” Cowburn observes that “post-medieval scientists” follow the principle of determinism and he finds “determinism as an

element of scientism” (153- 155). For him, the globalized western world would be more hospitable if they embraced the principle of free will but not determinism. In fact, Epstein’s transculture works as “a universal symbolic palette, from which individuals can freely choose and mix colors in order to paint their self-portraits” (343). It clearly proves how transcultural identity is formed. Transcultural identity, transnational identity and intercultural identity may look similar on the surface. But they are different in essence. Transnational identity focuses on going beyond national boundaries without necessarily acknowledging the individual differences. Transcultural identity as the dissertation stresses on, however; is the unstable identity that highlights for self-transformation and self- choices without changing the essence of cultural root and embraces and acknowledges individual differences within and the differences between cultures. Transcultural identity also differs a bit from intercultural identity because transcultural identity is formed embracing the features of interconnectedness of cultures, cultural fluidity, cultural flexibility, shared humanity, shared intimacy and mutual metamorphosis whereas intercultural identity focuses more on cultural assimilation into dominant culture. Transnational identity primarily focuses on the identity of the immigrants whereas transcultural identity is not merely the identity of the immigrants but of transcultural individuals who can be immigrants or the natives. Transnational identity looks more conditional than unconditional or it can be both but transcultural identity is assumed to be unconditional only on the basis of this research. In fact, transcultural identity can be strengthened only by being unconditional, responsible, ethical and sincere as suggested by Jacques Derrida and Immanuel Levinas.

### **Unconditional Hospitality**

Hospitality generally means warm welcome and treating the guests or strangers with dignity and honour. Magnanimous behaviours and sense of reciprocity are expected both in

guests and hosts. The operational definition of hospitality regarding this dissertation should be seen in broader level. In other words, American model of globalism or multiculturalism has betrayed global immigrants, mainly the Muslims as guests. In that sense, western world is always stick to conditional hospitality or hospitality of invitation. But for the sake of this research, a true hospitality is the situation of all being unconditional. In other words, true hospitality in transcultural living is the hospitality of visitation (i.e travelling according to the free will of the immigrants) as suggested by Jacques Derrida.

Derrida's unconditional hospitality or hospitality of visitation and ethical hospitality of Levinas are constructed on the philosophy of the city. The city has not just been "the main locus for human habitation" or the center of human consciousness or civilization, but it has also been the problem from ancient times till date (Jacobs and Malpas ix). The primary problem of the city is capitalism or money matter. For Aristotle, city suffers from "corrosive effects of money" (qtd. in Jacobs and Malpas xv). The whole dissertation project, in a sense, interrogates western civilization which has been represented as the city metaphor.

Regarding hospitality, Levinas and Derrida both take conditional hospitality as a mere practice of totalitarianism. For Levinas, such practice of inhospitable treatment of the immigrants or practice of conditional hospitality is seen mainly in the use of language. The host nations look irresponsible, insincere, and unethical in treating the immigrants. Levinas also looks suspicious upon the wrongly formed global order. Referring to the existing global order, he thinks that no one looks sincere, responsible, and ethical. He believes that a truly globalized citizen lives maintaining supreme dignity.

Derrida asserts that there are two kinds of hospitality; conditional and unconditional. His allegation is that the West has been open to the conditional hospitality only. Unconditional

hospitality for him is a far cry in the so-called globalized west. He further states that hospitality follows two laws- First “The law of unlimited hospitality” and Second “the laws” (*Of Hospitality* 77). In unlimited hospitality, for Derrida, there are no conditions and even if some small conditions are made they are easily fulfilled. In that sense, unlimited hospitality looks like homecoming of the guests without any restrictions. In conditional hospitality, on the other hand, the state forms various rights, duties and laws which are conditional. Andrew Shepherd also summarizes Derrida’s notion of conditional hospitality and unconditional hospitality. He states Derrida’s conditional hospitality as the “hospitality in the world of concrete realities” whereas unconditional hospitality is taken as the pure concept and it has neither political nor legal status (Shepherd 60). Derrida’s position regarding postcolonial immigrants or guests is reflected quite clearly as he asserts that hospitality has been replaced by hostipitality where the host nations have been playing the role of hostile agents towards the guests. Derrida argues “hospitality means the right of a stranger not to be treated with hostility when he arrives on someone else’s territory” (*Hostipitality* 4). About how hospitality changes into hostility, Derrida further asserts, “The welcomed guest is a stranger treated as ... an enemy” (4). According to Derrida, there are two essential features in hospitality, that is, visitation and invitation. Visitation is unconditional and invitation is conditional. The required hospitality for Derrida is unconditional. He clarifies the difference between visitation and invitation using the “door” as metaphor. He writes:

To take up the figure of the door, for there to be hospitality, there must be a door. But if there is a door, there is no longer hospitality. There is no hospitable house. There is no house without doors and windows. But as soon as there are a door and windows, it means that someone has the key to them and consequently controls the conditions of hospitality. There must be a threshold. But if there is a threshold, there is no longer hospitality. This

is the difference, the gap, between the hospitality of invitation and the hospitality of visitation. In visitation there is no door. Anyone can come at any time and can come in without needing a key for the door. There are no custom checks with a visitation. But there are customs and police checks with an invitation. Hospitality thus becomes the threshold or the door. (*Hostipitality* 14)

It shows Derrida prefers the hospitality of visitation not invitation because visitation follows the principle of free will or unconditional hospitality. Derrida defines cosmopolitanism as the “negotiation between the unconditional and the conditional, between the absolute and the relative, between the universal and the particular” (*On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* xi). However, problem occurs as the so-called globalized west plays hegemonic role instead of making negotiation and compromise.

Derrida and Levinas mainly blame “ill-equipped” “western thought” or ontology or western metaphysics of imagining the existence of God as nonexistence or existence of God not within this physical world but beyond. Such thought has made the western world inhospitable (Shepherd 81). The two major problems Derrida and Levinas raise are the problems of totalization and sameness and the ethics. To bring change in the western thought there is an urgent need of “a Copernican revolution in western thought” (Shepherd 81). For them, such thought can embrace the differences and they will be free from unethical or immoral act.

Derrida in *Dessimination* (1981) argues that city is in the core of his heart. His city symbolizes the whole project of globalization. In fact, the city is constructed consisting the haves and have-nots. He states:

The text occupies the place before ‘me’; it regards me, invests me, announces me to myself, keeps watch over the complicity I entertain with my most secret present, survey’s

my heart's core – which is precisely a city, and a labyrinthine one – as if from the top of a watch tower planted inside me, like that 'transparent column' which, having no inside of its own, is driven, being a pure outside, into that which tries to close upon itself. (341)

Derrida, thus, takes the city as a metaphor. His notion of the city is unicity or wholeness. Unicity refers to cosmopolitanism or globalism. "Derrida's city is split" just like a broken heart – "into tower and labyrinth, whose destiny is decided by the tower" (Damai 69). Tower refers to power or upward authority which is exercised by the western world and labyrinth refers to the status of powerless immigrants. The destiny of the immigrants is decided always by the tower or upward authority not by the labyrinth. Derrida wants to see harmony between "tower" and "labyrinth" but he finds a big gap between them. Therefore, the world of cosmopolitanism looks strange to him. Here, tower symbolizes the powerful ones whereas labyrinth refers to the powerless immigrants.

In "The Rogue That I am" Derrida raises the issue of "constitutive autoimmunity" (63). This refers to self-weakening immune system of cosmopolitanism. He argues that "hospitality remains limited and conditional" in constitutive autoimmunity (63). He claims that "democracy" attempts to "welcome only men, and on the condition that they be citizens, brothers, and compeers ... excluding all the others, in particular bad citizens, rogues, noncitizens, and all sorts of unlike and unrecognizable others" (63). He also argues that even "Rogues degenerates" should be treated as "brothers, citizens and compeers" in true democracy (63). Derrida in "Autoimmunity: Real and Symbolic suicide" describes autoimmunity process in three moments. He summarizes the process as:

I shall do this in three moments, twice by reference to what has been called the "Cold War", the "end of the Cold War", or "the balance of terror." These three moments or

series of arguments all appeal to the same logic. The same logic that elsewhere I propose we extend without limit in the form of an implacable law: the one that regulates every autoimmunity process. As we know, an autoimmunity process is that strange behavior where a living being, in quasi-suicidal fashion, “itself” works to destroy its own protection, to immunize itself against its “own” immunity. (94)

Here, Derrida uses “The Cold War in the head” as the “First moment, first autoimmunity that refers to the use of “transgression” or a breaking of a moral or legal code as defined by the dictionary of Meriam Webster (94). He claims that “transgression violates the territory of a country” such as Cold War and its cause (94). So the first symptom of autoimmunity is “suicidal autoimmunity” or “autoimmunitary aggression” (95). The second moment in autoimmunity refers to the situation that looks “worse than the cold war” (96). This moment, therefore, can be termed as “autoimmunitary terror” (96). Because of “traumatic event” it is “traumatizing” in essence (96). So Derrida describes this moment as “autoimmunitary logic” (98). And sometimes this moment is described as “autoimmunitary movements” (99). For Derrida, the third autoimmunity process refers to “The Vicious Circle of repression”. Derrida argues that “humanity is defenseless against the threat of this evil” or “The Vicious circle of repression” (100). He presents “War on Terrorism” as an example to illustrate this third moment of autoimmunity. It clearly proves that the immune system of western globalization and multiculturalism has been worse from the beginning of cold war, its end and it has been worst in post 9/11 phase.

Derrida’s notion of “aporias” in *Aporias* (1993) looks quite relevant as the western world is passing through aporatic situation creating uncertainty mainly among the strangers (12).

Derrida explores:



The places of aporia in which I have found myself, let us say, regularly tied up, indeed, paralyzed. I was then trying to move not against or out of the impasse but, in another way, according to another thinking of the aporia, one perhaps more enduring. It is the obscure way of this “according to the aporia” that I will try to determine today. And I hope that the index I just mentioned will help situate my discourse better. (13)

It clearly shows the condition of aporia has two features, first as paralysis and second extreme endurance. In other words, global immigrants are living the life of paralysis due to extreme surveillance and repression. As a result, their mobility is limited. The benefit of aporia is that the more the immigrants endure the pain and suffering the more they can do better.

### **Ethical Hospitality**

Ethical hospitality is born out of “ethics of epistemology” embracing “and ‘the other’” not “either- or assumptions” (Silverman 422). Regarding hospitality, Derrida’s target is the city or the western civilizational model itself whereas the target for Levinas is the language use. In other words, city looks inhospitable for the strangers or immigrants for Derrida but for Levinas, language use for the immigrants or for the strangers is inhospitable. LP Centre (London Premier Centre) lists out nine ethical standards for measuring hospitality - honesty and integrity, fairness and equality, respect, responsibility, professionalism, confidentiality, sustainability, compliance with laws and regulations and continuous learning. In general, ethical hospitality requires morality and responsibility mainly in host nations. The problem is that the western world looks great in forming ethical standards just in theory. The global immigrants are being stereotyped in practice.

Defining “ethical hospitality” operationally for the purpose of the dissertation, Levinas’s concepts of responsibility and sincerity are defined and elaborated here. The hospitality levinas

prefers is ethical hospitality that incorporates sincerity and responsibility. Levinas in *Totality and Infinity* (1969) mainly focuses on the essence of language. In other words, the language which is used by the West since Plato to communicate with the guests has been inhospitable in the globalized world as it follows the principle of totality that refers to the practice of totalitarianism. For both Derrida and Levinas, the notion of totality has been a problem and infinity is a need or they both demand for the address of differences. Their quest is to embrace heterogeneity and the Other rather than assimilating the Other into a totality or under the umbrella of western metaphysics. Regarding hospitality, Levinas and Derrida both have the common understanding that they take the western treatment of the strangers or others as the mere practice of totalitarianism either through language or city-unicity or wholeness. For them, the west has been inhospitable because it merely observes the East using the same glass of the west. What the westerners lack is that they forget embracing the differences. For both Levinas and Derrida – totalization notion of America is a problem. The western thought of being inhospitable towards the South Asian immigrants has been caused by the thought of totality or totalitarianism, wholeness, and generalization. In *Ethics and Infinity* (1985) Levinas suggests “ethics only comes into its own with the collapse of onto-theo-logy” or he interrogates western metaphysics (3). He views western world is facing problem at present because they are doing mistake by embracing “onto-theo-logy” (12). Levinas argues ethics “opposes power with ... responsibility and sincerity” (13). Similarly, he takes “responsibility as the essential, primary and fundamental structure of subjectivity” (95). Such responsibility should be for Other as he speaks, “I understand responsibility as responsibility for the Other, thus as responsibility for what is not my deed, or for what does not even matter to me; or which precisely does matter to me, is met by me as face” (95). He further speaks:

Positively, we will say that since the other looks at me, I am responsible for him, without even having taken on responsibilities in his regard; his responsibility is incumbent on me.

It is responsibility that goes beyond what I do. Usually, one is responsible for what one does oneself. I say, in otherwise than Being, that responsibility is initially a for the other.

This means that I am responsible for his very responsibility. (96)

It shows responsibility should be unconditionally adapted for the benefits of others for hospitable living.

Hospitality for Levinas depends on the matter of friendly human relation maintained by being responsible. Therefore, he stresses on strengthening “inter-human relationship” or “inter-subjective relation” for true hospitality which is the theme of his work *Totality and Infinity* (97-98). Whether others are responsible to us or not, it does not matter more but “I” should always be responsible to others. This is what Levinas intends to convey through *Ethics and Infinity*. He says, “I am responsible for a total responsibility, which answers for all the others and for all in the others, even for their responsibility. The I always has the responsibility more than all the others” (99). Here, Levinas seems to suggest that individual responsibility and sincerity plays vital role to make the world a better place. For that, our journey should start from “I” or individual. If “I” becomes responsible and sincere, all others are compelled to think and act in a different way. Levinas concludes his argument about responsibility stating that:

It is I who support the other and am responsible for him ... My responsibility is transferable, no one could replace me. In fact, it is a matter of saying the very identity of the human. I starting from responsibility, that is, starting from this position or deposition of the sovereign I in self-consciousness, a deposition which is precisely its responsibility for the other. Responsibility is what is incumbent on me exclusively, and what, humanly,

I cannot refuse. This charge is a supreme dignity of the unique. I am I in the sole measure that I am responsible, a non-interchangeable I. I can constitute myself for everyone, but no one can substitute himself for me. Such is my inalienable identity of subject. (101)

Thus, Levinas attempts to make every individual a truly responsible and sincere citizen who can live the life of “supreme dignity” being “Self- conscious” and such transferable, sincere, responsible and dignified individuals can live with “inalienable identity” or with “supreme identity” in a truly globalized world (Levinas 101). In contrast, the present reality of the global immigrants looks quite opposite because their dignity has been plundered. They are made irresponsible and insincere. They are living the life of prisoners. Such ideas are further explored and elaborated by Mireille Rosello in her theory of postcolonial hospitality.

### **Postcolonial Hospitality**

Postcolonial hospitality is defined as the welcome of “other” or respecting those nations and people who were colonized in the past. Postcolonial hospitality eschews the notion of mere assimilation of the “other” into the dominant culture. From the perspective of postcolonial diasporic 9/11 novels for the purpose of the dissertation, operational definition of postcolonial hospitality of Mireille Rosello has been dealt with.

The phrase “Postcolonial Hospitality” is defined as unconditional welcoming of the immigrants from the perspective of margins in postcolonial context. The unhyphenated word “Postcolonial” is used to refer to the sense of resistance. Similarly, Mireille Rosello defines hospitality in postcolonial context in order to achieve the aim of Derridean unconditional welcoming of the strangers. Rosello argues that guest should not always play the role of guest and host should not always play the role of host. They need to change their role according to context and ethical spectrum. Otherwise two extremes are born, that is, parasitism and charity.

They both create inhospitality. Hospitality for her is welcome and threat both. Like Derrida, Rosello also claims that hospitality can be conditional and unconditional. However, the so-called globalized world practices just conditional hospitality. Instead of creating thresholds or different kinds of barriers for the immigrants, the western world should create the environment of “mutual metamorphosis” in order to live happy and hospitable life.

Rosello states as we are in “new type of journey” different people need “different types of hospitality” (vii). She looks less hopeful to the hospitality of the global village as diversity has not been addressed as it should have been. Analyzing hospitality through deconstructive approach, she writes that hospitality “differs from culture to culture” and in this regard, she claims that hospitality should be defined in terms of “historical contexts” and “ethical spectrum” and “laws of hospitality clash ... between two communities” (viii). She looks quite critical to “Pasqua laws” drafted, passed and implemented in 1993 in France, which was the policy of the French government to demonize the immigrants (1). Because of the frequent debate on multiculturalism, as Rosello explores that the western world is spreading the message of the “Defeat of Hospitality” not explicitly but in an implicit manner (4). That means western world’s conditional embrace of the differences refers to the failure of hospitality.

Rosello is against the restriction of “individual hospitality” (19). The individuals, especially the foreign immigrants in the western civilization have been treated as cannibals. This cannibalistic representation looks uncanny for Rosello (31). Therefore, Rosello aims to analyze hospitality in “ordinary and unexamined practices” (33). She is quite aware even with Baudrillard’s argument that “All other cultures are extraordinarily hospitable,” and she is equally aware that some aspects of some cultures like the Japanese hospitality may take cannibalistic form sometimes as “cannibalism is a radical form of hospitality” (30- 31). She

believes that western hospitality is also not free from cannibalism and generosity although it has not been clearly defined so far. She clearly states:

In the private, individual sense, western hospitality can be practiced without being strictly defined, and it involves the mixed sense of responsibility and pleasure that we expect to experience when a friend, a relative, or, more rarely, a stranger visits for a little while.

Note that this is not very ambitious, and that my definition of hospitality is quite limited to a set of ordinary and unexamined practices. (33)

In both the situations of “state hospitality” and “private hospitality”, every citizen should be “required to abide by the laws of (in) hospitality” (35). She argues that immigration policy should be logically drafted. For instance, “Pasqua Laws” was not logically drafted in France (1).

Rosello investigates that the westerners suffer from “xenophobia” because of universalized imagination (50). Subverting the notion of “global citizenship”, she argues that “we all are hybrids” (61-62). In order to strengthen her claim, she brings novelistic reference from Cauwelaert’s *Un Aller Simple*. She finds that Aziz, a child found in a stolen car, has been stereotyped by Gypsy community instead of nurturing him (55). On the basis of the above novelistic reference, she concludes that “global citizenship does not exist”, but everybody’s identity is hybrid because “we all are hybrids” in globalism and multiculturalism (62).

Rosello recommends people to embrace “new models of cross-hospitality” (67). In such conditioning, “Hospitality requires a level of trust” (75). Therefore, the postcolonial texts should be taken as “The Gift” because they attempt to create postcolonial identity or hybrid identity in the globalized world (81). In this postcolonial conditioning, she suggests that the western world should create “a chance to rethink cross-cultural laws of hospitality” (84). Stressing on the significance of “cross-cultural laws of hospitality”, she suggests to watch Karim Dridi’s film

*Bye-bye* in which two Algerian brothers visit Marseilles where they are welcomed by a family and they stay there longer. Ismael, the elder brother, however, suffers from the fear of overstaying (63). Here, what Rosello highlights is that overstaying is also a problem in cross-hospitality. Hospitality becomes inhospitality when the guests are invited, welcomed but stay longer. For Rosello, “cross-hospitality” is the need of present because this type of hospitality is assumed to be “ethically encoded” (64-67). Hospitality prevails there only when “a level of trust” is maintained (75). Such level of trust must be reflected both in guests and hosts.

Rosello explores hospitality is controlled by the state in western world. In postcolonial positioning, western society’s hospitality is not free from debate because both host and guest are under the control of state although they intend to look hospitable to each other. To prove it, she brings insights from Merzak Allouache’s Film *Salut Cousin* and Jean de La Fontaine’s *The Town Rat and the Country Rat* as examples in order to support her claim. In *Salut Cousin*, Algerian visitor Alilo goes to France to meet Morkrane or Mok claiming that he is “the child of Algerian immigrants” but his visitation becomes suspicious for the French government (85). Therefore, Rosello critically examines that conditional “hospitality can never be more than half-successful and half- disastrous, because host and guest are not at liberty to define their own roles on the chessboard of international and individual hospitality” (86). The movie character Alilo resembles The Country Rat and Mok like The Town Rat in Jean de La Fontaine’s “The Town Rat and The Country Rat.” Apparently the town rat looks superior to the country rat but in reality the country rat is superior though he has not got any recognition. Alilo in the movie and the country rat in the fable are treated as inferior ones just like stereotyped immigrants though they are genuine. Rosello observes such condition as “failed hospitality” in the western world (98). She claims that the immigration laws of France mainly “since the end of world war II” have been anti-

immigrants (89). Since then, the hospitality for the immigrants in France has been just like the hospitality of “The Town Rat” or hegemonic (98). The western hospitality since the end of world war second has been just like “a tale of failed hospitality” (98). Here, the westerners are compared with town rats because they play the role of “parasites” in dealing with the immigrants (105). And the immigrants are compared with the country rat because they are too generous in respecting the town rat in their villages.

Rosello argues that hospitality should be analyzed in terms of domestic aspects. It should be seen through gender as well as racial layers. For instance, in western civilization women, illegal immigrants and house maids have been victimized in multicultural France. She argues for equal treatment of all in globalization. Neither should be excluded. To fulfill this goal, there must be the “rearrangement of roles” (148). As hospitality has been declining from the western world women are mostly affected. In such condition, her primary focus goes on women because she knows “how hard it is for a woman to be treated as guests” (119). Not only women, even black people are very badly treated who work in white peoples’ home as maids. As a support of her argument or claim she connects her ideas with Sembene Ousmane’s short story *Black Girl*. Rosello observes the case of a Senegalese young girl working as a maid in a French family. Because of hard work as a maid, the girl “has just cut her throat in the bathtub” but the French investigators and journalists misrepresent the case as “suicide” and they claim that her suicide was because of “Home sick” (122). This narrative clearly proves how inhospitable life a maid is living in so-called Multicultural France. Rosello also brings film narrative from Jean Renoir’s *Boudu Sauve des eaux* to illustrate how even western women become hostile in the appearance to the strangers in their home. Rosello observes the plot quite seriously and finds no harmony between French men and women in treating the strangers. Here, a homeless man named Boudu



attempts to make a “suicide” by jumping into Seine (124). The man is saved and brought in home by M. Lestingois, the master of the house who is presented as “archetypal generous host” and treats and cares the stranger being quite hospitable and generous (124). His wife, a maid and other two women look hostile and angry with M. Lestingois and the homeless stranger. Not only that, the situation becomes quite strange as “Madame Lestingois and her maid, Annie- Marie unite against the stranger” (124). This movie narrative is the strong evidence to prove that the so-called globalized France is not free from racism and sexism. If it is not so how such strange behaviors occur in the family between male and female. It suggests the west to make a re-think about global home and multiculturalism.

In “Protection or Hospitality: The Young Man and the Illegal Immigrant in *La Promesse*” Rosello analyzes the movie *La Promesse* directed by two Belgium directors Jean Pierre and Luc Dardenne. She paints the pathetic picture of illegal immigrants in the western world. Observing the plot of the movie, Rosello finds that western world has been inhospitable because illegal immigrants are employed by the natives as employers. Such illegal practices both from employers and employees result in inhospitality. In the movie, “Roger ... employs a few illegal immigrants in building his future house” (137). When “work inspectors” arrive for observation, the illegal employees “all runaway” risking their own work and the job of Roger” (137). One of the workers “Hamidon, falls of the ladder” and is “injured” (137). Luckily, they all get rid of the “inspectors” and they are helped by “Igor” and the situation becomes normal (137). This narrative proves that the illegal immigrants should be managed by making laws in favour of both the employees as illegal immigrants or guests and illegal employers as hosts. Rosello argues that “Hamidon’s disappearance” explores the need of making new and favorable policies for the

immigrants (139). That's why Mireille Rosello's spotlight lies on "rearrangement of roles" in postcolonial multicultural situation.

Rosello further claims western world has not just been inhospitable but it has been changed "From inhospitable states to cities of Refuge" (149). It is becoming so because the westerners are "closing doors and establishing borders for the immigrants or foreigners (149). Since the immigrants are not offered true hospitality so far, they are compelled to look like "fragile ghosts." She explores:

They are offered a sort of marginal hospitality, a hospitality that both individually corrects and collectively exposes the fact that there is a crisis of hospitality, that some individuals are expected to be set aside, excluded, banned from the community. They are not total outsiders, but their mode of belonging makes them externally fragile ghosts.

(165)

Rosello suffers while observing state of imprisonment and exile of the immigrants. Because of such demonic representation of the immigrants, western hospitality has been incomplete.

Rosello argues that unconditional hospitality is not only the need but is also risk as well. In her concluding remark, she states that there are "Two evils", the first "cannibalism or parasitism", and the second "generosity" or "charity" (175). She takes both of these extremes as evils as they reinforce inhospitable condition. To rid of these evils, guest should not always play the role of guest and host should not always play the role of host. They need to change their roles in different contexts in order to create "some degree of mutual metamorphosis" or role change may create the sense of transcultural living to some extent (176). The situation of mutual metamorphosis is required in guests and hosts both in order to live a truly hospitable life.

Thus, Rosello's idea echoes with the idea of Derrida because she also favours the path of unconditional hospitality of Derrida. However, much focus of her lies in mutual metamorphosis. In other words, both the guests and the hosts should be able to change their roles along with the spirit of changing time frame. Rosello also suggests the western world as a host should not treat the migrated guests as pests. The contract between the host and the guest only can create the environment of mutual metamorphosis. In order to fulfill the gap between guests and host, M. Dunja Mohr's notion of transcultural embrace needs to be analyzed.

### **Transcultural Embrace and Intercultural Identity**

The term "embrace" is generally defined as physical as well as emotional bonding through warmth, acceptance and connection. For the sake of transculture as for the need of the dissertation, transcultural embrace has been defined operationally by M. Dunja Mohr as the act of embracing the other or differences in order to strengthen intercultural identity in a true sense.

Mohr argues that globalization demonstrates unethical practices of xenophobia and xenophilia. Rather than embracing the differences in a positive light, globalization has created the situation of fear and eroticism. Xenophobia refers to the fear of strangers and xenophilia refers to the feeling of eroticism. Because of the unethical practice of these two extremes, the globalized world looks inhospitable. This is quite clearly depicted with reference to the short story entitled "Draupadi" by Mahasveta Devi demonstrating Senanayak's role of embrace to Draupadi as xenophobic and xenophilic. Although the story is not western creation, Dunja seems to take it just as an example to support her claim that embrace should be positive. It shows positive embrace is lacking in the home of globalization just like in this short story. As a solution to the problem, Dunja gives two more examples to highlight the need of postcolonial hospitality

or transcultural living. To exemplify, she analyzes two South- African anti – apartheid plays, that is, *The Blood Knot* (1985) by Athol Fugard and *Sophiatown* (1986) by Junction Avenue theatre.

The role of Senanayak has been found hegemonic and hypersexual in Mahasweta Devi's story "*Draupadi*." *The story* is taken as the critique of patriarchal ideology. Presenting Draupadi or Dopdi Mehjan as the representative character of Santhal tribe, a tribe of low caste community. Kamaljit Sinha in "Deconstructing Patriarchal Structures in Mahasweta Devi's "Draupadi" argues that the story rejects "the binary structures of patriarchal discourse" (1). In this story, Dopdi Mehjan and her husband Dulna Majhi get arrested by the armed officers because they murder Surja Sahu and his son in the case of not providing water for the untouchable communities from the wells. Rtoni Sahu, the brother of Surja Sahu along with the armed officers moves forward searching Dulna Majhi and Dopdi Mehjan. Dulna Majhi is found and murdered first by the armed officers. Then they also find Dopdi Mehjan and plan to murder her by raping her first one by one. When Senanayak's turn of rape comes, he is afraid in front of her and is unable to rape and murder her because she openly invites Senanayak to rape if he dares to do so. She shows her nude body, bleeding vagina, bitten breasts without any shame. In this way she is saved. By connecting Mahasweta Devi's Draupadi with the Hindu epic Mahabharata and the mythical representation of Draupadi, Sinha explores:

Even Mahasweta's Draupadi raises her voice against extremes torture and atrocities inflicted on the tribals. Her way of protest is very different and makes it an extremely shocking, powerful and innovative narrative. She seems to be an ordinary tribal woman but in reality she has created stir among military authorities who are on massive hurt for her. They remain confused about her real name, Dopdi or Draupadi. Dopdi is a peasant tribal name and Draupadi is derived from her name of the famous character in

Mahabharata. In the epic, Draupadi is married to five pandavas. Spivak points out, “within a patriarchal and patronymic context she is exceptional, indeed “attacker” in sense of odd, unpaired uncoupled. Her husbands, since they are husbands rather than lovers, are legitimately pluralized. ... Mahasweta’s story interrogates this singularity. In the epic, Draupadi is treated as an object and is used to demonstrate male power and glory. Her eldest husband puts her stake in a game of dice. She does not protest. The eldest of their enemies’ son Dhritrastra tries to dishonor her by pulling off her sari but she is saved by the divine Krishna. (2)

Thus, the difference between Draupadi, the wife of five pandava brothers in Hindu epic Mahabharata and Mahasweta Devi’s short story *Draupadi* is that Draupadi is depicted as submissive woman whose chastity has been saved by Lord Krishna in Mahabharata whereas Mahasweta Devi’s central character Dopdi Mehjan is presented as a revolutionary woman who has been able to save her chastity through her own attempt. Here, Dopdi Mehjan represents the same Draupadi of the Mahabharata but Mahasweta Devi’s Dopdi or Draupadi plays not the role of submissive woman but a radical one.

For Dunja, Senanayak’s “embrace is an instance of the devouring embrace that conflates xenophobia and xenophilia” (vii). Conventionally, an embrace is taken in a positive light that helps people bring together even if embrace looks negative on the surface. However, sense of welcome, honesty and truth are disappearing at present even if embrace looks positive on the surface. In other words, multiculturalism looks quite ironic. It is expected that multiculturalism embraces the differences but just the opposite is happening as the differences are frequently excluded from the framework of so-called globalism and multiculturalism. Embrace has been used to “stifle, to suppress, to immobilize” and to exclude other that looks like “the extreme

gesture of xenophilia: the devouring embrace that takes the other in until there is nothing left of them but us” (x). Mohr not only problematizes the binary logic of the embrace or othering through gender differences, she also attempts to minimize the gap between self and other. From Mohr’s example of Mahasweta Devi’s Draupadi, it can be clearly assumed that embrace of others is not possible without resisting and deconstructing binary logic of us versus them. In other words, she seems to prove that postcolonial embrace is a challenge in the world of globalization and multiculturalism.

Not only as a theorist but also as a critic of globalization, Bernard Waldenfels in *Phenomenology of the Alien: Basic Concept* (2011) argues that intercultural identity is formed deconstructing the norms of global alienness and embracing the ethics of interculturality through the chain of “Order- pathos- response- body- attention- interculturality” (4). The first phase of intercultural identity is the phase of “order” or “The Human as a Liminal Being” in which he argues that “the unordered in the ordered, the invisible in the visible, the silent in the audible” should be explored (4). Universal and global “alienness leads to hostility” as “boundaries emerge from ordering process” (3-8). However, intercultural identity is formed following the principle of “all- embracing cosmos” by breaking the so-called order (10). The second phase of intercultural identity formation is the phase of “pathos” or “Between Pathos and Response.” Pathos refer to “apathy or indifference ... where everything sinks into the monotony of in- difference” (27). In the situation of indifference, “an experience goes to sleep” for Husserl and for Plato “total apathy” is the situation which can be compared “to the absence of desire in a stone” (qtd. in Waldenfels 27). The third phase of intercultural identity formation is the phase of “Response to the Alien”. Waldenfels claims alien “challenges us, calls upon us, or puts our own possibilities in question in an alienating, shocking, or amazing fashion before we enter into our own wanting-

to- know and wanting- to- understand situation” (36). Therefore, as alien challenges us, our response to alien should be different from ordinary response. About the response to alien, he argues:

Ordinary, normal responding has meaning and follows specific rules. Yet this does not hold for responding to unanticipated calls, which breaks through an existent order and changes the condition for understanding and communication. But whenever and wherever the order of things and words is shaken, there opens a gap between the alien provocation we come to face and our own production. Here we run into the paradox of creative response. ... the response is creative despite its being a response. The response does not belong to the order. (41- 42)

The fourth phase is the “body” or “Corporeal Experience Between Selfhood and Otherness.” Waldenfels claims that “Our bodily existence is overshadowed once by the subject’s autonomy and again by nature’s measure” (43). Our body, he argues, is “covered and discovered” (43). The fifth phase of intercultural identity formation is the phase of “Attention” or “Thresholds of Attention.” He argues, “When something comes to a person’s attention, at first he does not know with what or whom he is dealing. Attending itself is the first response to the alien” (58). In this phase, “coming- to- attention and attending” both need to be fulfilled (58). The sixth and last phase is interculturality itself or “Between Cultures.” Waldenfels explores “The intercultural encounter” is always in “a questionable form of colonial alien politics” (70). For him, the birth of alienness first appears within us and in our home and then outside. His notion of “interculturality” resembles “Husserl’s intersubjectivity or Merleau-Ponty’s intercorporeality” (71). He defines interculturality as “a no-man’s land, a liminal landscape which simultaneously connects and separates” (71). He examines:

Europeans speak about Europeans and non-Europeans, men about men and women, adults about adults and children, humans about humans and animals, those awake speak about the awake and also the sleeping. In all these cases, one side of the difference is clearly marked, but the other is not. (73)

It shows complete presence of difference is ever needed but it is always sublated or eschewed in the world of globalization.

Bernhard Waldenfels argues that cultural justice can not be imagined in the world of globalization because differences are frequently excluded in it.

The opposition between the own and the alien does not emerge from a mere separation, but from a process of in- and ex-clusion. I am where you cannot be, and vice versa. We call a place alien if it is where I am nevertheless, in the manner of this impossibility. We do not do justice to cultural differences if we compare them to different species of a plant-or animal-world where differences are sublated in a universal genus. There is a threshold between the cultures, which is similar to these thresholds which separate one gender from the other, old age from youth, awakens from sleep, and life from death. (73)

In Waldenfels's opinion, interpersonal alienness begins from intrapersonal alienness as well. In other words, he clearly states that alien does not dwell outside our own walls. Regarding it, he claims, "As interpersonal alienness begins from intrapersonal alienness, so too does intercultural alienness begin from intracultural alienness" (77). It shows alienness emerges from within and also from outside.

Dunja's quest for embrace is transcultural embrace because in transcultural embrace both self and other are expected to treat equally, and voices of both sides are expected to address properly and equally. To prove how embrace is represented in apartheid South Africa, she brings



examples of two South African anti-apartheid plays – *The Blood Knot* (1985) by Athol Fugard and *Sophiatown* (1986) by Junction Avenue Theatre Company. They both are analyzed based on Bernhard Waldenfels's philosophy of alterity or alien. Their characters attempt to bridge the gap between self and other. For instance, Heike Frank, in the play *Blood Knot* (1985) analyzes the relation between Morrie, the white-skinned character and Zach, black-skinned character who have developed the sense of reciprocity than in the past. Similarly, the play *Sophiatown* (1986) presents the scenario of multicultural cohabitation in Sophiatown where racial tolerance and cultural diversity are shown. The central character Ruth feels alien in apartheid community and goes to all-black community in Meadowlands. She is excluded there as well. Then, she realizes she neither fits in totally white dominated society nor all-black community. She feels alien in the both extreme location and prefers to live in multiracial society, represented by the community of Sophiatown. These plays highlight the sense of reciprocity and multicultural cohabitation respectively. These three texts explore the idea of alterity (otherness) and its solution. The short story *Draupadi* presents the problem of alterity or otherness whereas the two plays explore the idea of addressing the problem. In Dunja's opinion, western world has been inhospitable because western embrace is full of xenophobia (fear of strangers) and xenophilia (erotic representation) as a result alterity (otherness) becomes active. On the other hand, *The Blood Knot* (1985) and *Sophiatown* (1986) explore the significance of postcolonial embrace that is possible through reciprocity as mentioned like in *The Blood Knot* and multicultural cohabitation as in *Sophiatown*. Mohr's quest for embracing the others seems to be possible only by embracing the perspective of glocalization.

### **Glocalization, Diasporic Identity and Transnational Identity**

The term glocalization is formed combining the features of global and local. The problem of the west lies in not valuing local as global. The research, however; takes different line. According to this dissertation, it should be the local that affects the global rather it is global that affects local. It therefore, attempts to maintain the balance by highlighting both the features of local and global. Although it is frequently argued to think globally and act locally in order to maintain such balance. However, localization has not been materialized so far though it sounds great. In order to bridge the gap, glocalization is born and needs to be operationally defined embracing the logic of “either- and” rather than “either- or”.

In Roudometof’s observation the concept of glocalization is generally the fusion between global and local. He investigates that glocalization has “gained popularity since 1990, and its use has increased across a variety of disciplines and fields” (1). Glocalization has various cycles. In the smallest cycle, there lies local and then it moves towards national, regional, glocal and and global. Global is at the top whereas local resides at the bottom. In recent years, glocalization has been developed as glocal methodology because it follows its own “both – and” logic in which glocal “studies” is taken as interactive, mutually constituent, interplay, reform-oriented, hybrid, resolution of antithesis between space and place, creation of new place in contrast to the “either – or” logic of globalization which embraces the features of “integral” or wholeness, global- local binary opposition, resistance and power relation and the cultural contexts of globalization are grobarization, Americanization and cultural imperialism and as opposition between space and place (Roudometof 143-44). This “either –and” logic of glocalization seems to strengthen transcultural living and transcultural hospitality. This logic is also assumed to strengthen

transnational identity of the immigrants of Digital Diasporas of twenty first century also by incorporating the ideas of Hall and Brinkerhoff.

Diaspora needs to be defined first before conceptualizing what Stuart Hall says about metamorphic identity. By origin diaspora is a word derived from Greek term “diasperien” which consists of “dia” means across and “sperien” means “to sow or scatter seeds” (Braziel and Mannur 1). Thus, they define diaspora as “displaced communities of people who have been dislocated from their native homeland through the movements of migration, immigration, or exile” (1). The terms diaspora and transnationalism are frequently used in order to show the actual identity of the immigrants in contemporary world. For the sake of this research, the preferred term is diaspora or diasporic identity rather than transnationalism or transnational identity although they are interrelated. Differentiating diaspora and transnational identity, Jana Evans Braziel and Anita Mannur in *Nation, Migration, Globalization: Points of Contention in Diaspora Studies* argue, “Transnationalism speaks to larger, more impersonal forces – specifically, those of globalization and global capitalism” and diaspora maybe taken as “consequent of transnationalist forces” (8). It clearly shows transnationalism or transnational identity is formed from the above but diaspora or diasporic identity is formed from the below which relates to glocalization and transcultural identity.

Stuart Hall in *Cultural Identity and Diaspora* explores the idea of identity formation of the Diasporas. His idea of cultural identity consists of “stable” and “Unstable” and his notion of unstable identity is the matter of metamorphic identity or diasporic identity (qtd. in Braziel and Mannur 233). The notion of metamorphic identity is not always the identity of being but it is the identity of becoming as well. Such metamorphic identity of becoming is the need for transcultural hospitality.

Jennifer M. Brinkerhoff argues that “globalization” or “The world after September 11, 2001” has been “a scary place” and global immigrants are compelled to live a life being “powerless” and “vulnerable” since then (1). In post-9/11 situation, “terrorism” has been promoted as “a growth industry” (2). However, the access of Internet has played significant role in forming new identity as digital Diasporas. She argues that diasporic identity as “hybrid identity,” now as the identity of digital Diasporas is formed embedding the features of “dispersion,” “collective memory and myth about the homeland,” “a commitment to keeping the homeland – alive,” “the presence of the issue of return” and “a diasporic consciousness” (31). Safran enlists four major components that help to form hybrid identity of the immigrants, which are “a distinct language, historical memory, a national religion, and the habitual status of a minority in larger societies” (qtd. in Brinkerhoff 32). Brinkerhoff further argues that “hybrid identity is not a fixed end. Diaspora identities are constantly produced and reproduced” (33). She also claims that diasporic hybrid identity is formed through the interaction of three elements, i.e. “the homeland, the hostland and lived experience” (33). Diasporas have been able to create distinct identity of “Digital Diasporas” through cyber communities. She exemplifies that Thamel.com, can be taken as a case in point. Such transnational identity created by Diasporas is taken as an alternative resolution to solve the problems of immigrants to some extent.

### **Critiquing Western Globalization and Hospitality**

Globalization in general sense means creating a single or common space or home for all. However, from the perspective of margins, mainly in postcolonial context, it is generally argued that true globalization should begin from below. From the perspective of civilization, globalization envisions the world as “a single market space” (Lechner and Boli 11). The history of globalization from the perspective of civilization of the world goes back to Paleolithic Age

and its recent practice has been observed in the Digital Age of twenty first century. Surveying different ages of globalization starting from Paleolithic Age or Stone Age (70,000 – 10,000 BCE) through Neolithic Age (10,000 – 3000 BCE) of farming, Equestrian Age (3000- 1000 BCE) of horse domestication and state formation, Classical Age (1000 BCE- 1500 CE) of empire formation, Ocean Age (1500- 1800) as the age of global empire, the Industrial Age (1800- 2000) as the Age of High Capitalism to the Digital Age of Twenty First century or Age of Digital Revolution, Jeffrey D. Sachs proves that globalization has been moving towards utopia. Sachs concludes his argument stating that “Each age of globalization has given rise to new tensions and wars” (195). E. O. Wilson also argues that twenty first century globalization will be strengthened embracing the principle of “Stone Age emotions, medieval institutions, and Godlike technology” (qtd. in Sachs 214). It clearly proves renaissance spirit can strengthen globalization through the amalgamation of traditional values and new scientific thoughts.

The history of globalization in modern sense goes back to “sixteenth century Europe” when “modern world system” takes place (Lechner and Boli 2). Since then the west has spent more than five centuries but the promise of globalization has remained unfulfilled. There are three essential phases of globalization in European context. They are the phases of colonization or territorialization, decolonization or deterritorialization and recolonization or reterritorialization (Lechner and Boli 567). Because of identity politics, Patrick Porter argues globalization functions as “myth of empire” in which globalism tells “half- truth” demonstrating “self- defeating behaviour” (3). This scenario quite clearly and succinctly proves that global home has been failure in embracing the differences.

Globalization in American context is the era after the end of Cold war in 1990s. Instead of embracing the differences, George W. Bush and his repressive administration declares Post-

Cold war phase as the phase of “end of history” imagining “new world order” (Lechner and Boli 8). The problem George W. Bush creates is that he involved in creating the binary logic of – Us versus them. Those who favoured George W. Bush and his administration came to be known as “Us” and all others as “them” or others, primarily the Muslims. Many researchers and academicians claim that George W. Bush planted the seed of terrorism by declaring the war in the name of *War on Terrorism* in Afghanistan immediately after 9/11 as a revenge. Bush’s administration played the leading role in giving birth of conspiracy theory and populist discourse. The life of diaspora became severe after the tremendous shift of globalization as the world led by Anglo- Americans mainly after post- 9/11.

Arjun Apadurai blames upon “the supremacy of the nation state” arguing that these nation states would not feel so if they were not connected with the “networks of diaspora, migration, technology, electronic media, ideologies, and global capital” (qtd. in Braziel and Mannur 25). It proves that globalization alone is meaningless. It has been able to create its empire only by the support of various components. However, the immigrants of the global diaspora are living the life of “exile” or other (Braziel and Mannur 1). For Avtar Brah, the global immigrants frequently struggle not just for survival but for recognition and identity. The immigrants’ transnational identity has been the identity of “a homing desire” (Brah 197). Instead of developing the desire for assimilation under the framework of globalization, the immigrants of global diaspora intend to return back in their birth places. Even the writers of global diaspora feel uncomfortable in assimilating the main stream western culture. “Despite the brutal violence of globalization” people should be able to search various alternatives (qtd. in Lechner and Boli 574). It gives the clue that transcultural living is one of the best alternatives.

Maximiliano E. Korstanje makes a claim that terrorism is western construct. He also argues that George W. Bush and his administration should bear the whole responsibility in creating unrest and violence in America. He claims that 9/11 attack and the war on terror both seem to be western strategies. He writes that the terrorists who participated in 9/11 attack got their education from “prestige European Universities” or they got “legal residence in the United States” (172). This is the question of inquiry for every researcher. Therefore, Korstanje argues “terrorism operates within the walls of Empire” (172). Since terrorism spreads within the walls of empire, it is not unusual to blame America as the center of terrorism because America is taken as empire of the world in twenty first century. America has played the role of fear monger in the world using both military and economic power. George Skull investigates:

The import is that the greatest fear monger today is the American Empire. It generates massive fear throughout the world with its own military and economic power, and it broadcasts fear within its territories by its alerts against terrorist attacks, secret surveillance, infiltration, and so on. (qtd. In Korstanje 174)

The major problem he raises is not only the problem of terrorism which is the construction of the West itself but it also leads to give birth of conspiracy theory and populist discourse. This is why he writes:

Modern terrorism has precipitated the arrival of conspiracy theory which adopts the rule and divides logic as the main form of government. This is particularly very dangerous not only for democratic nations, but opens the doors for populist discourses, like Trump’s one, that can reinforce a long-dormant beast. (175)

It is quite clear that the emergence of conspiracy theory leads to the division of logic and its failure and failure of logic leads to give birth of populism. Therefore, Korstanje argues that it is

useless to blame merely ISIS or Jihad in creating terrorism and violence. America is equally responsible for making the end of hospitality. Western media also plays significant role in exaggerating the minor issues in support of the Americans. It is also the western media that engages audiences to gaze upon deaths in violence and presenting Muslims only as criminals. For instance, western media's representation of 9/11 could not be free from such bias. For Korstanje, it is the western world where both the beginning and end of hospitality happen. If western media stop presenting ISIS in stereotypical way, he assumes, terrorism would exist nowhere. Regarding it, he claims:

Hospitality, as it was formulated in ancient Europe, is dying and this is happening not because of ISIS's cruelty, as public opinion seems to hold, but because of our obsession in gazing at others' deaths (witnessing). If ISIS's crimes had never been covered in the mass media, terrorism would fade away. (176)

The repressive act of George W. Bush, his administration and western media's misrepresentation benefited even Donald Trump in compelling him to embrace the discourse of populism in order to grab power and position as the president of America.

Populist discourse highlights the principle of populism in which inexperienced people or people from unrelated fields are elected as leader in politics. As a result they dismiss core principles and involve in controversy. Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart explore:

Populists have disrupted long-established patterns of party competition in many contemporary western societies. The most dramatic case is the election of Donald Trump to the White House. How could such a polarizing and politically inexperienced figure win a major party's nomination-and then be elected President? Many observers find it difficult to understand his victory. He has been sharply attacked by conservatives such as



George Will, establishment Republicans such as John McCain, Democrats such as Elizabeth Warren, and socialists such as Bernie Sanders. He has been described by some commentators as a strong man menacing democracy, by others as a xenophobic and racist demagogue skilled at whipping up crowds, and by yet others as an opportunistic salesman lacking any core principles. (3)

They both take “Trump as a leader who uses populist rhetoric to legitimate his style of governance, while promoting authoritarian values that threaten the liberal norms underpinning American democracy” (3). Defining “Cultural Backlash Theory” as grounding for comprehending populist rhetoric, Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart write, “The cultural backlash theory weaves together old and new claims” combining three components, that is, “Demand-side factors”, “supply-side factors” and their “consequences” (32). Donald Trump, for instance, applied the same strategies to win the election. Norris and Inglehart further argue that cultural changes lead to social changes but such changes are overshadowed by election results. Consequently, the future of liberal democracy remains in the shadow. It is happening because of the over-representation of “Authoritarian- Populist Parties ... in elected office” (56). It justifies that American politics has been polluted after the emergence of conspiracy theory and populist discourse mainly in post- 9/11 phase. Daniel C. Hellinger argues that the excessive practice of populist rhetoric has reinforced further practice of conspiracy theory and conspiracy theory creates uncertainty rather than providing solution. Hellinger again “argue[s] that the way American politics is influenced by elite conspiracies is just as important as a generator of popular suspicion, contributing to a gathering crisis of representation and mistrust of political institutions” (279). Hellinger further investigates:

Trump may or may not complete his term, but today's social climate of economic uncertainty, mistrust, and polarization ensures that conspiracy theories will be a prominent feature of American politics for many years to come. Conspiracy theories are not just symptomatic of the changing social and political climate; they are in some important ways relevant theories for explaining how politics in America operate. Dark money circulates freely not only through the electoral system but also through culture. Wealthy people and corporations hide their income from tax authorities in offshore havens. Politicians hire detectives and spies to gather dirt on opponents. (276-77)

It proves that the emergence of conspiracy theory or populist discourse or populist rhetoric in the mainstream American politics as a result of hegemonic administration of George W. Bush is not only a great challenge for the Americans but it will also make an end of existing framework of globalization in the days to come. It can easily be predicted that American society or western world will be inhospitable until they are engaged in exercising populist discourse and conspiracy theory because they both create mistrust among the citizens and non-citizens, natives and foreigners.

In his concluding remark, Korstanje argues that the relation between the west and the Muslim world can be strengthened only through "inter-tribal pact" that can best work to strengthen the ties of transcultural home (173). In other words, "hospitality should be understood as an ancient inter-tribal pact oriented to scrutinize the otherness" (173). His method seems as an appropriate tool in creating transcultural home. Korstanje's idea will be further supported with the idea of Gideon Baker.

By surveying hospitality from early modern era to modern era, Gideon Baker argues that "no host has the right to close his door" (51). He, however, makes logical doubt upon the western

hospitality why it could not be free from debate even from the period of “Francisco de Victoria in the early sixteenth century to Immanuel Kant in the late eighteenth” (41). He finds the sense of “right of communication and the right of property in Victorian hospitality” (44). Baker also finds similar tone of hospitality echoing even in Immanuel Kant. According to Kant “hospitality is a question of right and not of philanthropy” (qtd. in Balfour 3). Baker also informs that Jacques Derrida has explored such idea as double bind of hospitality or western hospitality as a paradox (61). Regarding it, he writes:

Derrida has drawn our attention to the ‘double bind’ of hospitality expressed here as the paradox that hospitality is constituted both by property and by the openness or communication (the welcome of the stranger) that threatens or may even destroy it.

Evidence of this aporia of hospitality is found in abundance in the natural law tradition from Victoria to Kant. (61)

Here, aporia refers to doubt or rhetoric that creates uncertainty. In other words, Baker intends to justify how and why western hospitality has been the matter of debate from early modern to Kant and even till date. Georg Cavallar in “From Hospitality to the Right of Immigration in the Law of Nations: 1750-1850” argues that after the end of cold war, the world is moving towards, “Post-national or cosmopolitan forms of loyalty, economic as well as cultural globalization and migration” (qtd. in Baker 69). It clearly shows “The nineteenth century with its emphasis on state sovereignty, legal positivism, nationalism and the society of civilized (European) states is perceived as a kind of fall from the cosmopolitan heights of the previous centuries, especially the cosmopolitan eighteenth century” (Baker 70). Focusing on the ethics of global hospitality, Garrett Wallace Brown in “Between Naturalism and Cosmopolitan Law: Hospitality as Transitional Global Justice” argues for the urgent need “of mutually consistent justice” (qtd. in Baker 99). To

prevail such justice, the western world and mainly the Europeans are “now required ... to reinvigorate our theorizing and implementation of basic laws of hospitality so as to generate this slow transition to a globally just world” (120). Brown also supports “universal right of humanity” as advocated by Kant. Through comparative reading of Kant and Victoria, Brown finds that “Kant expands Victoria’s laws of hospitality” and he highlights Kant’s six principles of hospitality which are formulated in the line of Victoria’s laws of hospitality:

(1) a right to exist; (2) a right to enter and travel ; (3) the freedom from hostility and from negligence; (4) the freedom of communication and to engage in public reason; (5) the right to engage in commerce and to use the world in common and (6) the freedom from false, misrepresented, extorted or fraudulent contract. (113)

Brown finally suggests to implement Kant’s Six universal laws of hospitality for hospital living.

In this regard, Brown argues:

To create ... condition of universal public right, Kant envisions a tripartite system of interlocking and mutually coordinated laws that are divided into *domestic law* (citizen to citizen, state to citizen), *international law* (state to state) and *cosmopolitan law* (states to all humans, especially non-citizens)”. (115)

The theoretical and critical observation of the western civilization or hospitality quite clearly proves that western world has made various laws in order to strengthen their tie of conditional hospitality rather than creating the ambiance of unconditional hospitality or the hospitality of visitation, which this dissertation has attempted to address.

On the basis of the critical observation of various theorists and critics, it is found that everyone prefers transcultural living and unconditional hospitality. It is quite clear that America became too rigid and bullish to the Muslims mainly after 9/11. In other words, Americans in post

9/11 phase developed the sense of exceptionalism – proving themselves as pure beings like God and profiling the differences like Muslims in stereotypical way. Monica Ali, Hari Kunzru, Salman Rushdie and Mohsin Hamid of the selected novels *Brick Lane*, *Transmission*, *Shalimar the Clown* and *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* respectively have the common feature of diasporic nature as they live and struggle staying in diasporic situations. They have realized that the western world is reluctant to accept them and their voices. For that they intend to create distinct identity through transcultural imagination.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### RESISTING RACIAL STEREOTYPING IN MONICA ALI'S *BRICK LANE*

Monica Ali in *Brick Lane* argues that globalization from its inception has been using not the language of cosmopolitanism but the language of otherness. The main issue that Ali raises in the novel is the issue of Bangladeshi immigrants, their struggles and the consequences they face in multicultural London. The novel deals with the scenario of stereotypical representation of Muslim immigrants in multicultural London. Their struggle begins mainly from 1971-- the emergence of Bangladesh that ended the civil war between East Pakistan and West Pakistan -- to the post-9/11 situation. The novel focuses on the struggle of those immigrants who had migrated to England during and after the civil war or even till after post 9/11 situation. The travails they had undergone were mainly due to them being subjected to racism and othering in England. The othering had worsened after the 9/11 terror attacks in the USA when the Muslims as a whole were suspected as potential terrorists. Ali engages with this othering in *Brick Lane*.

By presenting ordeal of the representative characters of three generations of a Muslim family -- protagonist Nazneen's parents' generation, her own generation and her children's generation, Ali alleges that the western world was inhospitable to the immigrants in the past, is inhospitable at present and will be hostile to the Muslim immigrants even in future. This chapter shows that *Brick Lane* underscores the need for a contract between the English and the immigrant for transcultural living -- a living that integrates the latter to the host nation without compromising the cultural roots and in ways that resist the prose of otherness.

The first part of the novel depicts the struggle of Nazneen's parents. They are the representatives of the first generation Muslims in Bangladesh who struggle hard for survival in colonial era before India partitioned. The novel implicitly gives the clue of racial stereotyping of

the Muslims in colonial era presenting the characters -- Rupban and her husband Hamid and their fight against poverty, sexism and racism.

Rupban and Hamid spend their life in poverty in Bangladesh. As a result, they are unable to educate their daughters. They not only struggle in poverty but also die in it. Moreover, fragmentation begins in the family after the suicidal death of Rupban first and then after the eldest daughter Nazneen gets married to Chanu. Their youngest daughter Hasina lives and struggles in Bangladesh as Nazneen and Chanu; their eldest daughter and son-in-law escape to England during the time of civil war. Rupban and Hamid live the life of fate despite British colonizers' ironic rule of modernizing India and the Indians. Rupban's pain of delivering Nazneen merely with the help of Banesa; the village midwife quite clearly illustrates the scenario that the village lacks hospitals and other medical facilities to facilitate women's labor for delivering children. About painful moment of delivering Nazneen, Ali writes "Rupban screamed white heat, red blood" as Hamid was in "latrine" (12). Hamid's latrine is incomplete and he rushes to help Rupban although his latrine is incomplete. It shows the project of colonization could not address the basic needs of the Muslims living in Bangladesh. Colonialism looked totally irresponsible and insincere to the needs and issues of Muslim immigrants. Nazneen's aunt Mumtaz asks Hamid to take rickshaw for calling the village midwife Banesa soon. Banesa thinks that Nazneen is dead and they need to be ready for her "burial" (13). Rupban's crying also indicates the same. Finally, Banesa confirms them that she is "perfect everywhere" but not dead (12). Because of poverty Nazneen is not taken in the hospital in city. Living such fate-driven life is the result of the lack of "sincerity" and "responsibility" of globalization project for Levinas.

There is no any way out to get rid of poverty and fate mainly for the first generation Muslim family in Bangladesh. The belief in fate is not a choice but it has been the compulsion for

Rupban. Rupban expresses, “We must not stand in the way of fate. Whatever happens, I accept it. And my child must not waste any energy fighting against fate” (14). It shows Nazneen’s parents are not rigid about fate. They believe that the belief in fate needs to come to an end soon so that their children could experience the benefits of modernity and hospitable living. Rupban also knows she is weakened because of her faith in fate (15). However, fate has ruled the family. Not only Rupban, her daughter Nazneen is also compelled to believe in fate. As a result Nazneen marries Chanu dreaming of a beautiful future in London. Nazneen’s devotion to God also proves that she is also not liberated from fate. Therefore, she expresses “I tell everything to God” (15). Nazneen’s sister Hasina also becomes a victim of fate. Hasina expresses that she is living with happiness in Bangladesh despite her struggle and scarcity of the goods unlike in the affluent west. Hasina’s new life begins after “She eloped to Khulna with the nephew of the saw-mill owner” despite being orphan after her parents’ death (16). Her elopement indicates her moves towards fate. This is how Hasina’s fate drives her towards uncertain future. Nazneen’s father Hamid’s selection of Chanu, as a son-in-law for his eldest daughter Nazneen is a little different case because Hamid believes that her daughter can easily fight against fate if she gets opportunity to go to London. Unfortunately, fate becomes prominent even in Nazneen’s life in London. For them, struggle for survival becomes painful.

The first challenge occurs in Nazneen because of her poor English in London. Regarding it, Ali writes, “Nazneen could say two things in English: sorry and thank you. She could spend another day alone. It was only another day” (19). However, Chanu hopes Nazneen is enough to be a “good worker” in London because she is “an unspoilt girl” (22). It shows she is still innocent and virgin and she is just eighteen years old. For Chanu, English does not matter to be a good worker. He thinks her good character may help her to find a good job and recognition both



in London. Being poor in English is not natural defect as it is assumed so. It is the responsibility of the native speakers or campaigners of globalization to teach English to the immigrants or every citizens in positive and friendly environment rather than insulting them.

After mother's death and Nazneen's departure to London, Hasina feels herself isolated and insecure because of her elopement with Khulna as her first husband. Gradually, Hasina feels proud of her husband Khulna because he looks smart enough for her and she also prays for the happy life of Nazneen and Chanu in England. Through her letter to Nazneen, Hasina writes that she is "happy" and in "love" with Khulna and she expects the same in Nazneen and she intends to "pray" that Nazneen should get love and care from Chanu in London (25-26). However, Hasina's happiness turns temporary as her marriages fail one after another and many people attempt even to rape her. She shares her pains and moments of happiness both in her letter to Nazneen. Globalization could never examine such fate-driven life of the Muslim family. As a result Muslims are compelled to live the life of othering or the life of outsiders being trapped under "devouring embrace," "xenophobia," and "Xenophilia" of patriarchy under the framework of globalization (Mohr vii). This clearly illustrates the features of eroticism and fear prevailed in globalization.

The second part of the novel draws the picture of the struggle of Nazneen, her husband Chanu in London and her sister Hasina's struggle in Bangladesh. Nazneen, her husband Chanu and Hasina are representatives who represent the period from 1971 onwards. This second generation seems to be in dilemma. They can neither isolate themselves totally like their parents nor can totally embrace the western values in order to assimilate in western culture. Life of dilemma should not be the choice of the citizens in globalization and the ethics of "all-embracing" is dismantled in Waldenfel's analysis.

First, Ali depicts the picture of the struggle of Nazneen and Chanu in Tower Hamlets in London where Bangladeshi Muslim immigrants have been stereotyped. Ali writes that Muslim immigrants in Tower Hamlets in London are not getting any “respectable” job; rather they are staying there “doing donkey work” but “these people are peasants, uneducated, illiterate, close-minded, without ambition” (28). This is a case of hospitality gone away. Until and unless the “supreme dignity” is maintained among the immigrants, the global home remains inhospitable for immigrants according to Levinas. The condition of the Muslim immigrants in London is similar to the condition depicted in the fable entitled “The Town Rat and the Country Rat ” from which Rosello gives the message of “a failed hospitality” in the western civilization comparing the westerners as the town rat and Muslims as the country rat. In other words, South Asian immigrants are true guests but the western world does not acknowledge it and the town rat is living a fake life like the westerners but feels himself superior to the country rat (Rosello 98-99). Similar scenario is depicted in *Brick lane*. London as a host has been irresponsible regarding the affairs of Muslim community like Chanu’s family. Chanu also admits that he has not arrived in London for money. Instead he has been there to work and for hospitable living. Although England is “mixing with all sorts: Turkish, English, Jewish. All sorts” but the immigrants are living the life of prisoners there (Ali 29). It shows London looks like the home of multicultural living only on the surface. . It is the center of racist people in actuality. As Chanu does not find hospitality in London, he looks frustrated and plans to return to Bangladesh.

Another Muslim immigrant depicted in the novel is Dr. Azad who has opposing view from Chanu because he does not intend to return to Bangladesh. For him, Muslim immigrants themselves are responsible for not being able in assimilating with the whites. This is because of the lack of education in Muslim immigrants. Dr. Azad is unaware that the west itself is

responsible for not providing true education to all. Dr. Azad is invited in Chanu's home apartment. While eating dinner at Chanu's, Chanu says, "I agree with you. Our community is not educated about this, and much else besides. But for my part, I don't plan to risk these things happening to my children. We will go back before they get spoiled" (32). Chanu believes that his children will be spoiled if they are exposed in the fakeness of London. Dr. Azad responds saying, "This is another disease that afflicts us ... I call it Going Home Syndrome" (32). It shows Dr Azad has been totally westernized. In the conversation with Dr Azad, Chanu also argues that the Muslim immigrants suffer from homesickness. For them, "The pull of the land is stronger even than the pull of blood. ... Their bodies are here but their hearts are back there" (32). This is so because these immigrants are peasants and lack other talents as required for the west. Dr. Azad also claims that he used to be homesick in the past as he says, "I used to think all the time of going back" (32). As dream fails, Chanu recalls the past stating:

'I am forty years old.' Said Chanu. ... 'I have been in this country for sixteen years. Nearly half my life.' ... 'When I came I was a young man. I had ambitions. Big dreams. When I got off the aeroplane I had my degree certificate in my suitcase and a few pounds in my pocket. I thought there would be a red carpet laid out for me. I was going to join the civil service and become private secretary to the Prime Minister.' (34)

Chanu's utopian thought or his beautiful dream shatters as he observes westerners of being money minded. Ali draws the picture of how the uneducated Muslim community members including Chanu's family members have been money minded and just begging in London. In other words, Muslim communities have been discriminated, exploited and dominated because of their own down mentality and also due to their lack of education. For Ali, the west itself is responsible in developing the sense of down mentality among the Muslims by devaluing eastern

philosophy in western education system and by not recognizing eastern values in western civilizational model. Chanu becomes quite critical to those immigrants who just think they have come there for money. He thinks they should change such thought. Chanu speaks, “All they think of is money. They think there is gold lying about in the streets here and I am just hoarding it all in my palace. But I did not come here for money. Was I starving in Dhaka? I was not. Do they enquire about my diplomas?” (35). Chanu thinks the immigrants should also be judged in terms of their “diplomas” (35). It shows multicultural London has been inhospitable for the immigrants because of the lack of recognition of skills in others. So many immigrants have been the victims or slaves of western neo-slavery or modified slavery. Such practice is “reverse racism” for Epstein (336). It shows westerners look inhospitable in their thought and action because of deep- rooted racist attitude.

For Ali, Muslim immigrants’ attitude about London has changed more significantly than in the past. For instance, the central character Chanu in the past thought he would achieve more in London by escaping from the civil war. He thought England was more secure, inviting and hospitable. The same inviting Multicultural London became strange place for those immigrants mainly after 9/11. According to Ali, the beginning of hospitality and its end both occur in the same location -- the West. Therefore, Korstanje argues that westerners themselves are destroying the hospitality through their warped view of terrorism. Terrorism refers to uncanny violence and tourism promotes western capitalism. As a result, the western home has been un-home mainly for the foreigners or immigrants.

For Korstanje, “terrorism is a western construction” and western “instrumentality of capitalism ... trumpets the end of hospitality” which exactly support Ali’s idea envisioned in

*Brick Lane* (Korstanje174). It shows western capitalism is the major obstacle to make an end of hospitality.

Chanu shares to his wife Nazneen that underclass white people dominate more to the immigrants than the middle class people in London. In contrast, the middle classes and others look more sophisticated in their manners. Comparing the underclass whites with middle class whites, Ali explores:

It is the white underclass, like Wilkie, who are most afraid of people like me. To him, and people like him we are the only thing standing in the way of them sliding totally to the bottom of the pile. As long as we are below them, then they are above something. If they see us rise then they are resentful because we have left our proper place. That is why you get the phenomenon of the National Front. They can play on those fears to create racial tensions, and give these people a superiority complex. The middle classes are more secure, and therefore more relaxed. (Ali 38)

It shows the natives of London suffer from the sense of xenophobia and maintain distance with Muslim immigrants rather than embracing them. Chanu, for instance, becomes the major target of such stereotyping and he feels as if the west has closed its door for the Muslim immigrants. Transcultural living never occurs in such situation. Therefore, Baker argues “no host has the right to close his door” (51). Here, the door symbolizes the door of global home or the door of multiculturalism. For Derrida, such door should always remain open and environment of unconditional hospitality should be made for hospitable living in a genuine way.

Because of the domination mainly from underclass, Chanu feels humiliated in staying any longer in London. In this context, multicultural London as host has not played the role of responsible and sincere guardian. It seems so because Chanu, his family and other Muslim

immigrants are not welcomed in so-called global home. Furthermore, London as a multicultural home seems to have forgotten the law of world citizenship, the law of universal hospitality and mainly cosmopolitan law as promised by Kant. Cosmopolitan law, for Kant, refers to responsibility of “states to all humans, especially non-citizens” (qtd. in Brown 115). Instead, multicultural London looks like “cities of refuge” because of racial tension that seems unable to embrace the differences. As a result western hospitality has been replaced by Derrida’s “aporia of hospitality”, the hospitality that creates uncertainty because of the notion of the right of property and communication (Baker 61). Derrida further argues Aporia refers to “tied up” and “paralyzed” situation (*Aporias* 13). It clearly illustrates that the Muslim immigrants including Chanu and his family are living the life of uncertainty. Similarly, the globalized world for Rosello looks like prison house or “cities of refuge”, having “a xenophobic status” which refers to “cities of inhospitality” (164). In other words, western civilization in existing model has been inhospitable for the Muslim immigrants mainly from South Asia.

This study investigates that London only embraces the principle of hard science. Therefore, humanity is declining there day by day. For Chanu, London is for “mathematics”, “IT Communication” but not for literature (42). It shows multicultural London lacks spirituality and humanity so it has been inhospitable destination for foreign immigrants. Chanu is also in the trap of patriarchal imagination or is compelled to imagine his future in racist way. He thinks he will be a “real man, a father” only by giving birth to a son (52). This shows female as race have been stereotyped under the umbrella of patriarchy. Chanu did not even imagine Raqib will die soon. Raqib’s death shatters his patriarchal imagination.

Another problem of the western world depicted in the novel is that everyone is judged in London in terms of job or profession. The happiness in London depends on job satisfaction. The

good news Nazneen shares to Hasina is that her husband Chanu has been promoted in his job although it is just part time job. Ali quite interestingly argues that “In Bangladesh it was no more possible to be both poor and fat than to be rich and starving” (53). It shows richness and starvation both are positively accepted in Bangladesh. They are taken as the two sides of the same coin. It is not shame even to look poor in Bangladesh because richness does not mean just the accumulation of material luxuries. Spiritual strength also matters. They are rich in heart. However, multicultural London lacks such spiritual tie. A true home of multiculturalism needs to combine geography, technology and institution or “stone Age emotions, medieval institutions, and godlike technology” are essential components but London lacks emotion and spirituality both (Sachs 214). Therefore, real poverty, for Nazneen is in England not in Bangladesh. Because of these various reasons, London looks like a desert for Nazneen and other Muslim immigrants because brick lane is a place that is “sucking people in, wafting others out” (56). It proves that London engages just in sucking and kicking the immigrants out after using their energy in labour forces rather than giving them lifetime security. The capitalists are the suckers. Therefore, globalization is no more than creating the “myth of empire” (Porter 3). In Ali’s observation, empire creation is done just for the benefits of the natives. Nazneen experiences that brick lane in Tower Hamlets makes her feel London itself not like home but like a desert. In Nazneen’s observation, the local whites always look rich and sophisticated in their outlook. In contrast, Nazneen always looks in poor posture- “Without a coat, without a suit, without a white face, without a destination” and just like “A leaf shake of fear-or ... excitement? (56). Nazneen lives a life in London which is full of fear, pessimism, disappointment, tiredness, hunger, pain and coldness losing self identity (58). Thus, both Hasina and Nazneen have been alienated in home and abroad respectively because of the lack of job satisfaction and also the lack of positive

embrace. In Ali's analysis, London has been the center of alienation and loneliness. Waldenfels argues, "An interpersonal alienness begins from intrapersonal alienness, so too does intercultural alienness begin from intracultural alienness" (77). In other words, alienness within and alienness outside both are twin evils in globalization. Hasina's struggle represents alienness within and Nazneen's struggle in London represents alienness outside. Hasina looks excited as she hears the good news that her landlord Mr. Choudhury was going to give job to her "in a garment factory" (69). However, she is alienated because of xenophobic and xenophilic nature of her landlord Mr. Chaudhary and other employees. Similarly, Nazneen's initial arrival in London looks welcoming and inviting in the beginning but she feels totally lost and alienated when she starts to experience the bitter reality of London. The world of globalization is to blame behind this all.

According to Nazneen's husband, the white people in Tower Hamlets are "racist, particularly Mr. Dalloway" (72). Nazneen looks doubtful to Mr. Dalloway and she thinks her husband should not be hopeful for a promotion from him. She explores, "He thinks he will get the promotion, but it will take him longer than any white man. He says that if he painted his skin pink and white then there would be no problem" (72). It proves that the whites of London are racist. For instance, the decision of promotion of Chanu can not be imagined except from the whites. Nazneen further states that white people look polite in their outlook but they look different in their character. Regarding it, Nazneen explores, "All the time they are polite. They smile. They say 'please' this and 'thank you' that. Make no mistake about it, they shake your hand with the right, and with the left they stab you in the back" (72). It clearly proves that the whites in Tower Hamlets in London are all racists. Until and unless racism prevails in London transcultural living remains in the shadow. In order to embrace the immigrants in a genuine way, Dunja M. Mohr's idea of multicultural co-habitation needs to be followed.



While observing the life of London, Chanu reads Jane Austen's novel *Sense and Sensibility* that explores "about politics, nineteenth-century elections, society, land reform" and many more (76-77). In Austen's novel, two daughters named Elinor Dashwood and Marianne Dashwood are the protagonists. Elinor Dashwood is neo-classical thinker or enlightenment thinker and she is married to Edward Ferras accordingly. Marianne Dashwood is a romantic thinker and she is married to Colonel Brandon as her first husband John Willoughby deserts her. In comparison to Elinor Dashwood's life, Marianne Dashwood's life becomes happier and more successful. The 19<sup>th</sup> century Irish political thinker James Connolly also writes, "a worker is the slave of the capitalist society; a female worker is the slave of a slave" (qtd. in Cavallaro 123). It shows the past of Europe was full of racism. Ali's reference of the novel *Sense and Sensibility* implicitly gives the clue that Nazneen is empowering herself remembering the quote of her mother who used to question God and his creation of male and female. She observes how Muslim women are exploited in London although sexism would not exist there in twenty-first century. Here, Nazneen remembers her mother's quote and convinces herself, "If God wanted us to ask questions, he would have made us men" (80). It clearly proves that practice of racism in London is the practice of patriarchy that undermines not only the women but also the Muslim women who struggle both in home and abroad. Like Jane Austen, Monica Ali also attempts to maintain the balance between sense and sensibility. Sense refers to the world of enlightenment or age of reason that gives prominence for masculine thought. Sensibility, however, refers to the world of feminine sensibility that attempts to empower women. Ali's quest resembles the same as Austen because many Bangladeshi women need to be empowered first through education and other opportunities so that they need not have to depend on others. In other words, transcultural living requires the balance between sense and sensibility.

Comparing the beauty of Bangladesh with London, Ali, finds brick lane of London not the lane of home but the cruelest part of multicultural London. The bricks in brick lane cannot communicate with the Muslim immigrants. So the bricks in brick lane do not give any sense of home. In contrast, she finds beauty and peace of soul in her own homeland Bangladesh. She writes, “You can spread your soul over a paddy field, you can whisper to a mango tree, you can feel the earth beneath your toes and know that this is the place, the place where it begins and ends. But what can you tell to a pile of bricks? The bricks will not be moved” (87). The above quoted lines clearly depict the scenario that bricks are so hard that they do not communicate or understand the feelings or emotions of the Muslim immigrants and the novelist. The hard bricks give the sense of stone hearted nature of global home itself and London in particular. The problem of racism still occurs in London because of the lack of reciprocity between the whites and non-whites in London. Chanu’s desire for reciprocity from Dr. Azad and the whites of London and finding no trace of it is Ali’s interrogation of the west regarding hospitality. In other words, the problem of communication gaps frequently occurs among the immigrants themselves and also among the immigrants of the natives of London and Muslim immigrants. Ali argues multicultural London should itself be responsible behind the lack of reciprocity.

Ali argues that very few Muslim immigrants like the fictional character Dr. Azad are reluctant in returning to Bangladesh because they look more settled than those who are from soft science background like the character Chanu and others. Those who are from hard science background, on the other hand, feel superior to those who are unskilled or from soft science background. Those innocent immigrants frequently suffer from the problem of “Going Home Syndrome” but for some Muslim immigrants who are from hard science background believe more in “The pull of land” rather than “the pull of blood” (32). Here, the pull of land refers to the

pull of the foreigners by multicultural London and the pull of blood refers to the pull of Bangladeshi immigrants by the homeland Bangladesh itself. Ali believes that true multicultural home should be constructed embracing the ethics of “the pull of blood” rather than “the pull of land”. Ali’s phrase “the pull of blood” resembles Rosello’s notion of “ethical spectrum” as the requirement for transcultural living (viii). In that sense, the novel should be taken as the manifesto of transcultural hospitality.

Chanu’s family have frequently invited Dr. Azad in the name of treating his new born son Raqib and they have honored him with great hospitality. Chanu also wants to be invited by Dr. Azad in their home. As Chanu does not find such reciprocity, he feels uncomfortable. Monica Ali explores:

The Dr. Azad’s question was troubling Chanu. The question was this: Was it hostility or neglect that led the doctor not to return hospitality? Or it was this: Was it a matter of numbers, so that one more dinner would ensure an invitation? Or possibly this: did it matter, did it make any difference at all, if the invitation continued to be one-sided? More and more frequently, it was this: What manner of snob was this Azad? (89)

Reciprocity is a must in hospitable living. Otherwise, it will be an evil to play the role of guest as always guest and the host as always host. Here, Dr. Azad’s role of being guest ever and Chanu’s role of host forever; are both uncanny. Rosello calls such practices as twin evils- parasitism and charity.

Ali agrees that there are cultural differences between Muslims and non- Muslims. For instance, alcoholic drink is not allowed in Muslim communities but it is easily accepted in London. There is “risk” of “outcast” for alcoholic drunkards in Muslim communities in Bangladesh because it is taken as unethical practice in Bangladesh (110). In contrast, those who

eschew drink may be outcasted. Ali's reference of drinking indicates that cultural differences are not positively embraced in so-called multicultural London. Therefore, globalized world has been inhospitable. Ali looks also critical to the westerners because they are not given recognition to the immigrants although they are qualified in English literature. Although Chanu studies English literature based on western curriculum, but he has been declared disqualified in London. He becomes unfit in finding an appropriate job based on his qualifications. Regarding it, Chanu questions to the West why the West can not accept him although he has been qualified. He says, "I have a degree in English literature from Dhaka University. I have studied at a British university- philosophy, sociology, history, economics. I don't claim to be a learned gentleman. But I can tell you truthfully, madam, that I am always learning" (112). It also proves that the west looks hostile to the Muslim immigrants not just because of education but because of the superiority complex born in the natives of London in the name of civilization. They want to prove themselves superior to Muslims in each and every activities that irritates Ali. The central character Chanu has been frustrated as he has been jobless in London despite his qualification of being Master Degree holder in English literature from Dhaka University. As an immigrant he is living the life of immigrant full of "tragedy" in London (112). Therefore, the "deeper tragedy" of the Muslim immigrants according to Ali is because of civilizational clash. Regarding it, Chanu explores:

I am talking about the clash between western values and our own. I'm talking about the struggle to assimilate and the need to preserve one's identity and heritage. I'm talking about children who don't know what their identity is. I'm talking about the feelings of alienation engendered by a society where racism is prevalent. I'm talking about the

terrific struggle to preserve one's sanity while striving to achieve the best for one's family. (113)

It shows that the Muslim immigrants face the problems of "assimilation" and "alienation" in multicultural England (113). The Muslim immigrants prefer salad bowl modality eschewing the principle of antebellum for assimilation and integration. Antebellum America refers to prosperous nation after the war of 1812 against Britain and before the civil war of America from 1861 to 1865. The Bangladesi immigrants, as *Brick Lane*, suggests prefer the environment of all embracing rather than following melting pot modality of excluding the differences. However, the post-9/11 scenario looks different. For Ali, the west has completely embraced antebellum principle even in twenty- first century eschewing the ethics of multiculturalism and diversity. True practice of diversity is yet to come. Epstein calls such practice – as "reverse racism" (336). The west strictly follows melting pot modality for assimilation and integration. In melting pot modality, others are not easily accepted. For Ali, why South Asian immigrants are living the life of alien in multicultural London is the matter of investigation. Regarding it, the modern world looks just "gray-on-gray of mere indeterminacy" in Bernard Waldenfels' words (4). It means the others are alienated because of the westerners' forceful attempts for integration and assimilation. Derrida also explores similar theme of *Aporias*. In Chanu's observation, the problem of the western world is that they think the immigrants should act just as the way the westerners do. Otherwise, they look indifferent to the Muslims and treat the Muslim immigrants in stereotypical way. In this regard, Dr. Azad's wife explores:

'Why do you make it so complicated?' said the doctor's wife, 'Assimilation this, alienation that! Let me tell you a few simple facts. Fact: We believe in a western society. Fact: our children will act more and more like westerners. Fact: that's no bad thing. My

daughter is free to come and go. Do I wish I had enjoyed myself like her when I was young? Yes! (113)

It is the proof that assimilation of Muslim immigrants in western society is the matter of reluctance but not natural.

In Mrs. Azad's opinion, local neighborhood of the whites is racist in comparison to the Muslim neighborhood. There is frequent conflict and tussle between these two distinct communities. The white community represented by The Lion Hearts looks superior to the Muslim Community represented by The Bengal Tigers. The white community looks totally racist in the observation of Mrs. Azad. Regarding it, Mrs. Azad exposes, "The society is racist. The society is all wrong. Everything should change for them. They don't have to change one thing. That, she said, stabbing the air, is the tragedy" (114). It is the evidence that western world is a prison house for the immigrants rather than home because of the society being racist. Such society brings only tragedy rather than harmony.

Ali interrogates to the affluent west whether it needs to be responsible or not towards their citizens despite their distinct identity. Racism is not the ultimate solution. Ali presents London city as the city like a heart "broken" and "shattered" (117). Levinas in *Ethics and Infinity* highlights the need for being responsible to others. As a translator's note, Richard A. Cohen states, "And yet Levinas insists on ethics, on a metaphysical responsibility for other human beings, to care not for being, for the unraveling of its plot but for what is beyond and against being, the alterity of the other person" (qtd. in *Ethics and Infinity* 3). The stereotypical representation of Muslim immigrants in Tower Hamlets justifies that the local whites of Tower Hamlets are irresponsible and insincere so this type of representation is taken as the tragedy of the immigrants. Levinas argues that the differences can not be embraced through power and gun

but they can be embraced only by being responsible and sincere (13). Regarding Chanu and Nazneen's family in the novel, the west should have been more responsible and sincere in solving their problem rather than creating family fragmentation and alienation. The city where Chanu and his family's life looks glittering in its outlook, it looks broken in reality. In contrast, Bangladesh, where he used to live in the past looks backward and underdeveloped in its outlook, but it gives immense pleasure. Such pleasure is missing in London. Chanu finds pleasure in Bangladesh even if it is full of dirt. Ali expresses that Bangladesh in the past was just like a paradise, but now its beauty is "sinking" and its pure "drinking water" is no more available due to western influence and brain drain from Bangladesh (133). The novelist assumes global migration is the main cause behind its pollution. Therefore, Chanu argues that working in London looks like a donkey's work. This is the tragedy of the immigrants for Ali (140). In other words, the status of the immigrants in London is just like the status of donkey that represents Muslim immigrants have the status of a mere labourer.

The novel also draws the picture of the struggles of Hasina who lives in Bangladesh being jobless and orphan. Hasina's life is full of uncertainty. However, Hasina cares for her sister Nazneen and her Husband Chanu and Hasina frequently prays to God in her letter wishing happy life of Nazneen and her husband Chanu stating "O God, who knows the secrets of our hearts, lead me out of the darkness and give me light. ... I pray for you and for your loving husband" (146). Thus, Hasina is compelled to imagine bright future only by believing in God. Hasina is equally grateful to Mr. Chaudhury and expresses that she is thankful to him for providing her new job as "machinist" (146). Appreciating the generosity of Mr. Chowdhury, Hasina further writes in her letter to Nazneen stating "He is father to me. Always he tells 'Anything you need. Anytime you in trouble. Come to me.' This is a kind of man. Everyone giving him respect"

(146). For Hasina, Mr. Chowdhury is a fair man because the villagers also feel comfortable in his preference. Hasina thinks Mr. Chowdhury looks better than “leaders”, “managers”, “judges”, “politicians”, “Army”, and “Trade Unions” (147-148). Hasina’s trust to Mr. Chowdhury has given her to live a hopeful life.

Hasina desires to see the photo of the room of Nazneen in London to know how happily she may be living there. Such thought occurs in her only after she has been employed in a garment factory. After being employed in a garment factory, Hasina explores “I am machine woman and things are different now” (150). She thinks so because of job satisfaction to some extent. Her little job gives her agency and awareness both. Now, she feels as if she is becoming a new woman. As a result she eschews the trend of dowry and thinks that women should be empowered for making money and this will be greater than dowry. Hasina writes, “Why should we give dowry? I am not a burden. I make money. I am not the dowry” (150). Her working experience clearly proves that dowry system would end if all girls got job opportunity like her. From her job experience it is also assumed that all psychological problems of Muslim women will be solved provided that they are employed. Therefore, she exposes that working opportunity is a kind of treatment or cure, mainly for the women despite some exceptions. Thus, she exposes “working is like cure. Some find it curse I meaning Renu. But I do not” (152). Her work experience has made her not only creative but also critical thinker. As awareness blooms in her, she also becomes critical about the existing practice of arrange marriage in Bangladesh. Her little job has awakened her in such a way that she starts to appreciate love marriage. She is equally aware that love grows slowly in arrange marriage.



Hasina's awareness also awakens her that she has been both bold and confident now. She is not even ashamed to tell to the public that she is both "widow" and "orphan" (157). However, such publicity would be a matter of shame in Bangladesh in the past.

Hasina gradually looks doubtful with the changing scenario of the modern world. Therefore, She also declares that she is the woman who is "killing own Self" (157). Such feeling of loss of identity occurs in her only after being employed. This is the question of investigation. Obviously, the main cause of loneliness is irresponsibility and insincerity of globalization itself. Globalization is to blame behind changing thought in Hasina. Her positive thought changes into negative all of a sudden. Now, she becomes suspicious even with Mr. Chowdhury. She starts to blame even Mr. Chaudhary quite negatively. His negative feeling irritates her sometimes and his sexual abuse to her looks like "commit [ing] sin" (158). It shows the so-called globalization or multiculturalism can never embrace the differences unless the agents of globalization kill their evil thought deeply rooted in them.

All of a sudden, the sense of betrayal occurs in Hasina. Now, Hasina intends to marry Abdul by betraying her husband Khulna-She writes to her sister Nazneen, "Abdul in actual fact love me. If it possible we marry. But his family looking for girl and I have husband in Khulna. I don't know. Maybe my husband divorce me after sometime. Is it possible get divorce and no one tell you about it?" (160). The problem is that no one is responsible behind such vulnerable thought of divorce in Hasina. It also proves that Hasina is insecure under the framework of globalization. The manager of the garment factory kicks Abdul and Hasina out from their job because he does not like sexual infidelity. The manager says, "You have behave in lewd manager. You have show no regard for reputation of the factory. I am not running a brothel. Do I look like brothel keeper to you?"... Get out. You are finished in garment business" (161). Thus,

Hasina's changing behaviours are not her own. The colonial project of globalization has created such situation. Mr. Chaudhary's mind has also been divided due to the evil aspect of globalization. Mr. Chowdhury does not ask rent from Hasina thinking that she is helpless and jobless. Instead, he gives her some money as help (163). Mr. Chowdhury looks quite sympathetic to Hasina. He is not only magnanimous for Hasina but gazes her being erotic. Such thought of eroticism is the western product from colonial era in India. In other words, Hasina is in the trap of Mr. Chowdhury's hyper sexual masculine gaze. Such gaze is created in Indian culture by the westerners. Therefore, the so-called globalization and its utopia of equality, freedom and justice is quite ironic for Ali.

Hasina writes to Nazneen how she is crying because she is not paid in factory. She has been the victim of the cheap labour policy of the westerners. The westerners developed the trend of cheap labours during colonial era and the Indians imitated their style. Hasina has her husband and also another lover Abdul. She writes in her letter to Nazneen, "Little and little I getting stronger. I pray God forgive me. I sick then inside my mind. Everything has happen is because of me. I take my own husband. I leave him. I go to the factory. I let Abdul walk with me. I the one living here without paying" (166). It proves that globalization promotes sense of divorce, eroticism, vulgarity and capitalism. When Hasina becomes jobless, she shares about her uncertain future with her sister Nazneen stating, "Where I can go sister? I run away for my husband. And I run away for him also. Now I afraid to run again" (166). In such a critical situation, Hasina desires to go to live in London with Nazneen. However, she cannot make quick decision because she knows Nazneen is also living in problem.

Hasina compares her working situation with that of Chanu and Nazneen and she feels herself inferior. She knows Nazneen is pregnant and her husband Chanu is planning for new

business. They need to spend more for tutoring Shahana and Bibi (166). Hasina expresses, “This factory have ruin me” (169). She blames factory administration of being irresponsible, untrue and unreasonable. She states, “They put me out from factory for untrue reason and due to they put me out the reason have come now as actual truth. This is how I was thinking” (169). In this way, Hasina becomes rational day by day. Her struggle for identity and survival has made her look critical and rational.

Another marriage proposal comes from “Ahmed” for Hasina (170). He is supervisor for the night shift of the same garment factory. He is a serious man for Hasina (171). Hasina’s friend Hussain asks Hasina to reject that marriage proposal of Ahmed but Ahmed insists on getting married with her (171). Hasina’s new married life begins with Ahmed. They start to live in a new location. Ahmed works in a shoe factory in night shift (172). Again Hasina feels as if “storm is coming” in her new life (173). Probably she assumes this marriage will also fail. Regarding it, she explores, “All his life people been stare at my husband. I think that how he getting so serious. Also how he understand things for women like me” (174). As she has been frustrated, Hasina now remembers her first husband and expresses “Sometime I look out from roof and think I see my first husband” (175). Thus, Hasina suffers from “disease of sadness” (176). Her new husband Ahmed works long hours out and Hasina thinks he suspects her. She also feels uncomfortable because he blames her of not ordering things. She uses the phrase “bad patch for the marriage” referring her husband as well as to the husband of Nazneen (176). Hasina writes to Nazneen, “I saying to him this is bad patch for the marriage. Every marriage has bad patch. Even my sister sometime having bad patch and she respectable like hell living in London and everything” (176). In this marriage also, Hasina feels-“I am maid in good house” (177). According to Mohr, if others live tragic life in comparison to the elites; they need to resist for

making the way to be assimilated in the mainstream- just like the struggle of Dopdi in Mahasweta Devi's Draupadi. Jacques Derrida, regarding the genuine unconditional hospitality argues that welcoming "the other and his alterity" is the necessity of the world (*The Gift of the Other* 82). If welcoming the other is the need, then why the western world looks indifferent to the Muslim immigrants, particularly the Bangladeshi immigrants in Tower Hamlets of London and why Chanu has been alienated and isolated. On the one hand, Chanu is facing the problem of joblessness, inhospitality, racism, sexism and so on. On the other hand, Hasina in Bangladesh is living the life full of pain because of unemployment, betrayal from marriages, abuse in garment factory, sexual harassment from her friend such as her friend Abdul, and from her landlord Mr. Choudhury and so on.

As her first marriage with Khulna fails, Hasina marries again with Ahmed. This home also becomes inhospitable for her. She mentions about it in her letter to her sister Nazneen in England, "Everything I putting out of mind now. They have taken me in and I am maid in good house. All are kind. Children are beautiful. My room is solid wall room. Clean place. Nothing here for making sacred of. Mistress is kind. They give plenty of food" (177). Hasina's feeling of alien within by defining herself as "maid in a good house" is also the result of globalization and otherness created by it in global scenario just as defined and elaborated by Bernard Waldenfels's notion of alienness. In this context, it can be easily argued that Nazneen's alienness for instance, begins from within first and then in connection with others. This idea is applied in cultural layer as well because the Muslims struggling in London suffers first from their own cultural alienness that begins while living in Bangladesh first and second, they experience alienness in comparison to the whites.

In the third part of the novel, Ali focuses on the voices of third generation Muslim immigrants and their desire to assimilate in the mainstream culture of multicultural London rather than planning to return to Bangladesh with Chanu. Nazneen's daughters Shahana and Bibi represent third generation Muslim immigrants. Apart from their parents, Shahana and Bibi tend to assimilate more in London's culture although they are unaware that life is full of uncertainty in London. Shahana is more aware about her origin so she also desires to return to Bangladesh but Bibi is less interested in doing so being younger and more innocent. This generation represents the life in London in post-9/11 era. This is not only about generation gap in natural sense because of which all three generations are facing problems in London but it is mainly because of inhospitable imperialistic thought and practice upon immigrants from colonial era till after 9/11. In a sense, all the three generations are facing problems of western civilization or civilizational clash that became intense mainly after 9/11 because in post-9/11 condition of uncertainty and fear, the westerners have engaged in the politics of othering the Muslims or treating them as strangers. Ali has presented Shahana of being westernized who forgets Eastern values and she does not want to return to Bangladesh because the westerners never teach her cultural, religious, artistic values of Bangladesh in so-called multicultural London. About such discrepancy and miseducation Ali explores:

Shahana did not want to listen to Bengali classical music. Her written Bengali was shocking. She wanted to wear jeans. She hated her kameez and spoiled her entire wardrobe by pouring paint on them. If she could choose between baked beans and dal it was no contest. When Bangladesh was mentioned she pulled a face. She did not know and would not learn that Tagore was more than poet and Nobel laureate, and no less than

the true father of her nation. Shahana did not care. Shahana did not want to go back home. (180)

It justifies that global home is formed through unnatural assimilation rather than natural. Because of unnatural assimilation, global home remains unhome. Therefore, Ali imagines an alternative home in which natural assimilation should occur in integrating the foreign immigrants.

Ali further investigates, "In the sixteenth century, Bengal was called the paradise of Nations. These are our roots. Do they teach these things in the school here? Does Shahana know about the paradise of Nations? All she knows about is flood and famine. Whole bloody country is just a bloody basket case to her" (185). Here, Ali seems to suggest that the global home should have been created embracing the historical root of "Bengal" as the "paradise." The hospitable root of Bangladesh has faded away due to the pressure of western imperialism in the name of colonization. This type of awareness or knowledge is not given to the young children of the Muslim immigrants, for instance Shahana and Bibi of the Muslim family are viable examples as fictional characters.

Ali claims that the history of Bengal is so vast which was the paradise of Hindus, Muslims, Buddhists, and even Christians in the past. Therefore, betraying a Muslim in England now means betraying all -- Hindus, Muslims, Buddhists, Christians and even entire civilization. But now the west teaches only about Christianity betraying all other philosophies of various religions. In other words, western education has been miseducation for Ali in the sense that Western education excludes eastern values. In the novel, Chanu looks uninterested to send his children to "the new mosque school" because they do not give true education there. Rather, they teach embracing the principle of unilateralism, the way of excluding the differences.

Interrogating the notion of memory based education system of Multicultural London, Ali exposes her rage through the mouth of Chanu by asking “Do they call it education? Rocking around like little parrots on a perch, reciting words they do not understand” (197). Ali is not only critical about western education system, she argues that true education should be given focusing on ground reality of the immigrants and their origin. Ali suggests that they should teach the immigrants “The Qur’an but also Hindu philosophy, Buddhist thought, Christian parables” like in the past and they should also teach the immigrants that Bangladesh is always famous for “Jute industry” (197). For Ali, Bangladesh should be the true destination for transcultural living because of its rich past. Therefore, the westerners should not take Bangladesh not just the destination of Muslims only. Bangladesh was the home of all in the past, and it should be home of all at present and also in future because, “Bengal was Hindu long before it was Muslims, and before that Buddhist, and that was after the first Hindu period. We are only Muslims because of the Moguls” (197). Therefore, everyone should feel pride upon Bangladesh and its history of civilization.

As Chanu becomes jobless in London in spite of being qualified he even takes “a loan” from Muslim community members for survival (199). It proves that Chanu never lives standard or even middle class life in London because of joblessness and racial stereotyping. Despite his qualifications, Chanu is compelled to be “a taxi man” for survival (209). His Master Degree certificate has been useless in London. Ali, therefore, interrogates western society’s “search for knowledge” alluding that those were the Muslims who “saved the work of Plato and Aristotle for the west during the Dark Ages? ... It was us. Muslims. We saved the work so that your so-called St. Thomas could claim it for his own discovery” (215). This is the irony that Muslims did a lot for the benefits of the westerners but now the Westerners stereotype the Muslims. Ali further

argues that Christian books have presented Muslim civilization as “Dark ages”, which for Ali “was the Golden Age of Islam, the height of civilization” (215). It shows Muslims should be respected because their origin shows they are not terrorists. The problem is why the Muslims are treated as savage in multicultural London in front of the whites. Chanu argues “We must have her to dinner. I tell my wife, let us return hospitality to Mrs. Azad” (245). It means reciprocity is the urgent need in a truly globalized world. Monica Ali presents the scenario through novelistic representation that western civilization is playing the role of “multicultural murderer” although they were “wicked colonialists” from the past and they put both Africa and India as “Dark and distant land” (251). They teach about “Mathew, Mark, Luke and John” and never teach about “Krishna, Abraham and Muhammad” which shows Western world is giving miseducation to the immigrants. Ali also resists “Muslim extremists ... planning to turn Britain into an Islamic Republic” and this is just a “rubbish” thought, for her (251). In other words, Ali also resists Muslim extremism. Ali believes that Muslims should not feel inferior in London in front of the whites because Muslims are culturally richer and stronger than the Britishers. Regarding it, Ali writes, “Because our own culture is so strong. And what is their culture? Television, pub, throwing darts, kicking a ball. This is the white working -class culture” (254). She means to say that London’s beauty is declining day by day because of native people’s artificial culture in front of the richness of Muslim culture.

The birth of extramarital affair among Muslim immigrants in London is the defect of so-called globalization and multiculturalism for Ali. Such affair is not natural phenomenon of the Muslim communities in Bangladesh. Ali is also irritated to the Muslim immigrants who have developed erotic behaviour while living in London. For instance, Karim is a Muslim Character working in London as immigrant. He develops affair with Nazneen although he knows Nazneen



is a married woman. Multicultural London looks irresponsible in such issue. When Karim's affair develops with Nazneen, she is irritated first because she has not experienced such affair before. Ali writes, "Karim came into her mind. The Angels noted it. She felt irritated. I did not ask him to come into my mind like that" (255). The arrival of Karim in Nazneen's life is the symbol of the arrival of devil. Such devil never dared to approach in Muslim civilization. This is happening because western world is falling down from the moral ground and the immigrants are compelled to imitate such falling values. Although the Muslim immigrants and the local whites should have embraced ethics based on the slogans written in two leaflets. But Ali finds that both the local whites and the Muslim immigrants are breaking such ethical values in London. She believes that ethics should be strictly followed in true globalization and multiculturalism. The Lion Hearts is the group of local whites which encourages them to embrace the principle of "HANDS OFF OUR BREASTS!" to preserve their Englishness; in contrast, the Muslim poster or leaflet entitled "The Bengal Tigers" is kept to encourage the Muslims to embrace the principle of "KEEP YOUR BREASTS TO YOURSELF" in order to maintain peace in Muslim community" (257-258). However, the local whites show their superiority in front of the Muslim immigrants. As a result, Muslim immigrants are also compelled to show their unethical behaviour and vulgarity. Karim is one of the leaders of The Bengal Tigers group. Chanu, in this context, argues that the westerners engage in "playing darts and football and putting up pictures of naked women" (257). This is uncanny for the Muslims. Especially, the young generations seem to break moral values in London. As Chanu explores "The younger ones don't want to keep quiet any more" and they may even break Muslim principles although they themselves are Muslims (258). However, sister Hasina looks sympathetic to her sister Nazneen and her family. It is because Hasina has not been totally corrupted and westernized. She looks so kind to her sister Nazneen and her children and

sends them little money earned from sewing. This shows Bangladeshi Muslims are too magnanimous in heart. Hasina, in her letter to Nazneen writes, “Sister, I hope you are well. The children are doing well at school. I am still doing the sewing at home. I am sending a little money. I wish it could be more” (265). It shows the magnanimity of the Muslims or their richness in heart compared to the whites in London is praiseworthy. This sense of magnanimity is lost in London. The westerners are totally indifferent to the Muslim immigrants mainly after 9/11 event of USA. Taking Us-led war on terror in Iraq as a crime of USA, Ali critically examines:

There is one crime against humanity in the last decade of the millennium that exceeds all others in magnitude, cruelty, and potent. It is the Us-forced sanctions against the twenty million people of Iraq. ... if the UN participates in such genocidal sanctions baked by the threat of military violence – and if the people of the world fail to prevent such conduct - the violence, terror and human misery of the new millennium will exceed anything we have known. This is what the former US Attorney General says. It is the new millennium now. (284-285)

It shows humanity is declining from the western world due to their craze of war and terror rather uniting all with peace and harmony.

Karim’s brief speech “Think of global but act local” clearly proves that he is living in the state of hybridization that never favors the voices of the immigrants like Chanu (287). In other words, local identity of the Muslim immigrants is lost while living in London. The Muslim immigrants are compelled to imitate only global values. Karim not only “kissed” Nazneen but also made love with her which is the demonstration of hypersexual masculine gaze upon women (288). What Karim does is not a problem but why and how he dares to do so is the question of

investigation. It obviously proves that Karim learnt sexual infidelity from the western civilization and he imitates them and attempts to implement such uncanny behaviors in the people of his own Muslim community. Ali depicts how Muslim immigrants fall in the trap of extramarital affair challenging their happy conjugal life due to various reasons as they leave their home. She presents extramarital couple Karim and Nazneen sleeping in the same bed and making love. She investigates:

He kissed her on the mouth and he led her into the bed room. Get undressed, he said, and get into bed. He left the room. She got changed into her night dress and lay beneath the streets. Through the window she looked at a patch of blue sky and a scarp of white cloud. She pulled the covers up to her neck and closed her eyes. What she wanted to do was sleep. It would be impossible to stay awake. She was sick and she needed to sleep. She had a fever and her body was shaking. She turned her face into the pillow and moaned when he kissed the back of her neck she moaned again. (288)

For Ali, nudity and extramarital sex are taken as crime in Muslim communities particularly in Bangladesh and even death punishment is declared. She thinks sexual mores should be uprooted in London if it is truly a global home. For instance, Karim and Nazneen should be punished heavily as they violate the religious principle of Islam. In this context, Ali explores, “He was the first man to see her naked. It made her sick with shame. They committed a crime. It was a crime and the sentence was death” (299). Thus, sexual infidelity has polluted the Muslim immigrants in London. Such evil practice irritates Monica Ali as it has created family fragmentation and divorce among the Muslim immigrants. Nazneen and Karim are not immoral by nature but they are made immoral by the natives of London. They are responsible behind the failure of Nazneen’s marriage in London. Her marriage is not the practice of her free will but it is due to

her submission to patriarchy, either from her father or from her husband. Regarding it, Ali writes, “She had submitted to her father and married her husband; she had submitted to her husband” (300). Therefore, Ali claims that western world itself is full of xenophobia and also xenophilia as argued by Mohr. The westerners not only apply binary logic of us versus them for othering the Muslim immigrants but also spread their erotic gaze in the public thinking that all the public members are white people. The Muslim immigrants attempt to imitate their behaviours and become too open in sex matter. If there were some controlling mechanisms to control sex, the immigrants would be compelled to adapt those rules and the west would be more hospitable. The case of Karim and Nazneen clearly illustrates it. Their crime of sexual infidelity is the result of what they have learnt from London and its inhabitants. Mohr quite clearly defines and illustrates about both positive and negative aspects of embrace. She states that positive embrace “draws people together” but negative embrace creates fear and eroticism as it is devouring in nature - first, xenophobia-the fear of strangers and second, xenophilia- demonstrating eroticism towards strangers (xi). In the novel, the Muslims immigrants are not positively embraced in London’s multicultural framework. Just like Mohr’s analysis, the novel raises a series of questions. Is Hasina embraced in her own homeland Bangladesh? Is Nazneen or her family easily embraced in Multicultural London? Has the embrace of Karim with Nazneen been meaningful and successful? Are the Muslim immigrants in London living the life of harmony among themselves and also in communities? Is the West or London more hospitable to the Muslim immigrants after 9/11? Only after the close analysis of these questions and others if any, it can be clearly assumed that the immigrants face otherness in London from the local whites on the one hand, and they themselves face the sense of otherness within their own Muslim community. In that sense, Muslim immigrants have the problems of interpersonal alienness as

well as intrapersonal alienness. Being alienated in London, Chanu shares his pains to his eldest daughter Shahana. However, she never desires to return back in Bangladesh. Chanu becomes nostalgic and explores:

I don't know, Shahana. Sometimes I look back and I am shocked. Every day of my life I have prepared for success, worked for it, waited for it, and you don't notice how the days pass until nearly a life time has finished. Then it hits you - the thing you have been waiting for has already gone by. And it was going in the other direction. Its like I have been waiting on the wrong side of the road for a bus that was already full. (320)

It shows the life of Muslim immigrants in multicultural London has been directionless. Monica Ali also sounds like Mahasweta Devi as they both believe in struggle and resistance to be embraced in multicultural society. For Ali, global home has been just the quest for alien rather than the quest for transcultural living because multicultural London has alienated the Muslim immigrants rather than embracing them in a positive light. Waldenfels writes, "Cultural justice" fails where "differences are sublated in a universal genus" (73). In other words, cultural justice fails when others are stereotyped and subjugated as the novel demonstrates such feature.

Claiming that alienness "does not dwell outside our own walls and defining "Interculturality" as "liminal space" or "no-man's land" Waldenfels further argues that just like interpersonal alienness begins from intrapersonal alienness, intercultural alienness begins from intracultural alienness (77). In *Brick lane*, alienness begins in the individuals of Muslim communities as they start to compare themselves with the local whites of London and then it is transmitted to other members as well because alien is contagious in nature; for instance, Chanu in the novel and its transmission to others. Derrida in *Aporias* argues that "crossing this strange border" refers to its "contagion" (1). Chanu, in the novel is facing the similar problem of uncertainty and he is

spreading it to others. In that sense, the novel explores the idea of both alien and aporia or uncertainty.

Hasina intends her new husband fly somewhere to earn but he goes nowhere so Hasina feels uncomfortable (335). Hasina's desire to "fly away and find some water" refers to the quest for transcultural home (335). Her expression of the quest for water symbolizes that she needs peace not war. Hasina also wants to fly towards the home of globalization but she is confused as she frequently hears the pains of Nazneen from England. The case of Nazneen is different, however. Instead of feeling like home in London, Nazneen explores "Brick Lane is going to stink like an elephant's arse" (368). It clearly shows Nazneen has been the victim of the existing model of multiculturalism and prefers transcultural living with transcultural hospitality.

While engaging in sewing clothes in London, Nazneen concentrates on the meaning of clothing because the same clothing can have different meanings in different locations. For instance, the meaning of clothing in London differs from the meaning of clothing in Bangladesh. Nazneen expresses, "You think that a clothing is just a clothing. But as a matter of fact it is not. In a place like this it is a serious thing" (377). It is serious in the sense that those who engage in sewing are dominated in London by those who acquire higher position or post or by those who earn more in the name of skilled workers. All the workers except the skilled ones are treated there as non-citizens or modified slaves. In a sense, twenty-first century's multicultural London looks like the centre of modified slavery or neo-slavery. Such scenario is depicted in a song of a servant.

The song of a servant boy Ali depicts in the novel represents the true identity of the Muslim immigrants in the home of globalism. He has heard about Allah but he does not know why he has not favored him if Allah exists. He sings:

I search for him

In the sky and the earth

Myself, I do not know

I search for him

In the sky and the earth

Myself, I do not know

Who am I?

Who is he?

Who am I?

Who is he?" (400).

Here, quest for Allah is the quest for identity and meaning in life which is ever needed but never presents in the so-called multicultural project in London. It shows Muslim communities are not totally freed from the belief in fate. The binary of fate versus science has existed from the past till date.

Ali interrogates to the west why the westerners blame only Muslims as terrorists. She writes, "Islamic terrorists. Islamic terrorists. That's all you hear. You never hear catholic terrorist, do you? Or Hindu terrorist? What about Jewish terrorist?" (407). Her fictional appeal shows terrorism lies in all religions if it exists. Therefore, only the Muslims should not be the target. She further argues that innocent people are killed during the time of violence whether from the side of the west or from others but why only the Muslims are targated. Therefore, global home cannot be a true home until and unless such trend of blaming merely the Muslims ends. Same thing happens in 9/11 and innocent people became the victim. With the aim of finding the gap, Ali explores:

A few weeks ago, persons unknown launched an attack on American soil. Innocent people were killed. Civilians. Men, women and children. The world wept and sent money. Now, America is taking her revenge and our brothers are being killed. Their children die with them. They are not any more or less innocent. But the world does not mourn them. (415)

Obviously, many innocent people were killed in 9/11 attack. It became the subject of concern, sympathy and empathy for the world but so many innocent people died in counter terrorism attack in the name of war on terror or war on terrorism in Afghanistan and Iraq but the world looked indifferent. Even the western media represented counter terrorism attack as a minor event. Such discrepancy irritates Ali. It is uncanny for Ali when a powerful nation attacks upon a poorest and most ruined country and its citizens instead of helping them being responsible. When innocent people are killed, then the global home becomes not home but a prison house and its immigrants as prisoners. So the status of postcolonial immigrants or guests in the west has been as fragile as the status of people in “imprisonment and exile” (Rosello 165). Ali writes, “The most powerful nation on this planet attacks one of the most ravaged countries in the world. We are fit young men. There are no chains trying us to these walls. With a little planning, a little effort, we can cross continents.’ He shrugged again. ‘What can we do?’” (415). Referring to the United Nations Statistics regarding 9/11 context, Monica Ali shows indifferent attitude of the powerful nations regarding the issues of children dying of global hunger. Instead of being responsible towards them, the westerners’ main target is dropping bombs on such victims. She examines:

According to United Nations Statistics, there was another big tragedy on September eleventh. On that day thirty five thousand children also died through hunger. ... ‘What do



we know about this tragedy?’ She looked down at the piece of paper in her hand.

‘Victims: thirty five thousand. Location: the poorest countries in the world. Special news report: none. Appeals for the victims and their families: none. Messages from Heads of state: none. (416)

On basis of the above data of the novelistic representation, it can be easily assumed that western civilization looks like a big tragedy not only for the immigrants but also for the westerners themselves. For Ali, the tragedy of September eleven is just like the tragedy of killing our own “son” (432). Mireille Rosello also argues that western world falls in the trap of twin “evils”, the first charity or generosity and the second – cannibalism or parasitism. She also stresses on the need of “mutual metamorphosis” between the west and East to minimize these extremes in order to achieve the goal of transcultural hospitality (176). Nazneen realizes that Karim does not want to marry her. He just wants to fulfill sexual passions from her. As she knows his real intention she also says, “I don’t want to marry you” (451). It shows Karim learnt nothing from London. He learnt just how to use women as toys. It proves how the western world has created indifference in the world in post 9/11 situations.

Chanu advises his daughter Shahana to develop eastern philosophical insights in her behavior instead of frequently running after western dream. He says, “Be good girls, do as your mother tells you, finish your homework every night, don’t waste time on television and all that rubbish, read Tagore (I recommend Gitanjali ), don’t think that there’s anything you are not good enough for, remember that”(479). This explores the idea that western television culture has created fakeness among the audiences. Instead of watching television, reading books by the reknown poets like Tagore looks better. And giving time for children and playing with them make sense instead of running after western culture of no sense.

The ice skating tour of Nazneen, with her children Bibi and Shahana, and also with her friend Razia, an “old lady” from Muslim immigrants becomes not just the tour of entertainment but it also becomes the tour of self-examination for Nazneen. To skate in sari, according to Nazneen, is impossible for Bibi, Shahana, and Razia because they follow osmosis, the process of unconscious assimilation. It shows change is inevitable in London. Without the commitment or promise to adapt new system, adjusting in multicultural London is impossible. Roots should be kept in heart and change should be embraced through physicality or body. According to Razia, “This is England ... you can do whatever you like” (492). This is misconception of Razia. This is also irony of London. Immigrants may feel free on the surface in London. In actuality, they have been the victim of “reverse racism” or the natives of London are racists in actuality (Epstein 336). If England is the nation of freedom and democracy, why it embraces the ethics of melting pot rather than the ethics of salad bowl. It also shows root does not matter for the young generation in London and Nazneen’s appearance in “sari” while in “ice skating” refers Ali’s quest for origin although her friend Razia and daughters are ready to skate with “boots” and “jeans” (492). It clearly proves that root should not be missing in imagining multiculturalism and globalization in a true sense. Nazneen’s resistance of osmosis process of assimilation is the quest of what Ali says.

Thus, the portrayal of all three generations of Bangladeshi Muslim family shows they are compelled to live and struggle under the western umbrella in a stereotypical way whether before the civil war of 1971, in post-civil war era or the era of post 9/11. In a sense, Muslim immigrants in the west are living the life having “unstable identity” in Stuart Hall’s term. It explores the idea that England gives freedom for all but that freedom has also some limitations of civilizational

clash, under valuing of their education and skill and their overall marginalization which became incentives for terrorist activities on the part of some of the immigrants.

The overall analysis of the novel shows that the westerners have not been sincere about enabling the immigrants from modest backgrounds to a respectable living in the host country, i.e, Great Britain. Instead, the mainstream British people subject them to a prose of otherness. As a result, the immigrants suffer from such an overwhelming inferiority complex that some of them go to the extent of perpetrating terrorism. While Ali is critical of terrorism, she nevertheless cues her readers that the mainstream citizens of the western world are also to be blamed. Through such an insinuation, Ali calls for an end to racial stereotyping and profiling in the western metropolis.

Thus, this chapter focuses on the problems faced by Bangladeshi Muslim immigrants in London through the novel *Brick Lane*. Family fragmentation has brought sense of cultural loss in them. As a result, they dream for rooted identity. In the novel, the protagonist Nazneen's parents Rupban and Hamid struggle in Bangladesh in order to make a living and to make their daughters Hasina and Nazneen successful. They marry their eldest daughter Nazneen with Chanu despite Chanu's longer age gap. Nazneen and Chanu go to London with the aim of settling there. Nazneen's sister Hasina becomes alone in Bangladesh and suffers after her parents' death and Nazneen's departure to London with her husband Chanu. Chanu returns back to Bangladesh being unable to tolerate racial injustice and other inequalities in London. However, Nazneen stays in London keeping her daughters Shahana and Bibi with her. Nazneen does so not because she loves London but because she thinks about her daughters' future. Nazneen is not staying in London for assimilation in whites' culture. Her reluctance to open her sari while ice skating in London proves that she can not be far from rooted identity of Bangladesh

## CHAPTER FIVE

### TRANSCULTURAL HOSPITALITY IN HARI KUNZRU'S *TRANSMISSION*

After the end of the cold war in the early 1990s, America became bullish about globalization. As a result, multiculturalism in American democracy received a significant privileging. Hari Kunzru, however, interrogates the American thrust on globalization and multiculturalism in *Transmission*. He assumes that the so-called multicultural living in America is fake. His suspicion deepens in the post-9/11 phase. Therefore, this research has attempted to envision a genuine transcultural living in America, that is, a living togetherness of the immigrants from the Third World on an equal footing with the white populations. This chapter argues that Kunzru's interrogation of the contours of transcultural living in America is to expose the lip service that the Americans have rendered to globalization and multiculturalism on the one hand, and on the other hand, to implicitly call for transcultural hospitality. The ground for Kunzru's interrogation is made through his exploration of the situation of "loss of confidence" in every sector, that is, individual, familial and organizational (Kunzru 119). With the aim of providing the above contention, this chapter falls back upon the strand of theoretical modality relating to the concept of unconditional hospitality broached in Chapter Three.

The impact at the individual level is seen in the job unfitness of the protagonist, Arjun Mehta, representing the East, Christine's loss of naturalness representing the west, and the effect at the familial level is the fragmentation of Arjun's family as well as the families of Christine, Gabriella Caro, Guy Swift and Leela Zahir. Similarly, the fragmentations at the organizational level are visible in the bankruptcy of organizations like *Virugenix* and Tomorrow. At large, the novel makes a critique of uncanny sexual mores frequently practiced in America implying the door open for transcultural living at least in the East. In fact, Globalization along with

information transmission becomes critical in individual, familial and organizational levels mainly in post-9/11 phase. For instance, Leela virus in information technology created by Arjun Mehta becomes the major cause of the bankruptcy of Darryl's Virugenix and Guy Swift's collapse of the company Tomorrow.

The major focus of the research, as depicted in the novel, goes in critiquing American sexual mores or their way of living together and its negative impact upon the immigrants. The Americans have avoided the culture of preserving semen unlike in the Indians. The evil aspect of the global information transmission is that it has created vulgarity, nudity and nakedness displacing traditional Indian values, for instance. This all suggests the call for new world order in order to re-create alternative home, also known as transcultural home embedded with hospitality with the aim of embracing all. The novel is written in the spirit of unconditional hospitality, a true basis for transcultural living in post-9/11 world.

The novel begins with the description of the fictional character Leela Zahir, a Bollywood star or a computer virus metaphor whose name is the same name as a computer virus created by Arjun Mehta, the protagonist of the novel. Kunzru states that the computer retrovirus named Leela has been transmitted as rapidly as the rising fame of Bollywood actress Leela Zahir. Its infection and transmission is so vast that it has been "impossible to count" (4). It shows computer virus has been spread in an unprecedented way along with the rapid communication transmission just like the transmission of HIV/AIDS in the world of globalization creating uncertainty and fear among its citizens and interrogating upon their morality and ethics. The easy access of computer technology has destroyed the quality of life in practical sense. Kunzru writes Leela virus and Leela Zahir both start with the first name Leela. Here, Leela is in double role -- first as a film star and then in the role of virus. He writes, "Leela was already a rising star,

India's new dream girl" (4). The novelist says that the advent of "machine" i.e. computer as well as "taxi" looks glittering and easy for the users but such easy access of machines has changed people's rich posture into "poor" one (5). The novelist assumes that the "poor posture" of young generations has plundered the beauty of the city "New Delhi" replacing it as the city of "mockery" and "laughter" (5). The above detail clearly states that Indian people changed their behavior along with the advent and spread of computer and its use in communicating with each other. This is not just the case of girls who started to move easily from one place to another spreading HIV virus; boys like Arjun Mehta are also equally responsible. As a result, Arjun Mehta desires to fly to the west.

While reading magazine, Arjun happens to listen to his friend telling him about the advertisement of Databodies. He is impressed in it as his friend reads aloud, "Listen, Mehta. You don't know how many positions Databodies has open. Perhaps there are several. The Americans have a skills shortage. They want as many programmes as they can get" (7). Being impressed with the fake advertisement, Arjun Mehta desires to fly in America thinking that America is the centre of happiness. Accordingly, he consults the Databodies, a consultancy for visa process for abroad. After closely observing Arjun Mehta's certificates of "B.Sc. standard at North Okhla Institute of Technology" the consultants of Databodies assure him to forward his application (9). Although Arjun Mehta dreams for migrating to the USA, his basic reality is that he is typical Indian, an inhabitant from Noida, a suburb of New Delhi. Although basic reality of both Arjun and his parents is "Noida" but "the gap was too great" between Arjun and his father because Arjun is a young and energetic youth of high ambition and dream unlike his father. Being happy, Arjun Mehta shares his happiness to his mother Mrs. Mehta-"Mummy, I'm going to America!" (15). For his parents, Arjun Mehta is "unmarried 23-year-old baby" (16). He is still a baby for

parents but he seems confident about getting visa. Convincing his parents -- Mr. Mehta, Mrs. Mehta, sister Priti and also Malini, the maid, Arjun shares his note of hope about getting visa to them. His confidence emerges from his understanding of the reality that the First World countries issue visas to those immigrants who have great technical or expert capabilities. Those who lack such demanding talents are taken as unfit fellows in America. Arjun is sure to get visa for America. However, his sister Priti's unhappy posture upon Arjun's "mismatching clothes" symbolizes that something bad is going to happen in his life. Lack of confidence in her symbolizes impending bad luck in Arjun's life (18). Arjun's dream is to catch "fast moving" world by getting visa of America (19). Arjun wants to be as fast as Guy Swift and Darryl. For instance, Swift Guy's Company named *Tomorrow* has earned international profile within a short period. According to Guy, the CEO of Virugenix, true input comes out of the love of profession maintaining "relationships" along with "brand of emotion" (20). For Arjun Mehta, however; Guy Swift's high sounding relationship and brand of emotion look fake as they look different in practice rather than in theory. The above detail proves that unattainable quest for American dream has made everyone alienated and dislocated. Such dream has nothing to do except giving birth to alienness among the immigrants, visitors, investors and among the natives as well. In such situation, Bernard Waldenfels's principle of "all embracing" declines and prose of otherness prevails instead.

Arjun Mehta has been presented here as a modern man who dreams a lot about moving to Silicon Valley of America. If he is selected, he would go in Silicon Valley of California to work as a computer software consultant with "H-1B migrant status" in his "dreaming location" (22). "His image as a modern man" proves that he might get success in his every step (23). After having been selected, Arjun Mehta becomes so happy and celebrates with his friends and

parents. Then he starts packing his disks and other essentials in his bags and suitcases. He is so happy because his dream has come to be true. He shares his happiness stating, "I'm going to America...I'm going to be an engineer in Silicon Valley" (28). However, Arjun's friend Amir suggests him to join in Hollywood rather than going in America (28). As Arjun insists on going, his friend Amir advises him to take some hot picture to kill loneliness while staying in America but Arjun Mehta replies that he does not need such hot picture because he will find "real girls" there (28). Arjun Mehta's "last supper was an ordeal" or symbol of misfortune in America (29). Arjun Mehta has been too much excited and hurried to go in plane and he wants to go little earlier although his mother asks him not to be too hurried. The sweet conversation of Arjun Mehta and his mother before his departure proves that he is very happy for his secure future in America. Kunzru writes: "'Can we go now, Ma?' 'Beta, the plane will not fly off without you.' 'Ma, actually it will.' 'Don't be so silly'" (30). Arjun's hurriedness to go to the airport to travel in a plane proves how overwhelmed he has been with American dream and mother's reluctance in seeing him off is quite ironic. The above sweet conversation of mother and son proves that they are happy family and they are living in happy family bond in India. The hurried trip of Arjun Mehta becomes a mess in his life while staying in America. Arjun's father encourages Arjun while seeing him off stating "Son, we know you are going to be a great success" and Arjun also replies his father with confidence stating, "Don't disappoint us' I'll do my best, Babaji" (31). It shows Arjun is quite confident to start his new life in new land despite his parents' disappointment. Finally, Arjun's sister Priti arrives to see him off being sentimental. The gathered family's accompany in seeing Arjun Mehta off is quite exciting moment. Eleven people in total assemble to see him off for abroad. However, his hospitable departure changes into disaster in America.



After Arjun Mehta departs from the airport for America, he looks excited on the plane and this pleasure becomes just like spiritual salvation. In this context, Kunzru writes, “It was Arjun’s first – time on a plane, and from the moment he sensed his body being lifted clear of the ground, he had been in the throes of a near religious rapture. First there were the city lights, spread out like wedding decorations below the line of the wing” (32). In fact, the mesmerizing moment of plane travel makes him feel as if spiritual salvation and scientific advancements are both the sources of happiness and joys. His selection makes him more confident and determined. It is first plane trip of Arjun Mehta so he is feeling as “religious rapture” (32). He feels so because he has never experienced such flight from land to sky and because it is his first journey to his dream land America. He is overwhelmed with pleasure in the plane and he likes the hospitality provided to him in the plane by the staffs not just as the traveller but probably as a true guest as well. Arjun Mehta’s happiness knows no bounds while flying in a plane from India to America. Luckily, he watches the movie *Naughty Naughty, Lovely Lovely (N2L2)* in his flight and he knows his life story matches with the plot of the movie. In this movie, Dilip and Aparna are in love. Aparna has just returned from London whereas Dilip has stayed in India with his parents doing farm work. While returning back to London, both Dilip and Aparna return together. Dilip is poor. His restaurant bill is paid by Bigshot. Eurobigshot also reveals to offer Dilip a job. Eurobigshot is quite hopeful that Dilip will marry his beautiful daughter. Dilip becomes wealthy. After being rich, Dilip rejects Bigshot’s beautiful daughter. Dilip wants to continue his “undying love” with Aparna (35). Dilip has been able to win Aparna’s heart with the help of his “bravery, decisiveness and diversified investment-portfolio” (35). The romantic relation of Dilip and Aparna has been plundered by “Evil Cristo” who “chooses this moment to kidnap Aparna, whom he intends to make his wife” (35). “Luckily Dilip is helped by ... Mr.

Vilson, the vendor, leads Dilip to the underground hideout” (35). Dilip is rescued as “The police arrive, arrest the evil boss and take him off to prison” (35). What makes it interesting is that Aparna’s uncle and Dilip’s father bless the union of Dilip and Aparna and Dilip and Aparna garland to each other. Life is, however, changeable. Arjun Mehta brings the reference of Aparna and Dilip from N2L2 to prove his ultimate quest: the quest for transcultural living. The reference of the movie suggests going abroad does not mean changing everything. Root or origin should not be violated neither by self nor by the host nations. Therefore, transcultural hospitality focuses on root. In Rosello’s words, “ethical spectrum” should not be avoided in true hospitality. Preserving the root is the ethics of transculturalism. Therefore, Levinas also stresses on ethics in transcultural living.

However, Arjun has been disappointed in America after FBI declares him terrorist. He is accused of creating Leela Virus with the name of Leela Zahir. He experiences the end of hospitality in America. He feels so only after he starts the new job in Silicon Valley. Arjun feels “Poor, foreign, mentally ill or jogging” in Silicon Valley of California (37). He feels as if his dream has betrayed him (38). Arjun Mehta looks frustrated in America because America does not pay him his basic salary. According to the contract with Databodies, they need to pay him “\$ 50,000 a year” (39). He demands at least “ten thousands” but the reality is that he is paid just “\$ 500 a month” (39). Such a big gap creates confusion in Arjun. Kunzru assumes such break in contract seems to be the cultural practice of faking in America. Arjun claims he is “a qualified IT consultant” but his logic fails in America although it is his genuine thought.

As Arjun finds no possibility to get him paid more from them, he is unable to continue the job any longer there. In the phone conversation with his parents, Arjun Mehta says that his job is “an exciting challenge” although the it is “so trivial” in reality (43-44). Arjun Mehta works

as a software engineer or as software consultant in fish processing firm, Portland, Maine just for three weeks and leaves there because he is underpaid and is hired in Virugenix in Redmond, Washington as a virus testing assistant (49). Arjun becomes quite positive in his new job. They “hired him” because they find him capable (50). At Virugenix, Arjun not only works as an employee but learns more from them. Kunzru writes, “Arjun learned more about himself. His dungeons and dragons alignment turned out to be lawful Good. His penis was of average size” (56). It shows Arjun is afraid in America observing the faking and uncanny practice of penis enlargement in an unnatural way. Observing email sent to him by Darryl, Arjun Mehta makes a sense that he is not fit to work there. Arjun is unfit there because they compare him with another employee Shiro and Arjun looks less capable in front of Shiro. “Shiro” is fit there because of his “discernible enthusiasm” and he is able to use “body language” more appropriately (58). It shows the westerners want to prove themselves smart both verbally and non-verbally. They also want to see enthusiasm and active non-verbal behaviours in foreign employees as well in order to strengthen their capitalism. However, they never attempt to find out that they themselves are responsible in creating fear and indifference among the foreigners. Instead of enquiring whether foreign employees are capable or not, they stereotype foreign workers like Arjun Mehta as the representative character in the novel.

In order to prove Arjun Mehta as misfit employee from Virugenix, the administration of the company is succeeded in creating mysterious plot upon Arjun Mehta. For that, they participate him in a quiz to test his capability. Arjun Mehta is innocent. His initial reactions make him believe that it is the genuine quiz. As he is declared incapable, he knows it is not genuine test or quiz. Rather, it is the fakeness created by the company. Arjun Mehta wants to know about the response of quiz taken from Virugenix regarding his capability. Arjun sends email to Chris in

the email address [chris@virugenix.com](mailto:chris@virugenix.com) without knowing whether Chris is male or female. It is the address in which he had received email earlier from Virugenix. First, Arjun enquires through email to know whether Chris is male or female. And after Chris replies, he is confirmed that the mailing address is of Chris. Now, Arjun Mehta is sure that Chris is female employee at Virugenix. He is confirmed in it only after he receives email response from Chris. The main reason Arjun has been disappointed at Virugenix is because of Darryl's treatment of him as inferior being. Arjun also knows Christine's full name is "Christine Schnorr" and "she was older than Arjun" (61). Instead of judging the capabilities and talents in Arjun, Darryl at Virugenix is plotting to destroy Arjun's life by forcefully engaging him in making love with Christine that looks quite unnatural for Arjun. Such plot is designed in the name of quiz. As Arjun fails to satisfy Christine to demonstrate sexual eroticism in unnatural western style, the Virugenix seems to kick him out from his job. The novel also interrogates why Arjun is presented as "noncitizen" or rogue whereas Christine is presented as citizen. In *The Rogue That I am*, Jacques Derrida raises the issue of "constitutive autoimmunity" (63). He argues that hospitality to the Other is "limited and conditional" in existing so-called globalized world of multiculturalism (63). Because of this phenomenon, in Derrida's view, democracy, which American never tires of trumpeting, is yet to come. It is precisely for the Americans' inhospitable attitude to whom they consider rogues that makes Derrida deconstruct American democracy and multiculturalism.

The status of Arjun Mehta in the novel, has been made just like noncitizen or rogue or bad citizen or other in a sense. Therefore, he has not been recognized as a true citizen in America and ultimately he has been declared medically disqualified. He thinks it must be plot against him. He shares about his pain to Christine and Christine wants to know whether he has been declared

disqualified in “plot or detail”, then he responds it may be plot but not detail (Kunzru 62). Arjun looks worried because of “This Asperger’s condition” the condition of the declarance as “medically disqualified” (62). Chris enquires what he is being suffered. Arjun replies that he is being suffered not from detail but “plot” or “story” (62). Now, he is sure that they are plotting against him. Chris’s conversation with Arjun regarding it justifies that Arjun Mehta’s loss of job in Virugenix seems to be the plot of Darryl, the CEO of Virugenix and Chris against Arjun Mehta. Arjun looks more worried and suspicious as Chris asks, “I would not worry too much. You’re doing a lot better than most of us. Anyway, you seem functional to me, on the surface at least. Would you say you were functional?” (62). Arjun Mehta thinks that Chris supports him only outwardly. In reality, it might be her irony because she declares him to be “not medically qualified” (62). But Arjun knows he has not done anything wrong but the western world attempts to prove him unfit to work in America.

Chris blames Arjun of having “no rational basis” and Arjun is “worried about his health” (63). It clearly justifies that Arjun’s rationality looks functionless for Americans. Now, “Chris decides to make two decisions: to hang out with Arjun and find out his secret” (63). Chris is also afraid that Arjun would reveal the secret of her about their bar experience to Darryl, the boss of Arjun. As Chris suspects, Arjun has been working in America as a “slave visa” and she thinks it will be better for Darryl to hire “an American engineer” (64). It clearly shows Arjun Mehta has been the victim of neo-slavery in America. Arjun has realized that it might be Darryl’s intention too “to hire an American engineer” (64). Arjun feels uncomfortable in such hidden plot of Darryl. After drinking, Arjun kills his shyness and shares about his family and other details to Chris. It seems as if Chris is playing detective role to find out whether Arjun is terrorist or not in creating computer virus at virugenix. In the depth, Chris herself seems to have engaged in the

plot for making Arjun Mehta jobless. Chris also inferiorizes Arjun of not being able to drive. She determines to teach him “interpersonal skills” such as driving for Arjun (64). Although Arjun agrees to learn the driving lesson from Chris but it is “ironic” for him (64). Therefore, he is doubtful in learning the driving skills as well. Arjun is forced to be intoxicated from Chris so that his naturalness would disappear. First, Chris teaches Arjun Mehta to drive step wise step to “turn the wheel”, “Slow down”, “brake ... brake!”(65). After Arjun has been declared “a qualified success” in driving “Arjun bursts in tears” (65). Now, “Chris liked him. When he drank, his shyness evaporated and he became animated, waving his arms and laughing. He talked a lot about his extended family, which seemed to have more members than American Express, and he had a habit of comparing events in his life with scenes in Indian movies” (65). Chris says, “You’re not gay, are you? She theorized one night, after one too many pints of Jimmy’s Big Bear Porter. ... Later she caught herself flirting, wagging a finger and giving him arch smiles” (66). It proves that Arjun’s confidence and naturalness is killed by Chris trapping him in sexual infidelity.

The computer virus created by Arjun not only makes Virugenix and its computing system functionless but it also affects Guy Swift’s company *Tomorrow*. Consequently, the company bankrupts. Gabriella Caro is in love with Guy Swift, the CEO of Tomorrow, but as the company is declining “she was looking at him with an expression of unfathomable scorn. He began to think he had said something wrong” (72). Chris’s way of teaching driving lesson to Arjun Mehta seems to be hegemonic rather than to make him look fit in professional modern world. Her mission looks different -- that is the mission of teaching western civilization, the lesson of becoming fit in the world of living together. Her first attempt of doing so fails from Nicolai, her first boyfriend. Accordingly, she aims to make Nicolai fit in the world of living together. As he

looks reluctant in accepting her proposal, she blames him of being “an asshole” or a stupid person (73). Her intention looks similar to Arjun. The conversation of Chris and Arjun clearly illustrates that Chris is living the life of living together, a life away from marriage. She shares to Arjun that she is “not married” yet but “just living together” (73). From the conversation of Chris and Arjun it can be clearly assumed that Arjun and Chris come totally from different worlds -- Chris from the world of living together whereas Arjun from the world of distancing. What surprises Hari Kunzru about the Americans is their uncanny way of living together. Their uncanny sexual practices have numerous devastating effects. As a result, most of the representative characters -- such as Chris, Guy swift and Darryl have been the victims of bisexuality, homosexuality and lesbianism. Such uncanny sexual mores have been working as stumbling blocks in creating the environment of transcultural living in the western world (73). Arjun cannot assimilate in such society and as everything for him seems to be “turning into trouble” (74). Arjun’s inability to assimilate in “contemporary sexual mores” is not his failure; rather it is his quest for transcultural living (76). Nicolai can correctly be called “Chris’s boyfriend” but they have not “married” yet (76). Chris’s boyfriend Nicolai is not native American. He is also foreigner; a “Bulgarian” (76). The main cause of Chris’s detachment to Nicolai looks similar to her detachment to Arjun because both are foreigners -- Arjun from India and Nicolai from Bulgaria. Here, Arjun blames Chris of being “a bisexual” (77). Arjun asks Chris not to “judge” people the way she treats Arjun just for sex appeal (78). Here, Arjun criticizes the way Chris invites him for fucking. For him, her sex appeal looks forceful like the forceful posture of Nazis of Germany to attack the Jews. This irritates Arjun. Chris asks Arjun to fuck her in the car but Arjun declines her proposal in doing so. Chris asks Arjun to be open in fucking. She suspects him and concludes that his religion may not have allowed to do so. But

Arjun says it is his rationality that does not allow him in fucking her rather than his religion. She also blames Arjun of being “bigoted assholes” as he lacks interest in fucking her the way she demands (78). It clearly shows how the Americans practice uncanny “sexual mores” in contemporary America unlike Arjun. It seems to be the failure of western rationality, civilization or hospitality (78). Chris further appeals Arjun for sex stating that “ I don’t think you’re sick and I have no professional legal experience and I know this is the land of the free and you have full citizenship rights to do whatever you want anytime” (79). However, Arjun Mehta looks innocent and says, “All I wanted to know is-well, this is all rather new to me. I expect you are taught about it in sexual education classes. You have to remember I haven’t had your experiences” (79). Chris is experienced in sexual practices whereas Arjun lacks such and says, “For sex. I’ve read a lot of things about it. It’s important to educate yourself. I’ve seen pictures too, of course” (79). It shows Arjun has only theoretical knowledge of sex gained by reading lots of books and watching lots of pictures but he is unaware about its practice. But Chris has idea of sex both in theory and practice. Arjun’s assumption is that though Chris looks perfect in sex education – both in theory and practice but she lacks the core of it. So she needs to be educated first before she teaches about sex education to Arjun. Here, Chris suspects Arjun of being “homosexual” (79) and Arjun suspects Chris of being bisexual. The conversation of Arjun and Chris while teaching Arjun to drive gives a clear clue that Arjun Mehta is a virgin boy although Chris herself suspects her own virginity.

The research explores that America has gone down and down because of the excessive practice of uncanny sexual mores. As a result they look irresponsible. Chris looks uninterested to Arjun Mehta. Gabriella Caro looks uninterested to Guy Swift and Leela Zahir looks indifferent towards Indian culture and seems to look more open just like the westerners. Instead of creating



distance and isolation, the American society seems to avoid the principle of transnational ethos, they stress on the ethics of “living together” a life away from marriage or the world of touch and its devastating consequences can be felt just like the Covid-19 or Corona virus that killed millions of lives and making millions infected throughout the globe. It compelled people to live longer in isolation as well as quarantine thereby making the nations locked down. Kunzru’s novelistic representation and prediction proves it. As a result of practicing uncanny sexual mores, the globe is facing the problem of either computer virus or HIV or even Corona virus that the world is fighting against in twenty first century, for instance. In that sense, American society or the western civilization has the greater responsibility in creating viruses of different kinds and replacing the global home as unhome or inhospitable home. The American society’s transformation of being “misogynist or homophobic” in recent era is also because of their embrace of uncanny sexual mores (81). American society’s sexual infidelity not only challenges “Arjun’s living space” but also the “world of touch” (83-84). The world of touch has made Chris addict. Use of “MDMA” drug has been common to Chris. She uses this drug for temporary excitement in sex (83). She has been the major cause of the end of “Arjun’s living space” (83). It shows western way of positive embrace has been declining due to unnatural practices of eroticism or erection. Therefore, they are compelled to look erotic using the drug like MDMA. Hari Kunzru argues that the western civilizational model of touch seems to be failure now. Arjun Mehta has been the victim of uncanny western touch mainly from Chris or Christine, who is from New Jersey. Her way of making love seems strange to Arjun Mehta. The novelist argues that Chris’s nude body looks as strange as “naked torso”, a body without head, legs and arms (84). It shows western society is moving towards artificiality. After having sex with Arjun, Christine or Chris becomes dead or as if she becomes just like “a waste land” (85). Kunzru , in

the novel, writes, “Physically she felt battered but mentally things were worse, her ordinary landscape of thoughts and feelings reduced to a scoured bleakness, a waste land strewn with the shattered remnants of whoever she had been before she got high” (85). In this way, Chris’s condition looks like waste land. But Arjun “felt fresh and relaxed, suffused with a sense of the rightness of things” (86). While experiencing uncanny sexual mores in America, Arjun Mehta remembers his grandfather’s saying, “God bless you. You are a good boy. I want you to remember two things. Always conserve your semen. It is your strength” (87). It shows the richness in Indian culture lies in strengthening their semen through spirituality and meditation. However, western society is weak in such matter, although they have high technology. Chris is not the sexual adventurer. But she thinks she is. The true sexual adventurer is Arjun because he has not used any drug for sexual arousal or erection but Chris has been the victim of MDMA, a drug to arouse sexual desire. After having sex, Chris is disconnected with Arjun Mehta.

A disconnection like the above foreshadows his job termination from Virugenix. The forceful job removal makes Arjun sad but Darryl, the CEO of Virugenix assures Arjun and encourages him not to be sad due to job termination. Mehta’s sadness increases as Virugenix responds to Arjun Mehta stating that the company will not recover soon and his job will not be continued there. In fact, Virugenix fires him out from there not because he is less capable but because they think he opposes their deterministic way of living and intends to live there according to his “free will” (Cowburn 15). Arjun becomes so hopeless that his “mouth was dry ... as he left the room” (93). For Arjun, “There was no way he could go back to India. He would bring shame on his family” (94). In order to relieve from frustration, Arjun leaves his office and comes in the “open air” and starts to observe the activity of a “crow” and compares human “policy” that looks quite “contrary” to anthropocentric world (94). It clearly proves that the root

cause of Arjun's frustration is his interrogation of the unnatural life of the Americans. Arjun desires to live free life just like a crow and he finds peace in nature rather than the life of the humans that looks completely uncanny as their policies are totally human-centric and such policies are used in order to fulfill the desires of the main stream Americans but not of others, mainly those of South Asian immigrants from India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. After he leaves job at Virugenix, he feels the world was plotting against him and "he realized he was crying" (95). Arjun Mehta is confirmed about the plot only after he receives email from Darryl stating that Arjun should not blame the company and its staffs.

Chris's relationship with Darryl and Virugenix is uncanny for Arjun. It is this uncanny relationship which is instrumental to Arjun's expulsion from the company. His expulsion indicates western world's inability to embrace Arjun Mehta in their home of globalism. Virugenix's inability to embrace Arjun in their organization system largely suggests inability of the west to embrace the others -- either Muslim immigrants or South Asian immigrants. Mohr writes, "An embrace is ... interpreted as a positive act of good intentions that draws people together" (x). She argues that "embrace is neither necessarily and always welcome; nor it is automatically honest or true" (x). She also argues that "embrace might be given or offered to stifle, to suffer, to immobilize; it might deny a history of exclusion and inclusion; it might be given to a chosen other in order to exclude yet another" (x). She takes "extreme gesture of xenophilia" as "devouring embrace" (x). She states that western society's embrace has been working as "binary logic" that refers to "us/them", "Self/Other", and "inclusion/exclusion" (x). In other words, embrace has two aspects -- positive and negative. For example, in Mahasveta Devi's short story "Draupadi", Dunja M. Mohr argues, Mahasveta Devi's representation of Senanayak's embrace of Draupadi as "devouring embrace" referring the sense of "xenophobia

and xenophilia” (xii). The example of Senanayak’s embrace to Draupadi looks quite relevant only in the sense that it can vividly demonstrate the attitude of Senanayak type of people who jump upon innocent and powerless people in order to show their bravery rather than embracing others. The example can easily justify that “devouring embrace” is dangerous whether it comes from west or non-west. For Mohr, Otherness should be positively dealt either it is the otherness of within the self or it is the otherness of beyond. In the novel, it is clearly stated that Arjun Mehta has the sense of otherness within himself as inferiority complex or it is seen even in the behaviors of Chris and Darryl as superiority complex themselves. However, as a responsible western host Darryl’s intention to Arjun should be positive. Instead of being positive and responsible, Chris seems to be plotting against Arjun Mehta in order to make him jobless. She does not seem to be a true friend of Arjun although she seems to be so on the surface. Chris just comes as a virus to make love in order to weaken his immune system. Her plotting does not seem to embrace Arjun in globalism. Instead, she intends to desert him so that he could not adjust himself anywhere. Now, Chris thinks Arjun may intend to go home. Chris is not sure what he means. She supposes he meant returning back to India but she is not sure in Arjun’s tone. Probably, it is sure that Chris will miss Arjun and she thinks she will have to embrace her own boyfriend Nicolai. Arjun blames Chris of having sex with her. As a result of this sex, his automation has been broken. He remembers why his grandfather would frequently suggest him stating “Always conserve your semen. It is your strength” (87). Now, he seems unable to conserve the semen because of Chris. She has infected him probably with HIV/AIDS. Birth of Leela (Virus) in Arjun is the result of his dream of visiting America. It is quite clear that Chris is in affair with Nicolai before she starts affair with Arjun Mehta. After Chris distances with Nicolai, she comes into contact with Arjun and their relation starts to bloom. Kunzru writes, “He

was pissed at her, and he was probably justified. She felt as if she was losing him. Arjun was a symptom” (97). This symptom seems to be the symptom of HIV/AIDS infection. Kunzru writes, “Arjun would disappear and it would be easier to put things right. It was cold of her, she knew it. She also knew whatever had happened was her fault” (97). Chris assures Arjun to be confirmed that it is not her decision to fire him from his job. Instead, she looks helpful to him and says, “Arjun, that kind of decision takes place way over my head. I’m just a coder. You know that. I realize it’s hard, but you’ll find another job” (97). She thinks that it would be better to find another job as it is impossible to convince Darryl.

Arjun, however, does not believe Chris because she reveals the truth that she loves Nic or Nicolai not Arjun. When Arjun does not seem to get help from Chris, he gets irritated with her and regrets for having made love with her. Arjun concludes that Chris’s sex offer is not for providing him “love” and care, rather it is the way of insulting him (98). It shows Chris just loves sex but not Arjun Mehta. It also indicates that Arjun’s hospitality from the western world is going to end soon because he knows sex only happens with those who have close loving bond in Indian culture. In that sense, he assumes his relation with Chris will last longer and she will love him for eternity. But Chris has not been hospitable to him. Chris’s sexual affair with Arjun is just a ruse: a strategy to keep him in illusion. This is why, she states that sexual desires are “internal processes” that function just like “machines” (98). Kunzru doubts upon the “internal processes” of Americans, not just Arjun’s employers. Kunzru is critical to the whole American mechanism which is full of doubt and full of mystery. He believes that such doubt can be minimized only through the embrace of conspiracy theory. Kunzru writes, “In a world of illusion you have to ask questions. You have to doubt, systematically. Other people may act real. They may behave as if, like you, they are animated by internal processes. But you never know. Some of them are just

machines” (98). It justifies that American globalism and their multicultural project both need to be observed through conspiracy theory in order to find out who the Americans are and what secret mission they carry. Now, Arjun Mehta believes that he will live now with “Broken automation” indicating that “His life was malfunctioning” (99). In Kunzru’s observation, America’s broken automation and malfunctioning is the result of their embrace of hard science represented by STEM displacing humanistic principles through soft science. It shows western embrace of STEM is taken as stumbling block for transcultural living.

Kunzru believes that the world is becoming inhospitable because of the excessive practice of numbers as the measurement tools. Here, number refers to hard science and other related disciplines. Arjun Mehta intends to find “a place to stand” and this place or home would be different from the world of “numbers” (99). For instance, Arjun Mehta wants to continue his job at Virugenix but they have compelled him to leave the job there because the company also invites those only who prefer the world of numbers, the world represented by STEM. Now, Arjun Mehta remembers his parents, grandparents and also his sister. He repeatedly remembers his grandfather’s moral quote, “Always conserve your semen. It is your strength” (99). Arjun feels as if he has been homeless in America because he knows American society cannot embrace the people who look different from them. Americans associate numbers with science, technology, mathematics, engineering and management. In other words, he finds American society just the society of STEM that seems to disregard humanity or social sciences. STEM stands for science, technology, engineering, mathematics and so on. Because of the dominance of such subjects of hard sciences, humanity seems to remain in crisis or in the shadow. Regarding such bizarre scenario of the domination of numbers, Kunzru argues, western world

has been too much inhospitable. About how complexity has been created in western world's number system and also about how the Eastern World differs from the west, Kunzru explores:

Numbers were the truth of the world, numbers cloaked in materials. Find certainty by counting the things. In decimal. In binary, hexadecimal. How many sixteens of trees in his field of vision? How many around the lake? Streams of numbers came to him, too fast to handle. But he had to try. It all boiled down to your ability to handle complexity. (99)

It is the evidence that western society lacks hospitality because their primary focus is on numbers rather than on spiritualism. In other words, their primary focus is on hard science. As a result, western world is quite backward regarding a moral ground. Arjun's major problem is the problem of existential crisis in America after he becomes jobless. Until and unless he regains his job back, he will die of hunger and starvation. Arjun starts to "think" after locking himself within his apartment (99). It looks obvious to him that where there is hunger there lacks hospitality. Americans' lack of hospitality which drives Arjun to the brink of starvation makes him vengeful. In such a surcharged state of mind, he creates Leela Zahir or Leela virus. Just as he has been deserted from Chris and Virugenix, the whole computing system will crash now and everything will be functionless. He probably thinks that he is doing justice by creating such virus because he has been the victim of western domination. Arjun Mehta's creation of Leela virus is his resistance against global injustice. Virugenix's decision of making him jobless makes him rebellious and creates computer virus named Leela Virus that makes all computing system functionless. His resistance looks like the resistance of Dopdi in Mahasweta Devi's Draupadi as illustrated by M. Dunja Mohr to justify his argument of postcolonial embrace and its challenge. Recalling the past, Arjun Mehta informs the audience that he happens to see the computer for the first time at the age of "ten" and he thinks "there were actual living things inside computers"

(101). Later, he comes to know that computer works “into binary simplicity” (101). Arjun Mehta has been frustrated because of the failure of the machine (Computer) while communicating with others. First, the computer he is using is betraying him and second, he has been a failure in communicating with Chris because he thinks she cannot understand his feelings. As Arjun thinks nobody understands him including Chris, he feels of being “a computing hermit” and determines to isolate himself from the world of “computing” (102). His happiness knows no bound as he becomes familiar with computer in the initial phase. His father dreams to make Arjun engineer. Now, he has been perfect in computer. Not only that, “he has created several simple viruses” (103). The viruses he has created have “infected his own machine” as well (103). Arjun Mehta frequently gets frustrated and disturbed because of the computer he uses, it looks as if every computing system has been infected with computer virus known as Leela virus which has led to the failure of the controlling mechanism. Metaphorically, the racial bias -- age-old American virus -- has made the recent American thrusts on globalism and multicultural dysfunctional like the computer.

The computer emerges with a vengeance from the western world before the cold war but it becomes the means of inviting evil things later (104). Hari Kunzru argues that numerous Indian values have been declining with the emergence of computer along with internet facilities. The novel depicts that computing body of the world as infected by computer virus has been emerging now as “future terror” replacing “life” into “not-life” (104). Here, Kunzru is obsessed not with life or the world of touch but with the virtual world created by internet or computer.

Kunzru argues that not only India but whole “South Asia” is the centre of “Pyaar” or love and this message is frequently transmitted through “cinema” or Bollywood movies, “generation of young people” mainly after India got “Independence from the British” or after the advent of



“globalization” in India (104). He means to say that true globalization should have emerged keeping “pyaar” or unconditional love in the centre. Instead, money becomes prominent rather than love. It shows transcultural living should be full of pyaar or unconditional love rather than the world of globalization which stresses on conditional love in which capitalism resides in its core. Kunzru does not totally believe that westernization can make an end of Indian values through the means of globalization, imperialism, capitalism, science and technology and so on. He claims that even capitalism can do nothing in front of the power of love. What capitalism can do is that “love can be reduced to money” but nothing more than that (105). In other words, the advent of computer or internet has minimized the world of touch and maximized the size of virtual world indicating the possibility of impending virtual terror in future.

For Kunzru, the true Indian love or unconditional love would be the matter of pride in the past; however, it has been declining along with the emergence of computer with internet now. For him, the advent of computer technology looks exciting in the beginning but its rapid growth in an uncontrollable manner becomes just like “a hard ache inside”, “an alien presence” that looks “like a tumour” or cancer (105). The novelist becomes sentimental and nostalgic upon the loss of unconditional love after the emergence of computer. Foreign influence pollutes original Indian culture just like the rise of cancer that pollutes the healthy body of a man. Observing Indian love of then and now, Kunzru becomes quite nostalgic and writes:

Love was the price of touch. Love was the maze through which you had to find your way. In the May heat, when the heavy air was like a hand on his body as he lay awake at night, he could feel the need for another person as a hard ache inside, an alien presence which had formed in his chest like a tumour. (105)

It clearly proves that global home in broader sense and India in specific is being inhospitable home because of the rapid transmission of computer virus resulting unconditional love into conditional one.

Computer-assisted message or information transmission, for Kunzru, has become uncanny because of the computer viruses that engage the users in immoral activities and advertisements such as sending “people messages about penis enlargement, great investment opportunities and requests for urgent business assistance” (106). It proves that computer has not just assisted business advertisement but it has also forced people to earn quick profit rather than giving the clients best quality services. Arjun knows many have been infected with the virus he has created. Kunzru writes, “Nothing happens. Ten minutes later, when his computer sends copies of email to everyone in his address book he does not notice because he has fallen asleep” (107). Arjun’s “fallen asleep” indicates the end of hospitality from the western world. Leela’s initial attack is so intense that “first variant Leela virus” also known as “Leela01” enters into more than “17000 hard drives around the world” within a while (107). The novelist attempts to draw true picture of Leela but Leela is seen not just in one form. She is seen in various forms and spreads quite rapidly. Leela 01 is defined as “a swarm, a horde” that spread through “mail” and “cell phones” in “business and universities” (108). Kunzru argues even Virugenix fails in analyzing about Leela because “Leela was in the wild, and for the moment entirely invisible” (109). Thus, “Leela” suggests India as the land of mystery which is ever rich; however, it is being polluted due to western influence.

The novelist claims that “The post 9/11 loss of confidence” among immigrants in the western world is caused by the problem in communication transmission that not only affected Arjun as an employee but also the employers like Darryl’s Virugenix and Guy Swift’s Tomorrow

(119). Now, Arjun remembers Kashmiri love song. He thinks Leela would not attack if the Indians ever embraced the theme of Kashmiri love song instead of running after computer and internet or they would be safe and the world would be a better place if they used internet in a systematic and protective way. Highlighting traditional Kashmiri values in front of the impending demise of morality from the western world, Kunzru brings Leela's lyric or Kashmiri song of Leela in order to experience peace. According to Kunzru, the song sings:

O my love, O my darling  
 I've crossed the line of no control  
 I hear your gunfire in my valley  
 You've tripped my wire  
 You have my soul  
 I've crossed the line  
 The line of no control. (121)

The song highlights Indian traditional values that have been declining due to the advent of western values along with the advent of computer from the western world. It implies that the controlling mechanism in the moral sense has disappeared in globalization. It is because the situation is quite serious as, "Leela was stealing resources from other programs, taking up disk space, making herself at home" and Leela was spreading so rapidly that no one could dare "to counter her" (121). This all proves that people are down from moral ground after the advent of computer or internet.

After he becomes jobless Arjun looks tired. Kunzru writes, "A little needle of fear made its way up through Arjun's tired brain. Shutting down a whole company. That was serious" (122). Only Arjun knows the cause of collapse of the company. Although Gabriella Caro gets job

at Guy Swift's *Tomorrow* and performs her best but the company collapses because of Guy Swift's "absurd sense of his own importance" (127). This sort of absurdism has not been just self-destructive but it has created uncertainty among global immigrants. Kunzru writes Leela "had infected an estimated 3.2 million individual hosts around the world ... Leela started to work her glamour on the life of Guy Swift. Her subject went off to work, leaving his girlfriend in bed, pretending to be asleep" (128). Such unprecedented spread of computer virus has created global depression not only among individuals but also among communities, nations and in the whole globe. Hari Kunzru calls computer or internet "A bloody technical hitch" because it creates gloomy environment in Guy Swift's *Tomorrow* (130). Leela virus is synonymous to Indian movie star "Leela Zahir" with the same name as the novelist writes "The woman in the picture. She's an Indian movie star called Leela Zahir" (131). Guy Swift blames Muslims behind the tragic collapse of his company *Tomorrow*. Leela virus weakens the tightening knot of western civilization through unethical act of "stolen" of "privacy" and violation of "copy right" (135). In this sense, computer virus has created fear and uncertainty.

Arjun still hopes from Darryl that he will help him to continue his job. Arjun further requests him to let him continue his job. Arjun expresses that his job is a compulsion for him. What Arjun needs from Darryl is his "job back" (143). He also seems to be fighting for the protection of his "space" and against Americans' "boundary-transgression syndrome" (143). Darryl's reluctance in giving him his job back means reluctance of the Americans in embracing the differences. Darryl very angrily responds to him stating, "Stop talking. That's an order. I don't feel comfortable" although Arjun Swears stating "Even on a trial period. I'll be the best worker you ever had. I swear it." (143). But he gets no any sign of getting his job back.

After Arjun's unfriendly and unfruitful conversation with Darryl, "Arjun left the office, and for five minutes existed in a state of minor but perceptible hope" (143). Now, Arjun kills his hope of getting his job back. In *Ethics and Infinity*, Immanuel Levinas suggests "ethics only comes into its own with the collapse of onto-theo-logy" (3). He views western world is facing problem at present because they are embracing "onto-theo-logy" or metaphysics that looks uncanny to others just like the fate of Arjun in the novel (12). It proves that western imagination is declining along with the decline of their civilization or hospitality. Levinas argues ethics "opposes power with ... responsibility and sincerity" (13). Similarly, he takes "responsibility as the essential, primary and fundamental structure of subjectivity" (95). Such responsibility should be for Other as he speaks, "I understand responsibility as responsibility for the Other, thus as responsibility for what is not my deed, or for what does not even matter to me; or which precisely does matter to me, is met by me as face" (95). He further asserts:

Positively, we will say that since the other looks at me, I am responsible for him, without even having taken on responsibilities in his regard; his responsibility is incumbent on me. It is responsibility that goes beyond what I do. Usually, one is responsible for what one does oneself. I say, in otherwise than Being, that responsibility is initially ... for the other. This means that I am responsible for his very responsibility. (96)

For Levinas, responsibility lies at two levels -- first at the level of self and second at the level other. However, he clearly states that responsibility is urgent basically for others. In connection to the novel, America does not seem to be responsible to Arjun Mehta. As a result, he is compelled to follow the path of fundamentalism. Levinas stresses on "inter-human relationship" (97). Without strengthening "inter-human relationship" Americans' multicultural project becomes meaningless. Levinas further raises "inter-subjective relation" in his work *Totality and*

*Infinity* (98). In other words, subjective relation may create harmony among the people. But the west observes the world only through objective lens that brings fragmentation not harmony. Whether others are responsible to us or not, it does not matter more but we should always be responsible to others. This is what Immanuel Levinas intends to convey through *Ethics and Infinity*. From his expression that “The I always has the responsibility more than all other” quite clearly proves that it is “I” who should look responsible in every situation regarding others. In novelistic representation, America looks irresponsible in assuring job for Arjun Mehta. As America has the leading role in preserving rights of every citizens of the globe mainly after cold war, they look hegemonic instead. Immanuel Levinas concludes his view on responsibility stating that our responsibility to others plays the role of “inalienable identity” or as “a supreme identity” that emerges from our “self-consciousness,” so we should not “refuse” it (101). In the novel, it is clearly depicted that Darryl, the CEO of Virugenix has been irresponsible to Arjun at micro level, for instance. At macro level, it can be easily assumed that America or the western world looks irresponsible towards immigrants, mainly those who travel from South Asia to the western world. In that sense, Arjun’s resistance and struggle is just for hospitable existence. But the western media like CNN and other TV channels claim “legally and morally Arjun Mehta must bear responsibility for the outbreak” of the virus (147). After Arjun has been declared a “terrorist” American security agencies including FBI suspect Arjun (149). Arjun’s dream of living in “magic America” fails out of the blue as he has been declared “terrorist” and has been treated as “non-person”. Arjun thinks he should take revenge against “uncontrollable” world, that is, America.

Leela’s transmission affects not only the people of certain location. Rather it spreads all through America, Europe and rest of the nations as well. It creates a bizarre scenario upon the

beauty of London city. The pace of London city becomes slow as if its becoming functionless, the city looks like the centre of cyber gloom. Even the loving bond of many couples -- either married or single is dismantled because of the advent of computer and its rapid transmission along with the transmission of computer virus. For instance, Gabriella Caro walks together with Guy Swift just like in a date and at the same time “someone had called Rajiv too” as her true boyfriend (187). Thus, the research critically examines why and how the immigrants as well as natives are crossing the limit of their behaviours under multicultural framework of globalization. The birth of the trend of developing multiple affairs is western product which looks uncally for the Indians like Arjun Mehta in the novel. In that sense, the novelist takes global communication transmission as “global cyber terror” (188). It is because global communication transmission has been misused that lacks effective controlling mechanism. Rajiv Rana, the true boyfriend of Gabriella Caro also makes sexual relation with her thinking or assuming that she is truly his beloved, but it becomes vain when Guy’s phone rings. Gabriella Caro’s romantic sex with Rajiv Rana is disturbed. Gabriella is terrified as Guy Swift phones her calling with the nick name “sweetie” (190). She is also aware that Rajiv Rana may betray her if he notices about her affair with Guy Swift. This sort of the fall of morality is spreading along with the spread of information transmission through computers. It is the clear evidence that western civilization has been strange due to uncanny practice of sex with multiple partners. For the novelist, western world after 9/11 has been inhospitable because they take sex as a means of “relieving tension” rather than respecting it like in Eastern world, for instance Rajiv Rana in the novel thinks so (191). Such is the bizarre scenario that Kunzru presents here. It is the global communication that has destroyed familial ties as well as the ties or bond of loving couple.

Arjun feels insecure because “FBI releases picture” regarding “cyber terror suspect” (201). About why Arjun Mehta has been suspected as cyber terrorist, Kunzru writes, “Arjun uploaded his home made videos to his secret space on the NOIT server, then created an account on a free email service and used it to send messages containing the location to the people he wanted to watch them: Priti, Chris, the FBI and Leela Zahir” (205). After the company *Tomorrow* has been bankrupted, “Gabriella lay on her stomach on the bed, listening to Rajiv Rana dressing ... she lay still for a long time. Then, feeling cold, she crawled under the covers” (218). Gabriella Caro has been used by many men such as Guy Swift, Rajiv Rana and others. So she feels herself deserted. Gabriella Caro is disgusted when she finds Rajiv Rana kissing and embracing Mrs Zahir too. Kunzru writes, “He embraced Mrs Zahir like an old friend, making no eye contact with Gaby, who watched with distaste as the other woman simpered, brushing his collar with her fingers. It occurred to her that perhaps they had been lovers. The idea disgusted her” (220). It proves that bisexuality has been common in multicultural America. Here, Arjun first narrates his ground reality and then tells why they are attempting to call him a terrorist. Then he justifies why he is not terrorist and blames FBI for accusing him terrorist. Kunzru informs that Arjun is from “New Delhi,” “an NRI in America”, fan of the heroine of the film *N2L2* but “not a terrorist” (229). It shows Arjun looks innocent but western world declares him terrorist.

Now, Arjun regrets for making a “bad decision” of visiting USA (229). Despite his capabilities, he becomes jobless there. Arjun Mehta tries a lot to convince Darryl to give him his job back but fails. Arjun is very sad in losing his job and he feels uncomfortable even to return home. In such situation, expresses:



If I lose this job, I have to go back to my parents in disgrace. ... I meant to cause a little disruption, just a small problem, because then I could step in and solve it and be the hero. But instead I'm here and they are calling me terrorist and FBI most wanted and I'm scared, Miss Zahir. (229)

Instead of proving Arjun as a hero, FBI declares him terrorist that irritates Arjun. Addressing Miss Zahir, Arjun expresses that he is feeling uneasy and uncomfortable. He regrets of using her pictures and songs without her permission. Arjun confesses that he has done nothing wrong except using Miss Zahir's "pictures" and "songs without permission because they are irresistible" (229). He feels sorry for not taking permission but he has not committed any terrorist act. This makes him feel uncomfortable. Arjun, in fact, is living the life of fear in America after he has been declared as "most wanted" "terrorist" by FBI (229). It shows positive embrace lacks in multicultural America in Post 9/11 situation where innocent Muslim immigrants are the major target of suspect.

Obviously, the computer virus has weakened not only the immune system of Arjun but also of Chris and others in particular and is also weakening the immune system of global home itself at large. For instance, Leela Zahir's natural and broad smile is changed into, "a forced little smile" after she is infected and changed into Leela virus (230). It symbolizes that the beautiful Bollywood actresses like Leela Zahir get infected after the arrival of Leela virus first in the western world and then in other developing nations like in India. Leela Zahir thinks Arjun Mehta should stop terrorist acts. Regarding it, Kunzru writes, "Leela Zahir pleads with the terrorist to give up to proper authorities forthwith and if he is her true fan to stop using her pictures to damage international commerce. He is copyright infringer and criminal and must be giving up

right-now" (230). Thus, Leela Zahir also suspects Arjun of being "terrorist" and plagiarist until she knows America frequently plays double role regarding war and terrorism.

Hari Kunzru suffers from the "common enough desire" that has been "uncommon" and he thinks that such uncommon desire needs to be abolished to live a perfect life (257). It clearly shows globalized citizens have the problem of "enough desire" (257). Such desires are promoted by internet. However, the computer virus blocks easy transmission of such capitalistic desires creating "uncertainty" or "confusion" among them (257). Kunzru argues that perfect information should be "transmitted from a sender to a receiver without loss" (257). To be a perfect communication, the relation of receiver and sender must be healthy. Arjun Mehta and Leela Zahir are just representative characters. There are so many Leelas and so many Arjun Mehtas who suffer daily in the world of so-called globalism and multiculturalism. It has been quite common that girls look like boys and boys look like girls. Therefore, the novel draws the scenario and campaigns against globalism and multiculturalism throughout the world in order to get rid of such uncanny practices.

The research investigates that the problems of global terror created by information transmission can be solved only by the embrace of conspiracy theory. Kunzru's critique of globalization seems tenable here because he shows the situation of weakening immune system of global home just like Derrida's idea of autoimmunity. Arjun Mehta's condition can be compared with Jacques Derrida's concept of autoimmunity that gives birth to "strange behaviour" which destroys not only the immunity of "the self" but also the immunity of the others. Arjun Mehta's position in the novel has been presented as suicidal. Just like the suicidal state of Arjun in the novel, the so-called multicultural project of America has been functionless. It is only because of irresponsibility and insincerity by not addressing the genuine problems and issues of the

immigrants. So the west should acknowledge that terrorism is not natural from the side of immigrants like Arjun Mehta in the novel rather it is counter productive. For instance, Arjun takes Darryl's treatment as transgression or crime and he exposes the sense of "aggression" in the first place. Secondly, he has been traumatized and the condition for him becomes worse than the cold war as he becomes jobless. Thirdly, his resistance of westernization through the creation of Leela virus looks destructive on the surface. But in the depth, it is resistance against repression. Arjun's way of resistance proves that "humanity is defenseless" in globalization (Autoimmunity 100). In simple words, autoimmunity is a medical term that gives the idea of self and non-self. It states that self should play protective role of self itself first, and non-self should also play protective role for the welfare of self. Arjun Mehta's role is not the role of terrorist though he has been presented so by FBI, but his appeal to get his job back proves that he needs to create space for him in the west if he gets support. In that sense, the novel's ultimate message is the message to create transcultural hospitality embracing the ethics of self and non-self. Kunzru ends his novel stating, "According to Conspiracy theorists, there is only one possible explanation, only one pattern that makes sense" (281). Just like 9/11's mysterious official explanation of generalizing the Muslims as terrorists, "the dramatic disappearance of Guy Swift, Arjun Mehta and Leela Zahir" is also the matter of mystery (261- 281). Their disappearance from the novel towards the close indicates that their actual location of disappearance will be found only through the close observation using the theoretical insights of conspiracy theory. In other words, global home has been unhome or inhospitable home because it creates mystery. Globalization has the power to hide serious crimes committed by the so-called powerful nations. The major characters' disappearance also suggests that the so-called global home has made its citizens homeless or stateless just like Palentinians, for instance. On one hand, their

homelessness indicates the demise of globalization and it also creates the possibility of finding new home known as transcultural home as the novel asserts, “Zahir’s disappearance was not abduction ... or suicide but a well- planned bid to escape ‘prison’” on the other (279). This clearly indicates that the existing world of globalization is not home but a prison house where its non-citizens have frequently been the target of over surveillance.

Mireille Rosello also states that the space for the immigrants in the west has been just like the life of prisoners where the western hosts play the role of town rats. For instance, Arjun Mehta in the novel has been presented as a prisoner and the Americans as town rats. For Rosello, true hospitable living must be just like a “book” and guests should be treated just like its “readers” (166). The analogy of the immigrants or guests with readers and book with host nations clearly suggests that a truly global home demonstrates the relation between books and readers. It shows the popularity of a book depends on “you attitude”, a phrase used in managerial communication to refer to friendliness to the audience or readers or reader friendly environment created by author in a book. In other words, a truly globalized world should always “leave doors open” and farewell of the guests should also be positive because a truly global home must be “a place for happy endings and harmonious separations” (Rosello 166). But just the opposite is happening in the world of globalization just like in the novel. Arjun Mehta’s departure for America looks welcoming but his return from America has been mysterious and unwelcoming. Rosello also argues, “Generosity and cannibalism” are the “two evils” of hospitality (175). To get rid of these two extremes, the hosts and guests must embrace the principle of “mutual metamorphosis” or compromise and negotiation (176). Such negotiation is what Derrida calls cosmopolitanism which is lacking in the globalized world at present. Regarding this aspect, America has neither been too generous to Arjun Mehta nor has disturbed the Americans by overstaying. He visits

America with H-1B visa that does not seem illegal. In this way, Arjun Mehta's struggle is for postcolonial identity or transcultural living with hospitality and respect but not as strangers or others. Kunzru argues that globalization has been "anti-globalization" because of the easy access of communication through computer and transmission of secrets as well as virus. Using computer as easy means of communication, many people -- especially the young generations seem to engage in unusual activities. This ending part of the novel explores the idea of hospitality just like Korstanje's argument that modern tourism has spread terrorism through the means of media. As a result, conspiracy theory has been emerged and it has challenged western logic of binary opposition or the logic of "Us" versus "Them". Such a failure of logic has challenged democracy and its practice. When logic fails, people engage in populist discourse. Embrace of populist discourse is the declaration of the end of hospitality.

The key ideas, that is, Kunzru's interrogation of and skeptical attitude to America's multiculturalism and globalization, exposition of the fakeness or America's neo-slavery -- calls for a transcultural hospitality with such an implicit call, the novel turns out to be an excellent critique of globalization and multiculturalism. It is also the critique of post-9/11 fiction writing trends by both the west and non-west. Hari Kunzru has clearly demonstrated America's positioning and attitude regarding cosmopolitanism or transnationalism in the novel first. Next, his exploration about America's fakeness or neo-slavery is quite clearly depicted as the Americans intend to pay low wages for the immigrants breaking the contract even in twenty first century. A case in point is that Arjun Mehta in the novel is not paid as much as they have to, according to the contract or agreement despite his capabilities. And his final call for making sense refers to the call for transcultural hospitality because he looks hopeful that hospitality is not ended from the world although western world is being senseless in creating hospitable living.

Their stress on interpreting the world through single or only one pattern does not make sense. In order to make sense such thought of single pattern should be deconstructed. Kunzru's quest for making sense out of nonsense is his quest for unstable identity of becoming.

In this way, the selected novel *Transmission*, demonstrates the fakeness created by Americans in which the innocent but skilled immigrants like the central character Arjun Mehta have been victimized under the umbrella of globalism and multiculturalism in America. While resisting labour exploitation, he is declared as the most wanted terrorist. The novel talks about family fragmentation under the framework of globalization. Arjun Mehta is the central character in this novel. He has a beautiful sister Priti. He is the only son of Mr. Mehta and Mrs. Mehta. They have also kept a maid Malini as helper in home. This is a typical Indian family who lives in Noida, a suburb of New Delhi. Priti and Arjun Mehta are the key sources of happiness for the parents. Arjun Mehta goes to USA for job as H-1B visa employee. After he reaches in America, his contract is broken and he creates a Leeva virus named Leela Zahir out of his anger. The virus makes all computing systems functionless. FBI declares Arjun Mehta terrorist. The novel does not tell what happens to Arjun Mehta next. Mehta's parents leave India and go to live "in the Sydney suburb of Fairfield" in Australia "close to their daughter ... Priti Chaudhuri and her husband Ramesh" in Australia (227). They all are shocked because they all are disconnected along with Arjun Mehta.

## CHAPTER SIX

### HOSPITALITY IN *SHALIMAR THE CLOWN*

Throughout the novel *Shalimar the clown* (2005), Salman Rushdie makes a critique of western hospitality or the world of so-called globalization and proposes glocalization as an alternative approach in order to achieve the goal of transcultural hospitality. Such a mission of achieving hospitality, for him, is Derridean unconditional. The unconditional, for Derrida, is the absolute welcoming of the other. Rushdie assumes pure hospitality can be achieved only by subverting the prose of otherness. Western hospitality has not achieved such purity till date. For instance, 9/11 literature of the mainstream white Americans, has created more gap rather than minimizing the differences. A truly hospitable home for him emerges from below rather than from above. In doing so, he presents five major representative characters of distinct and ambivalent personality along with the plot of happy ending. The plot revolves among the characters India, Boonyi, Maximilian Ophuls, Shalimar the Clown and Kashmira. Here, Rushdie develops such a plot line of the narrative in which Shalimar the Clown or Noman Sher Noman is shown resisting against Maximilian Ophuls's plan of multicultural project persuading Shalimar's wife Boonyi for elopement. The rising action moves towards climax as Shalimar murders both Boonyi and Maximilian Ophuls out of his fury. Shalimar does so as he feels more insecure even in the prison after 9/11 occurs. He is more terrified than before. Instead of recognizing Kashmir's terrorism as a part of global terrorism, the Americans declare the innocent Noman Sher Noman as a terrorist and imprison him in the fictional narrative. The falling action begins after Shalimar's attempt to murder India. In contrast, India and Shalimar both look hesitant at murdering to each other. Along with the falling action, the plot line moves towards denouement as sudden realization occurs both in India and Shalimar that they are true citizens of Kashmir or

India but not enemies. Such happy ending of the novel opens the door for transcultural hospitality. This chapter critically examines Rushdie's assessment of the prospects which, without pure hospitality to the other at play, do not look very bright. The characters India and Boonyi are presented as the representative characters having gullible nature at first, Shalimar the Clown as a radical one, Max as the man of mission of western multicultural project whereas Kashmira as a true national figure or local figure of India or Kashmir. In the confrontation with each other, Boonyi and Max are slaughtered by Shalimar. India transforms into Kashmira and Shalimar the Clown as a true local figure of Kashmir.

The first chapter's main argument is drawn based on the description of India, a female character having hybrid identity who ironically looks revengeful to Shalimar. She is born from Boonyi and Maximilian Ophuls. She looks revengeful to Shalimar after she knows Shalimar is assassin of her parents- Boonyi, the mother and Max Ophuls, the father. In the end she realizes that she is not India, a hybrid child but she wants to be called by Kashmira. The character India symbolizes India and changing India into Kashmira in the final section of the novel proves the quest for transcultural living because Epstein's transculture needs self transformation which is the foundation of transcultural hospitality.

The climax in the family begins as Shalimar's beautiful wife Boonyi has been taken away by Max Ophuls, an American ambassador to India and counter terrorism Chief who has escaped from Nazi's attack from Europe. By origin Max Ophuls is a Jew. As Maximilian Ophuls starts to settle in Kashmir, he involves in sexual infidelity with Boonyi and makes her pregnant. Boonyi is a very good woman from Hindu family and has married Shalimar although he is a Muslim. The marriage is successful because of communal harmony in Kashmir between Muslims and Hindus. As Shalimar knows, his wife has eloped with Max, he plans to murder



Max and Boonyi both. Rushdie writes “the ambassador was slaughtered on her doorstep like a halal chicken dinner, bleeding to death from a deep neck wound caused by a single slash of the assassin’s blade” (4). Shalimar justifies that his act of murdering Max is right because of Max’s uncanny behaviours in the city of Los Angeles. Shalimar feels dislocated in Los Angeles as the city has been the city of “all treachery, all deception” and the city of “nakedness” (5). The city looks completely dark for Shalimar because of the fakeness and uncanny practices of the Americans rather than their embrace of the differences. His sense of resistance resembles Dopdi’s nude resistance against Senanayak in Mahaswetadevi’s *Draupadi* as illustrated by Mohr. In that sense, Senanayak, the main character of Mahaswetadevi’s short story *Draupadi* and Max, the central character of *Shalimar the Clown* have been presented as the patriarchal and racist agents. Although Senanayak represents the East and Max the West, and both attempt to use women as sex objects and intend to throw them away instead of embracing. This exemplifies the idea of xenophobia and xenophilia.

Rushdie also resists Western way of naming and renaming. For instance, Max and his wife Peggy name new born baby as India but Boonyi prefers to call her with the name Kashmira. As India grows up, she dislikes her own name given by Peggy because the name itself others her as a “vulgar”, “crowded”, “noisy”, “mystical” and “Third World” (5-6). This is how the west misrepresents India as the nation of savage beings that irritates Rushdie though India should be taken as the paradise on the earth. The west never understands India as the centre of civilization in every aspects. On the surface, India feels as if she is the only girl who is being dislocated and she is compelled to be driven by fate. In depth, it is not just a character’s dislocation. Rather it is the dislocation of the whole Indians. Therefore, Rushdie is quite critical of the western

stereotyping of India, which actually comes as an obstacle of glocalization; that is Rushdie's transcultural quest. Regarding such quest, the character India expresses:

I live today neither in this world nor the last, neither in America nor Astrakhan. Also I would add neither in this world nor the next. A woman like me, she lives some place in between. Between the memories and the daily stuff. Between yesterday and tomorrow, in the country of lost happiness and peace, the place of mislaid calm. This is our fate. Once I felt everything was okay. This I now don't feel. Consequently however I have no fear of death. (9)

Here, the phrase 'in between' refers to the world of glocalization or the world of transculturalism. It proves that neither Russian nor American model of globalization has created peace and prosperity till date. Glocalization, therefore, is expected to embrace the differences. For that, Rushdie is ready even to sacrifice for prevailing peace in the world.

Western domination has been felt in different ways. One of their means of domination is English. They feel themselves better English speakers than those from South Asia. Initially Boonyi, for instance, compares Shalimar's English with Max and finds him weak. She also finds his body strange and falls in love with Max betraying Shalimar. About Shalimar, Rushdie characterizes:

The name he went by, the name he gave her when she asked, was Shalimar. His English was not good, barely functional. He would probably not have understood that phrase, barely functional. His eyes were blue, his skin colour lighter than hers, his hair grey with a memory of fair. She did not need to know his story. Not today. (11)

It clearly proves that the major cause of the failure of globalization is comparison. Where there is comparison, there is less chance to embrace the differences. For instance, Maximilian Ophuls's

English is regarded as standard English whereas Shalimar's English has been taken as vernacular or local or having no standard at all. Because of this difference, conflict arises in Boonyi and she treats Maximilian Ophuls as superior and Shalimar the clown as inferior and weak. For Emmanuel Levinas, language used to treat the differences or others must be hospitable. In that sense, western world looks inhospitable because of their so-called Standard English, for instance. In the name of language standardization, the west looks irresponsible and insincere to the others.

Another means of western domination that Rushdie finds uncanny is the sexual vulgarity or sexual openness of the westerners. Regarding it, he exposes how open and how vulgar the westerners are regarding sexual behaviours:

We can have sex in elevators and never mention it. Sex in transit zones, in places like elevators that are between one place and the next. Sex in cars. The transit zones traditionally associated with sex. When you fuck me you'll be fucking her, whoever she is or was, I don't want to know. I won't even be here, I'll be the channel, the medium.

(13)

It clearly proves that the western world should strictly follow moral and ethical principles in order to look hospitable in front of others. The openness of western sexual mores irritates Rushdie. For the westerners sex is just a kind of passion and it can be fulfilled in any way and there is no need to think about it much. However, this does not happen in the same manner in Eastern societies like in India. There, sex should follow the rule of culture and proper use of sex is highly respected. If the rules are broken, they are not accepted in both Hindu and Muslim communities like Kashmir of the past. In that sense, Max's role of making Boonyi pregnant can be normal in the western world. But such act becomes uncanny in the east, mainly in the Muslim

world. Levinas's notion of "supreme dignity" emerges only by being ethical which lacks in western civilization.

The true sense of transculture means applying "the rule of thumb" avoiding the practice of "reverse racism", "pride of minority" and "deterministic" thought ( Epstein 329- 350). For Rushdie, the western world engages in politics of generalization rather than embracing the logic of rule of thumb. In other words, Rushdie imagines a world of glocalization in which every individual's distinct identity is respected just like the rule of thumb. Everyone has thumbs and no one's rules of thumbs are exactly the same. Similarly, every individual has distinct identity according to his/her origin or culture. No one is superior to anyone else. Everyone has dignity. The western world never recognizes such potentiality and they attempt to treat all with the same glass or lens. According to the western glass or lens, all who look different from them are taken either as terrorists or as lesser beings. This is what Rushdie frequently resists throughout this novel.

Rushdie takes western civilizational model or their imagination of borderless world as the model of "utopian fallacy" (20). His ideas resembles with the ideas of the critic of globalization Jeffrey D. Sachs because he also argues that people in the margins are always in the shadow throughout the history of globalization. Regarding it, Rushdie writes, "Europe, free of the Soviet threat, and America, free of the need to remain permanently at battle stations, would build that new world in friendship, a world without walls, a frontier less newfound land of infinite possibility" (20). It clearly justifies that the world of glocalization is the world without walls that provides infinite possibilities to its citizens. In contrast, Rushdie observes western globalization as the city of "a naked whore, lying invitingly back and turning every trick" (22). Rushdie claims that it is not India or Kashmir that is being the nation of "naked whore" and the nation of

“trick” but it is the western world that cheats others using various tricks and through its demonstration of nakedness instead of presenting itself as hospitable host.

Because of the western interference, India has been made the nation of “chaos making” or the nation of falling values (25). In fact, it is the Western world whose values frequently fall. It is not only that they fall but it is the westerners who make other people fall as well. For instance, it is Kashmir that has been polluted by the influence of Indian army. Indian armies do not totally seem to be liberated. They work under the guidance of the westerners. Rushdie takes the fall of Kashmir not just as the fall of Adam and Eve, but as the collapse or fall of the whole paradise itself after the interference of Indian army and foreign attack. It clearly proves that Kashmir’s terrorism was not minor. In other words, if 9/11 of America is the fall of paradise itself as the mainstream white American writers have exaggerated in their fictional responses then why not of Kashmir. The major cause of Kashmir’s paradise lost is foreign interference. If the novelistic character Maximilian Ophuls had not been appointed in India or Kashmir as an American ambassador, the beauty and originality of Kashmir would not have been lost. In the novel, both Max and Peggy seem irresponsible mainly to Boonyi and Shalimar. Such tendency of being irresponsible and insincere is inhospitable and unethical for Immanuel Levinas. To be a global citizen in true sense, one needs to look sincere and responsible in any circumstances. But truth is just the opposite. The western world looks indifferent, insincere and irresponsible rather than solving the problems of others in a positive light. Korstanje also thinks that the western world has not attempted to make any “inter-tribal pact” in order to “scrutinize the otherness” (Korstanje 173). As a result, Max has been slaughtered by Shalimar making his wife Peggy, a widow. Although Shalimar’s act looks like that of a terrorist on the surface, it is not Shalimar who is terrorist here. It is the whole western civilization that is terrorizing the world. In that

sense, Shalimar's act is the quest for transcultural living. It is more clearly illustrated as the novel moves towards happy ending.

Rushdie argues that globalization is not born out of the blues. Rather it has emerged out of "Collissions" and "explosions" where people of various social and cultural backgrounds are amalgamated in the the existing global framework but such people are still outside the framework of globalization being "unsettled" and unassimilated (37). Regarding it, Rushdie explores:

Everywhere was now 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. There were collisions and explosions. The world was no longer calm. (37)

The above novelistic reference proves that the world of globalization in the so-called multicultural western model has made its citizens "unsettled". He means to say that true settlement is possible only in the world of glocalization or transculturalism that is yet to come.

The second chapter's major focus is about the betrayal of western embrace of the South Asian immigrants in America. Presenting Boonyi as the grabbee and Maximilian Ophuls as the western grabber, Rushdie finds western world being full of xenophobia, xenophilia or eroticism. Boonyi has been the grabbee. The western agent or grabber is Maximilian Ophuls. Boonyi dreams that she will get embraced in western model of so-called globalization or multiculturalism by marrying with Max. In contrast, her dream is plundered and she has been betrayed by Max. Boonyi, the beloved wife of Shalimar and the illegitimate love making partner of Max becomes the puppet of so-called globalization. Here, Rushdie subverts western way of forceful construction of globalization and attempts to create the better world of glocalization.

The name Bhoomi refers to the earth and the name Boonyi refers to local chinar tree of Kashmir. In other words, the name Boonyi is local and the name Bhoomi is global. For Rushdie, the new world order should focus on the creation of glocalization. In such world order, Boonyi or Bhoomi should get equal justice but more focus should go for Boonyi in order to highlight local values.

Rushdie interrogates upon the act of grabbing of Max upon Boonyi. His forceful grabbing justifies that western world is reluctant to embrace the differences in positive light. Instead, his act proves western domination. He thinks that such grabbing would not be possible in America because women are also given agency there. In America, not only the men but also the women can be grabbers and grabbees both. In contrast, East is still rigid in liberalizing women. In India, men are always grabbers and women are always grabbees. However, men as grabbers and women as grabbees give respect to each other. Max is problem maker in this novel since he is irresponsible both in his actions and thought and he misjudges Boonyi. Instead of recognizing Boonyi as the woman having agency, he treats her as a sex toy and brings fragmentation in Shalimar's family. Rushdie believes that women feel better and more secure in calling themselves as "grabbee" and men feel better to be called themselves as "grabber" in India. For him treating women as "grabbee" and men as "grabber" is natural way of treating both men and women. But just the opposite is happening in the western world which has been uncanny for Rushdie. In the West, women may play the role of grabber and men have to be the grabbee as well. Rushdie compares Boonyi and other women with grabbee and men with grabbers. Fall of grabbee like Boonyi is natural but fall of grabber as Max is unnatural for Rushdie. In this context, Rushdie explores:

There was the earth and there were the planets. The earth was not a planet. The planets were the grabbers. They were called this because they could seize hold of the earth and bend its destiny to their will. The earth was never of their kind. The earth was the subject. The earth was the grabbee. ... There were nine grabbers in the cosmos, Surya the Sun, Soma the Moon, Budha the Mercury, Mangal the Mars, Shukra the Venus, Brihaspati the Jupiter, Shani the Saturn, and Rahu and Ketu, the two shadow planets. The shadow planets actually existed without actually existing. They were heavenly bodies without bodies. ... Rahu was the dragon's head and Ketu was the dragon's tail. A dragon, too, was a creature that actually existed without actually existing. It was, because our thinking made it be. (45)

It clearly shows that the Indian culture in the past used to treat women as subject before foreign influence. All the men would be treated as just grabbers but they never could dare to grab women negatively. Even the Rahu and Ketu would not dare to grab women negatively. But along with the advent of western influence men as grabbers became negative and women's objectification began. Rushdie attempts to subvert this tendency through this novel. This all shows women's objectification is western product. Until and unless women are treated as subjects like in India, hospitable living or transcultural living is a far cry.

Rushdie is not only critical with the western model of so-called globalization, but also with "spiritual fakery" created by the West to strengthen patriarchy by arriving in Eastern world like in India (48). In other words, the globalized world looks inhospitable because of the stereotypical representation of women. The research aims in minimizing such discrepancy in the world of glocalization or in the world of transcultural living. The compromise of Shalimar and



India at the end of the novel proves that a truly global home is going to be formed along with the embrace of male and female both.

Rushdie argues that both Hindus and Muslims need to be liberated from their orthodox nature as well. They should not be the victims of western grabbers in the name of being liberal or open. In this novel, father Pandit Pyarelal and mother Pamposh's daughter Boonyi's preference not to be called by the name Bhoomi given to her from her parents proves Rushdie's quest for glocalization. Her preference to be called by the name Boonyi is her personal choice. For Rushdie, the name Bhoomi refers to the earth that has the static and unchanging nature. In other words, if Boonyi is called Bhoomi it shows her orthodox nature. But the name Boonyi refers to the name which gives the flavor of "Kashmiri chinar tree" referring to local flavor (46). Rushdie also presents a Muslim character Noman Sher Noman who prefers to be called not by that name but by the name Shalimar the Clown. Rushdie is critical neither with the name Bhoomi nor Boonyi. The problem he raises is that Boonyi as grabbee and Maximilian Ophuls as grabber is quite unnatural. In contrast, Boonyi as grabbee and Shalimar as grabber looks quite natural. This analogy clearly proves that Rushdie prefers multiculturalism or globalization having Indian flavor in order to fulfill the aim of glocalization.

Rushdie finds harmony between Hindus and Muslims although he observes Hindu art and painting is full of eroticism. On the surface, he looks quite critical observing the representation of Hindu deities' naked and erected disposition. However, Rushdie's reactions are normal as he observes the in – depth meanings of such erotic arts. Rushdie is not totally aggressive to the erotic art of Hindus because such art has not stereotyped the people of any other religions. Regarding it, Rushdie writes, "naked-breasted Hindu deities played their daily thunder-and-lightning games. The gods didn't feel the cold, Pandit Kaul explained...But in that case-Noman

wondered but did not dare to ask – why were their nipples always erect?” (47). It shows eastern art looks erotic in the outer look but people still follow the principle of ethics from their inner psyche. In contrast, westerners like Maximilian Ophuls look sophisticated in the outer look but there is darkness in their inner psyche. This is probably the reason that made the western world inhospitable.

Rushdie informs the audience that even the name Pandit Kaul looks uncanny for Pandit Kaul himself but he looks like cold water. In other words, he can easily control his emotional temperament regarding sexuality. Nobody complains him. People take him as natural as water because he lives a life full of ethics maintaining dispassion. Regarding it, Rushdie writes:

Pandit Kaul did not like his name either. There were far too many Kauls in the valley already. For an uncommon man it was demeaning to bear so everyday a surname, and it surprised nobody when he announced that he wanted to be called Pandit Kaul-Toorpoyni, Pandit Kaul of the cold water (47).

Rushdie argues that even uncommon man takes Pandit Kaul not as mysterious man to justify that he looks uncommon for himself only. But he never interferes the Muslims. Instead, Pandit Kaul is able to bridge between Hindus and Muslims by allowing his daughter Boonyi for marriage to a Muslim man Shalimar. In other words, transcultural living is the world where differences are positively accepted and acknowledged. Instead of being inimical to Pandit Kaul, Shalimar calls Pandit “sweetie uncle” and falling in love with his daughter “was the most dangerous decision in the world” (47). For Pyarelal also, the love of his daughter Boonyi with Shalimar is unusual. But he accepts Shalimar in a positive light and he is happy in being able to make Shalimar his son-in-law. Pandit Pyarelal’s relation with Shalimar looks like the relation of “Rahu and Ketu” on the surface but their intimacy has been stronger after the nuptial knot is fixed between Shalimar and

Boonyi as Rushdie argues “Einstein had proved the existence of unseen heavenly bodies by the power of their gravitational fields to bend light, and sweetie uncle could prove the existence of the cloven heavenly dragon-halves by their effects on human fortunes and misfortunes” (48). In other words, the love of Shalimar and Boonyi looks mysterious on the surface. But they have been a perfect matching couple not only in love but also in marriage though Shalimar is a Muslim and Boonyi is a Hindu lady.

Rushdie is quite aware about Hindu philosophy and he appreciates the way people can balance and control their instincts understanding the essence of Rahu and Ketu in their life. For instance, Pandit Pyarelal, Boonyi’s father has lived ethical life by embracing controlling mechanisms of Hindu Philosophy in the novel.

Regarding it, Rushdie explores:

There are six instincts ... which keep us attached to the material purposes of life. They are called Kaam the passion, Krodh the Anger, Madh the intoxicant, e.g. alcohol, drug et cetera, Moh the Attachment, Lobh the Greed and Matsaya the Jealousy. To live a good life we must control them or else they will control us. The shadow planets act upon us from a distance and focus our minds upon our instincts. Rahu is the exaggerator the intensifier! Ketu is the blocker the suppressor! The dance of the shadow planets is the dance of the struggle within us, the inner struggle of moral and social choice. (48)

The above reference indicates that Rushdie imagines the world of glocalization in which there is not just appreciation of the differences but various controlling mechanisms also help to develop and strengthen their moral and ethical behaviours. Rushdie finds both the qualities of Rahu and Ketu in Boonyi or Bhoomi. Boonyi Kaul has been described “dark as secret, bright as happiness” and also “the cold water, great kisser, expert caresser, fearless acrobat, fabulous cook” (48).

Thus, Rushdie attempts to highlight Indian culture that can easily balance the position of Rahu and Ketu. This is the foundation of Rushdie's glocalization or world of transcultural living which is rooted in local values. For Shalimar, the name Bhoomi look better than Boonyi because Shalimar's compromise with Bhoomi is his transcultural knot between Hindus and Muslims. It also proves that the strength of glocalization depend on the strong bond among local cultures first. Instead of directly jumping into being global citizen, one needs to strengthen his/her local knot stronger otherwise globalization may betray us anytime like betrayal of Boonyi in the novel. Throughout this novel, Rushdie interrogates the westerners whether they have addressed Indian identity in their multicultural project.

The research investigates Rushdie's use of Hindu epic the *Ramayana* as an allusion for the purpose of the analogy to compare its plot with the plot of Boonyi, Shalimar and Maximilian Ophuls. Both the plots in the *Ramayana* and *Shalimar the Clown* look similar on the surface. In the *Ramayana*, Sita is abducted by Ravan and later she is positively accepted by Ram. In *Shalimar the Clown*; however, Boonyi is abducted by Maximilian Ophuls but Shalimar is unable to get her back. It clearly proves that Sita's abduction by Ravan is settled in a positive way because Ravan's embrace of Sita is not xenophobic, an erotic gaze in Dunja Dunja M. Mohr's theorization of embrace. In contrast, Boonyi's abduction by Maximilian Ophuls has not been settled. Instead, Boonyi is betrayed and is very badly rejected by Maximilian Ophuls before they both are murdered by Shalimar. In the *Ramayana*, Sita is presented in win win situation because both Ravan and Ram feel themselves as men of victory but *Shalimar the Clown* presents the situation of loosing in both sides. Although Shalimar and Maximilian Ophuls both are losers, Shalimar still has sense of pride. Max does not feel so. Similarly, Boonyi after betrayal from Max does not have the sense of pride like Sita after betrayal from Ravan. Sita feels comfortable

in the embrace of Ravan and Ram both. But Boonyi in Rushdie's novel feels uncomfortable to live with Maximilian Ophuls after the daughter India is born. This allusion clearly shows the distinction between Eastern embrace and embrace of the west. In other words, differences are always excluded in the world of so called globalization. But differences also get space in Eastern embrace. Furthermore, fault should be observed not only from Sita's side; rather it should be "analyzed" as "Eagle's fall" as well (49). In *Ramayana*, Eagle's fall refers to the fall of Ram and Ravan, as male representatives. Despite it, there is negotiation and compromise even after the fall of male and female both. Attempt for negotiation in the novel is not seen mainly between Maximilian Ophuls and Boonyi. After she is betrayed from Max Ophuls, Boonyi regrets and starts to take Shalimar positively and claims that "This was no warrior demon! He was sweet Noman, who called himself Shalimar the Clown partly in her honour" (50). It shows South Asian immigrants knowingly or unknowingly fall in the trap of westerners' glamorous way of living in initial phase. As they know the real mission of the westerners, they are betrayed very badly just like Boonyi in the novel.

Boonyi's openness in sex is the matter of gene as her mother Pamposh is one of the "love making Kashmiri women" and thus for Pamposh, "A woman can make every choice she pleases just because it pleases her, and pleasing a man comes a poor second, a long way behind" (52-53). It shows Hindu women are liberal and open but such openness should not be misinterpreted by the westerners. The Hindu women look open does not mean that they intend to be the victim of western gaze just like Max's hyper sexual masculine gaze upon Boonyi. Boonyi blames her mother Pamposh of being ghost and argues that "Ghosts don't have to live in the real world" (53). Boonyi's reference of the arrival of her mother's ghost in her life means she also desires to be open in sexuality just like her mother Pamposh. However, her mother Pamposh replies, "I'm

not a ghost...I'm a dream of the mother you want me to be. I'm telling you what's already in your heart, what you want me to confirm" (54). It shows women need to be guided by heart just like Pamposh in order to live in transcultural home rather than living the life of failure western rationality as represented by Maximilian Ophuls. Boonyi appreciates Shalimar of being "the most beautiful boy in the world" (54). Boonyi is not a childish woman and says to Shalimar, "Don't treat me like a child" (60). In the initial phase, Boonyi compares masculinity of Max and Shalimar and finds Max superior to Shalimar. After she is betrayed from Max, she finds Shalimar superior to Max.

Now, Shalimar takes training from insurgent groups in Afghanistan and Philippines so that he could easily murder Maximilian Ophuls easily because he realizes that Max has challenged not only Indian femininity but also Indian masculinity. Shalimar makes a request to Boonyi not to leave him. However, Boonyi is ready to leave him and would like to engage with Max. Shalimar asserts, "Don't leave me ... Don't you leave me now, or I'll never forgive you, and I'll have my revenge, I'll kill you and if you have any children by another man I'll kill the children also" (61). It is the clear evidence that Boonyi's leaving home and her embrace of Maximilian Ophuls can have long term effect not only in Shalimar's life but it will pollute whole Indian culture and their identity. In such situation, Indians will be compelled to follow the path of fundamentalism. Shalimar's sense of resistance suggests India's resistance against hegemonic west. Presenting Shalimar as a terrorist or fundamentalist, Rushdie attempts to declare the demise of so-called globalization and calling everyone to come under in the umbrella of glocalization.

Through this novel, Rushdie desires to regain lost harmonious living of Muslims and Hindus of the past which was plundered after foreign influence in colonial era and also after

Indian Partition in 1947. He argues that both Hindus and Muslims used to live in harmony in Kashmir in the past. But now, they both play separatist role -- Hindus as the role of Ram and Muslims as Ravan in modern sense although both Hindus and Muslims were helpful to each other in the past. At that time, even Muslims would enjoy in watching the play "*Ram Leela*" sitting together with Hindu audience and Hindus would enjoy Muslim's Play "*Budshah*" or "the tale of a Muslim Sultan" (71). But after Indian partition, that harmonious relation ended and both started to treat each other as enemies.

The evil aspect of Indian partition Rushdie envisions through this novel is that the British rule was not only defective in political grounding but it also polluted Indian culture killing the moral sense of the Indians through their activation of immoral behaviours such as Boonyi in the novel is being immoral not by nature but by Max representing the western world. Regarding it, Rushdie argues "Man is ruined by the misfortune of possessing a moral sense" (91). Immanuel Levinas argues that the globalized world needs to follow the rule of ethics. Being ethical means being sincere and responsible in dealing with the powerless ones with the intention of giving them agency not through "bigger army, more guns" but by letting them work with bigger "responsibility and sincerity" (13). In that sense, Maximilian Ophuls is given the responsibility of working as an American Ambassador to India. But, the question is -- Is he responsible? Is he sincere? He is neither responsible nor sincere. As a result, the innocent Indians like Boonyi are not embraced in Westerners' model of conditional hospitality. Although Rushdie is quite aware that man's character can not be free from suspect but the westerners are lesser than animals. They wear the masks of civilization and morality but their character is full of suspicion. Regarding it, Rushdie writes:

There are no surprises in the animal Kingdom. Only man's character is suspect and shifting, only Man, knowing good, can do evil. Only Man wears masks. Only man is a disappointment to himself. Only by ceasing to need the things of the world and believing oneself of the needs of the body (92).

It shows Rushdie's major concern is that of the loss of virginity in Boonyi and its root cause is hyper sexual masculine gaze of the western imperialism. For instance, Boonyi has been pregnant from Max. Boonyi's "loss of virginity" refers to the loss of virginity or loss of paradise of Kashmir (93). It proves that the loss of innocence in Indians is not natural phenomena, rather it is brought by the foreigners. According to Shalimar, Boonyi's loss of virginity is because of her recklessness created by the western agent Max. Such recklessness has been developed in her through western imperialism. Boonyi is innocently imitating western values. Later on, she realizes that she has been ruined. Rushdie writes, "Shalimar the Clown began to see that the loss of her virginity had unleashed something reckless in Boonyi" (93). In Shalimar's understanding Indian armies' influence is the main cause for the loss of virginity in her. The research further investigates, "Shalimar the Clown was not the only local male to have Boonyi Kaul on the brain. Colonel Hammirdev Suryavans Kachhwaha of the Indian army had had his eyes on her for some time" (94). It shows Indian armies were responsible in polluting Boonyi and those armies are mobilized in the interest of the westerners. For Shalimar, Boonyi slowly becomes mysterious, as mysterious as "a poem" (100). Here, Rushdie Writes, "Then he saw Boonyi. It felt like the meeting of Radha and Krishna except that he was riding in an army Jeep and he was not blue-skinned and did not feel god like and she barely recognized his existence. ... she looked like a poem" (100). In other words, Max has changed Boonyi's nature from normal to mysterious or from rational to emotional. Boonyi's father "Pyarelal's face fall" is caused by Boonyi's



“wildness talking” (104). It shows Pyarelal’s prestige is down by his daughter’s reckless behaviour. But Boonyi is not responsible for that. The whole responsibility goes to Max and Max is the representative character who represents American agent or fake American. Boonyi’s relation with Shalimar is becoming tasteless as she exposes, “once the milk has curdled ... it never tastes sweet again” (105). It shows the loss of Kashmiri values is just in memory. It is not only difficult but looks even impossible to regain such declining values of Kashmir.

When Boonyi is in affair with Shalimar, Shalimar’s father Abdullah and mother Firdaus and even Shalimar’s brother are suspicious in Shalimar’s “infatuation” with Boonyi as they observe their frequent meet of each other in Pachigam (106). They think that their relation may not last longer. However, Shalimar is determined to prove even impossible into possible through marriage. According to the sweet talk of Abdullah and Pyarelal, “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” (110). Thus, the sweet talk of Pyarelal and Abdullah proves their readiness to accept the marriage between a Muslim boy Shalimar and a Hindu lady Boonyi. Wedding preparation of Boonyi and Shalimar begins according to their customs only after their fathers Abdullah and Pyarelal agree to follow their customs to make the marriage successful. Abdullah argues, “First we’ll do everything your way and then we’ll do it all again in the way we do” (114). It shows the Hindus and Muslims were living in Pachigam in harmony. The marriage succeeds to an end. All are happy in observing the nuptial knot of Shalimar and Boonyi. Such compromise and negotiation is what Derrida calls the true meaning of cosmopolitanism. However, the arrival of Maximilian Ophuls as an American Ambassador in Kashmir becomes a

bad omen both in Shalimar's and Boonyi's life. Boonyi develops extramarital affair with Max with full interest thereby betrays Shalimar.

Rushdie argues that "The summer of 1965 was a bad season. India and Pakistan had already engaged in battle" over the issue of Kashmir (118-119). Since then Max loses interest in Boonyi. Max's betrayal attitude to Boonyi looks like America's lack of interest to the Muslims or to the South Asian immigrants after 9/11. Max looks irresponsible towards Boonyi just like America being irresponsible towards others after 9/11. He looks insincere and irresponsible and makes her pregnant out of his marriage. Although the event of 9/11 and Kashmir look similar as both are the instances of terrorism, the first as global terrorism and the second as local terrorism. Here, Rushdie interrogates through this novel why Kashmir's terrorism could not get global recognition. Therefore, he imagines and forwards the notion of glocalization in order to prove that local affects the global. Therefore, the so-called multiculturalism and globalism can be taken as the failure of western embrace and also the failure of western hospitality.

The third chapter presents Ambassador Maximilian Ophuls as the representative of so-called globalization or the man of mission or an agent of multicultural project. He has been presented in the novel as "dangerous" and having "possibly even lethal quantities ... of charm, grew up in a family of highly cultured Ashkenazi Jews" (137). Max is from a highly cultured family but he becomes a target of Nazi. Max has been declared "ambassador to India nearly two years after the Kennedy assassination" (137). It shows Maximilian Ophuls can be taken as the metaphor of John F. Kennedy and his failure administration. Rushdie finds John F. Kennedy's traits in Maximilian Ophuls. Maximilian Ophuls's fragmented identity clearly shows he is one of the Jews, Hitler's enemy. He is the product of failure civilization of the west -- both of Europe and America. He is born out of "Frenchification" as "Germanification" was challenged (137-

138). Max feels insecure and uncomfortable in living in France in fear. Max arrives in America from France as a refugee and reaches to the power through politics. Later, he is appointed as the American Ambassador to India after the end of the Second World War. Initially, he is welcomed in India and the Indians look optimistic about positive change after his arrival. However, his extramarital affair with Boonyi made him fall from the grace. The cause of his assassination from Shalimar is his own evil character. Max has been taught from his seniors that “In civilization there are no borderlines” (141). He fails to embrace such principle in practice, though. Rushdie in that line investigates and writes:

Max Ophul’s parents were wealthy, cultured, conservative, cosmopolitan; Max was raised speaking High German as easily as French, and believing that the great writers and thinkers of Germany belonged to him as naturally as the poets and philosophers of France. ... In civilization there are no borderlines’, Max senior taught him. But when barbarism came to Europe, years old that erased borderlines as well. The future ambassador of Ophuls was twenty nine years old when Strasbourg was evacuated. The exodus began on September 1, 1939; one hundred and twenty thousand strasbourgais became refugees in the Dordogne and the Indre. (141)

Rushdie compares Max’s history with the history of the Europeans as both look clean in the past but become corrupt later. Rushdie also wants to prove that Europeans are still racists just like Max’s stereotyping from Nazi while staying in France. Rushdie’s interrogation is not directed towards genuine Americans. His question is why America gives power and position to the fake people like Maximilian Ophuls. Ophuls’s arrival in America as a refugee and his arrival to India as an American Ambassador both are unacceptable. It neither benefits for America nor for India.

For Rushdie, over exercise of patriarchy is another way of making the world inhospitable. In patriarchy, men have greater passion for war. Regarding it, Rushdie writes, “Men are fools. No wonder we made you mad” (151). In general, men engage in war and they bring disasters. For Max, war is not his preference but the case of France is different as Germany wants to see their defeat. He views, “War for us, signified disaster. But was it the case that France, to spare itself a defeat, had refused to fight? I don’t believe it. ... This was the only known instance in the whole of world war second of a successful- reverse string” (161-166). Max claims that he is compelled to resist with the Germans to protect his identity. He argues, “Entering the Resistance was, for me, a kind of flying. ... one took leave of one’s name, one’s past, one’s future, one lifted oneself away from one’s life and existed only in the continuum of the work, borne aloft by necessity and fatalism” (166). Max, thus, thinks leaving France is a safe way rather than resisting against Hitler.

As a refugee, Max goes to America, marries Grey Rat and they live a happy married life there. Max intends to make divorce with Grey Rat as she does not share about her “vision” to him but he remains silent because of public pressure (176). Grey Rat is frustrated with Max and she intends to live a separate life from him because Max seduces many women. Rushdie lists out about the number of women Max seduces exploring:

Consequently she knew the name of every woman her husband had seduced, every adoring college postgrad, every assistant willing to be researched, every woman up-town society beauty and downtown party slut, all the personal two-way simultaneous translators at his international conferences, every East End summer whore he’d fucked in their South Fork home perched on the forested heights left behind by retreating glaciers, the uplands of the terminal moraine. (176)

This textual evidence proves that Max has lost his moral sense by engaging in extramarital affair. Grey Rat not only blames her husband Max for creating “erotic urges” but also blames the war itself that brought erotic urges in him (177). In the immediate aftermath of Indo-Pakistan war of 1965, Max is happy as he is sent to India as an American ambassador to India. Rushdie dramatizes how happy Max has been after being selected as ambassador in Indian Embassy:

When Secretary Rusk called Maximilian Ophuls in the immediate aftermath of the 1965 Indo-Pakistani war and offered him the Indian embassy, Max realized that he had been waiting for the call, waiting without knowing he was waiting, and that India, which he had never visited, might prove to be, if not his destiny, then at least the destination to which the mazy journey of his life had been leading all along. (178)

Max’s happiness knows no bound in visiting India for the first time and he thinks he will fulfill all his desires, mainly the erotic desires in India. Luckily, Boonyi Kaul arrives in his life to fulfill his passions. Rushdie writes, “Then Boonyi Kaul Noman came out to dance and Max realized that his Indian destiny would have little to do with politics, diplomacy or arms sales, and everything to do with the far more ancient imperatives of desires” (181). It shows politics or diplomacy is secondary for him. His primary aim is erotic passion. Rushdie presents Max as “the man of power” or the man of hyper sexual masculine gaze rather than the man of diplomatic mission (181). Rushdie compares Max with John F. Kennedy and argues that he was assassinated because he involved in “too much sex and bad back” (182). Max’s assassination from Shalimar also proves that he is just as erotic as Kennedy. The ambassador’s wife Grey Rat is now transformed into “Peggy –Mata, mother of motherless” and here in India, Max pollutes Boonyi and Boonyi also wants to fulfill her sexual passions from Max (186). Such change in Boonyi is not her natural attribute, rather unusual presence of Maximilian Ophuls helps her to arouse

sexual desires in her. The problem of Max is that he “was actually aroused by the young woman’s naked pragmatism” and Boonyi also expresses that “My body will be yours to command and it will be my joy to obey” (192). The sense of obeying in Boonyi is uncanny and unnatural. However, the major cause of betrayal is not Boonyi but Max. His fault is that he is sexually aroused in the presence of Boonyi rather than looking responsible in his major duty as ambassador.

The novel presents Max as the man of command and Boonyi as the woman of obeying orders. It shows Max’s embrace is uncanny embrace. Falling in love with Max may create further “trouble” because Boonyi has been in love with Shalimar for long (193). If it is so, problem occurs also in European from their origin not just in Max. In fact, Max’s attachment to Boonyi is nothing but just a “romantic infatuation” and “a perfect forgery of love” as Rushdie exposes:

As a result of Max’s unexpected romantic infatuation-and also because Boonyi was every bit as attentive as promised-he failed to sense what she had silently been telling him from the beginning, what she assumed he knew to be a part of their hard-nosed agreement: Don’t ask for my heart, because I am tearing it out and breaking it into little bits and throwing it away so I will be heartless but you will not know it because I will be the perfect counterfeit of a loving woman and you will receive from me a perfect forgery of love. (194)

Such sense of epiphany occurs in Boonyi only after she deserts her village, relatives, parents and husband being infatuated with Max. This realization makes her being nostalgic as the novel depicts, “When she closed her eyes she invariably saw her father, her husband, her companions, her appointed place on earth. Not her new lover but her old, lost life. My old life like a prison,

she told herself savagely, but her heart called her a fool” (195). It clearly shows Boonyi is in affair with Max just to satisfy her physical needs. If not so, her heart would not call her a fool. The western home cannot satisfy her in spiritual level. Rushdie, therefore writes, “She thought of Shalimar the Clown and was horrified again by the ease with which she had abandoned him” (195). Thus, she regrets of betraying Shalimar the Clown. Boonyi remembers Shalimar the Clown and she is haunted by reading his letter sent to her by Shalimar after she has been separated from him:

I reach out to you and touch you without touching you as on the river bank in the old days. I know you are following your dream but that dream will always bring you back to me. If the American is of assistance well and good. People always talk lies but I know your heart is true. I sit with folded hands and await your loving return. (195)

It shows the Westerners feel proud only in the physicality but the Easterners are rich in heart. Regarding spirituality, the western world looks quite backward. Therefore, it cannot embrace the differences. The key of true hospitality is the heart just like the love of Shalimar and Boonyi though Boonyi has been deserted and betrayed by Max. Boonyi has been raped not only by Max or western hegemony but she also claims that it is the Indian armies who have raped her or have raped her private field. The private field refers to the loss of virginity of Kashmir as well. About the cruelties of Indian armies, Rushdie reveals:

At that moment she decided that the term ‘Indian armed forces ... would secretly refer to the ambassador himself, she would use the Indian presence in the valley as a surrogate for the American occupation of her body, so, ‘yes, that’s it,’ She cried, ‘the ‘Indian armed forces,’ raping and pillaging. How can you not know it? How can you not comprehend

the humiliation of it, the shame of having your boots march all over my private field?’  
(197)

However, Max Ophuls claims that he has been attracted to Boonyi because she has ‘sex appeal’ (199). Boonyi looks ‘democratic’ and ‘omnivore’ for Max, as Rushdie writes, ‘It crossed all frontiers of language and custom. She was vegetarian and non-vegetarian, fish and meat- eating, Hindu, Christian and Muslim, a democratic, secularist omnivore’ (202). It indicates that Rushdie’s critique is not targeted just on Max but also on Boonyi in order to make a critique upon the flexibility on Hinduism and Hindu women like Boonyi in the novel.

After fulfilling his sexual passion from Boonyi, Max shows less interest in her and shares such feeling to Edgar wood stating “the poor wretch. What a wreck she has made of herself” (203). This type of women’s objectification from so-called American agent of higher authority brings fragmentation rather than harmony. In Levinas’s terms such insulting acts make a person or any nation irresponsible, insincere and unethical. Similarly, Dunja M. Mohr’s notion of transcultural embrace may remain in the shadow if others are excluded and objectified. After the Ambassador stops visiting her, Boonyi “becomes like a child abandoned in wolf-infested hills” (203). Derrida also condemns such malpractice of changing a true citizen as rogue or non-citizen. As Boonyi has been betrayed by Max, she becomes angry and expresses her rage to Max stating, “Your love looks just like hatred. I never spoke of love ... I was honest and you have turned me into your lie. This is not me. This is you” (205). Boonyi’s aggression is not only against Max, her blame is against western world’s stereotyping and objectification of South Asian women and others. Max also claims that Boonyi has not loved him. As a response, she blames Max of being snake as he has treated her just like a rat. Rushdie’s claim is that love between rat and snake is impossible. Boonyi asks, “Does a rat love the snake that gobbles it up” (205). In other words,



Boonyi has been presented here as a rat and Max as a snake. Rushdie's question is -- How is love possible between a rat and snake? The ruined identity of Boonyi refers to the ruined identity of Kashmir. Rushdie explores "A Kashmiri girl ruined and destroyed by a powerful American gave the Indian government an opportunity to look like it would stand up and defend Kashmiris against marauders of all types to defend the honour of Kashmir" (206). In other words, it is quite clear that rape upon Boonyi is the rape upon Kashmir. It was Indian government's responsibility to defend Kashmir and Kashmiri people but Indian government failed in doing so because of the arrival of Maximilian Ophuls as an ambassador. He arrives in India and plays the role of snake and he treats Indians as rats.

In this novel, Boonyi's relation with Maximilian Ophuls can be taken as an allegory of Vietnam because America was largely affected by the war although Vietnam surrendered in the end. Although more than two million Vietnamese and 57,000 Americans died in Vietnam War (1954- 1975), America was totally humiliated because the huge loss of Americans was the loss of military not of civilians. The reference of Vietnam War is an instance to observe the failure of western civilization. Rushdie asserts, "The Vietnam war was at its heights and so was American unpopularity in Asia. ... so war-torn America turned on Max as well, his alleged oppression of Boonyi becoming a sort of allegory of Vietnam" (206). This historical reference proves that Max's superiority is as meaningless as the humiliated Americans. After he betrays Boonyi "The American ambassador was being withdrawn in disgrace" (207). It justifies that Max's betrayal of Boonyi is as meaningless as the Vietnam War of no glory for the Americans.

Now, Boonyi has realized the true love of Shalimar only after she has been betrayed from Max. Regarding it, she expresses, "You understand me – No, my husband did not send me here" (208). At first Boonyi is in illusion that Max will understand her. Boonyi regrets only after Max

betrays her after giving birth to a child. Rushdie writes, “Boonyi gave birth to a baby daughter in a clean, simple bedroom . . . In due course the baby was born. Boonyi, cradling her daughter, named her Kashmira” (209-210). Boonyi was not quite happy although Kashmira was born to her. Rushdie exposes, “Boonyi’s eyes filled with tears” and after she cried a lot her “tears had dried” (210 -211). In this way, Indian army’s role in Kashmir seems to be xenophobic for the locals of Kashmir. They take the locals as others and they frequently rape innocent girls and also women of Kashmir. Not only the foreigners but the Indian armies also should respect and protect the virginity of Kashmir. Dunja M. Mohr clearly distinguishes between western embrace and postcolonial embrace. For her, Western embrace has the problem of “xenophobia “that refers to fear of strangers and “xenophilia” that refers to the problem of eroticism (Dunja x). Until and unless xenophobia and xenophilia are minimized, hospitality cannot be maintained. Regarding the novelistic representation, neither the embrace of Indian army to the locals of Kashmir nor the embrace of Maximilian Ophuls to Boonyi looks positive. However, the root cause seems western imperialism. Mohr writes, “An embrace is conventionally interpreted as a positive act of good intentions that draws people together. But an embrace is neither necessarily and always welcome; nor it is automatically honest or true” (x). Focusing on Mohr’s line, Rushdie in the novel suggests all – including Indian armies and Westerners to demonstrate positive embrace in dealing with strangers so that transcultural hospitality may emerge soon with the emergence of global peace.

Rushdie further argues that the birth of the character India and her belonging raises the question of origin and the question of ethics. Boonyi claims that her new born child should be named Kashmira Noman but Max’s wife Peggy claims that she should be named India Ophuls. Finally, Peggy tells Boonyi to take the baby. Boonyi agrees but she is crying while doing so.

From the conversation of Max's wife Peggy and Boonyi after the birth of newly born child India, it is clear that Peggy is neither ready to name the child as Kashmira Noman nor she seems to be able to give birth to any child. It reveals that she will stay with her husband either just in biology (sex) or divorce. This sentimental moment attracts the attention from the audience that they need to be sympathetic to Peggy. Boonyi feels that she will go to her home Pachigam in Kashmir although she has been deserted from her husband, relatives and friends but she hopes she will be accepted by her home Kashmir. On the other hand, Peggy will be really a tragic woman because of loneliness. It shows Peggy has the problem of impotence.

The western world has been inhospitable because of impotence or inability to give birth to a child even in their fertile age. About Peggy's infertile status, Rushdie explores:

Let's look at the world as it is, shall we? - I can't have a baby. That's clear. More than one reason now. Biology and divorce - And you? You can't keep this little girl. She will drag you down and she will be the death of you and that will be the death of her. -You follow? - Whereas with me she can live like a queen." "No." said Boonyi, dully, hugging her daughter. "No, no, no." "I'm so glad," said Peggy Ophuls. "Hmm? - Yes. Really!

(212)

This detail justifies that Western world has the problem of infertility or sterility which is invited not by others but by their own inability to control their behaviour. Therefore, the novel presents Max as "invisible" man because his presence in Kashmir is invisible and dangerous (213). In other words, the world of so-called globalization looks bright on the surface but its invisible nature destroys themselves as well as the immigrants and others.

Chapter four presents Shalimar as sane and insane both. He is sane in the sense that he is imagining an alternative home of glocalization. In that sense Shalimar plays the role of freedom

fighter. He looks insane or terrorist because he kills Boonyi and Max out of his fury or aggression. His role as sane looks sensible through the perspective of glocalization and insane or terrorist from the perspective of so-called globalization. Shalimar has been betrayed from his own wife and beloved Boonyi. Although Boonyi deserts Shalimar, he is optimistic and assumes she will return home one day. Rushdie presents Boonyi in the condition of being “shivered, and the shiver was the feeling of her self-returning to herself. Since the day she left, her mother had not visited her in her dreams” (217). It justifies that “self- returning” or state of the quest for origin occurs in Boonyi only after she is betrayed from Max. Such state of epiphany or sudden realization in Boonyi proves that her real identity is her mother or her village Pachigam in Kashmir and her true lover or husband Shalimar. After Boonyi leaves, Shalimar feels himself less “sensible” than “a ghost” due to extreme anger (217). In other words, frustration emerges in Shalimar after Boonyi betrays him. In his fury and frustration, Shalimar sees “Only Kashmir” not “Kashmira” (218). He knows Kashmir’s identity has been changed into India along with the change of her name from Kashmira, Boonyi’s preferred name of her daughter to India. India is the preferred name given to her by Peggy and Max. Rushdie just sees Kashmira as India, a child of hybrid identity in his fury. Rushdie also believes in hybrid identity; however, his hybridization model is different from the hybridizational model of the westerners. Rushdie is quite aware that Hybridization based on so-called fake Americans like Maximilian Ophuls and pure Indians like Boonyi is full of betrayal. Pure hybrid identity should come in the line of the harmonious relation between Muslims and Hindus before Kashmir’s movement.

The research makes an announcement that Kashmir’s beauty has been plundered along with the arrival of Indian armies and their deployment in the sacred land of Kashmir by the end of Second World War in 1945, Indian partition of 1947 and Indo- Pakistan war of 1965. Besides,

American influence has also reached in the peak after 9/11. American Ambassador Max's erotic gaze and family fragmentation in the life of Shalimar and Boonyi are some of the examples and cases to prove the loss of paradise vision of Kashmir due to foreign influence in which "The old comfortable days are gone" because "Everything is politics now" (220). Politics has replaced sense of *communitas* and transcultural living now.

From the perspective of Shalimar, Boonyi's status can be understood in different layers. She has been presented as the woman of "The Living Dead" (225). In other words, Boonyi feels that women's life is "Living Dead" because it does not remain in the same status like the status of men. Living dead does not mean that women need to be the victims of western erotic gaze. Boonyi's desire for openness in sex may look nothing on the surface but such desire is life process. However, men should not treat women as sex toys. They should acknowledge women and they should look hospitable to them. People should not misinterpret such openness in a wrong way. Regarding how a male can look responsible and hospitable to women, he explores:

'The Living Dead One serves the s-s-s-satguru. The Living Dead One manifests love within her; and by receiving love her life spirit is set free.' ... Boonyi heard the example of the earth. 'The earth hurts no one. Be like that. The earth hates no one. Be like that as well.' She heard the example of the sugarcane and the candy. 'The sugarcane is cut up and crushed and boiled to make the j-j-j-jaggery. The jaggery is boiled to make the raw sugar. The sugar burns to make rock candy. And from rock candy, sugar candy comes, and everyone likes that. In the same way the Living Dead One bears her sufferings and crosses the ocean of life t-t-t-towards joy.' (225)

The process of making rock candy clearly proves that one needs to transform himself or herself in the spirit of natural flow of life to live a life of transculturalism for which Mireille Rosello uses

the term “Mutual metamorphosis” in order to describe the process of transformation (176). It shows Boonyi realizes and accepts different phases of life a woman bears in the world of glocalization. In other words, the process of glocalization looks like the metaphor of making rock candy and sugar candy from jaggery. Being a glocalized citizen, Boonyi struggles, suffers, accepts and frequently remembers her origin. Boonyi’s father Pandit Pyarelal Kaul is strict in dealing with “the organ of lust” and he believes that being lustful is “sinful” but Boonyi’s mother Pamposh herself is lustful which Pyarelal eschews (226). Pyarelal views:

The g-g-g-god of lust is a robber. Lust is a mighty, dangerous, pain-giving, narrative power. The lustful woman is the mine of Kal. The Living Dead One has enlightened herself with the lamp of knowledge. She has drunk the nectar of the Name and merged into the Elementless. When she has done this, lust will be f-f-f-finished. (226)

It proves that lust is mighty, dangerous and painful from male’s perspective in Hindu communities but they are also aware that women will be enlightened after the end of lust, for instance, Pandit Pyarelal’s experience in the novel depicts such theme. Although males know this reality but they do not resist against it. Pandit Pyarelal is quite aware about the lustful nature of his wife Pamposh but he has accepted her positively. It is also quite common that lust gives narrative power or a way of acquiring knowledge or the meaning of life in Indian culture. Lust is also taken as “the lamp of knowledge.” But lust, in western world, is taken just as the source of pleasure or entertainment or just a fall or destruction. Boonyi believes in lust because for her “The age of reason was over” and “the age of love” begins being “irrational” (226). From the perspective of Boonyi, it is believed that western rationality has failed in embracing women. Boonyi believes that women need to be enlightened through lust like her mother. Sense of lust enlightened her mother but the same sense of lust has brought tragedy in her life. It clearly shows

lust in western perspective is just for entertainment not for life. For instance, Max has used Boonyi only as the means of entertainment. In contrast, being lustful in Indian culture means life process itself. For instance, Boonyi's mother Pamposh was lustful but it was tolerable for her father Pandit Pyarelal. The world looks hospitable only in the situation where lust is accepted and acknowledged in natural sense. When lust is made unnatural then the world suffers much and hospitality disappears. Boonyi's parents and Boonyi's extramarital affair with Max and its consequences are some cases in point. For Rushdie, people need to look natural for the formation of glocalised world. Rushdie also believes that a truly globalized world should respect women's sensibility because women look more natural than men and they are more sensible and optimistic than men. Regarding such thought, Rushdie writes, "Only man wears masks. Only Man is a disappointment to himself" (229). It proves that the existing world of globalization and multiculturalism has been inhospitable because of masks, or dual personality of men. Such dualism disappears in transcultural home.

Rushdie argues that Kashmiriyat movement of Kashmiri people of the past can be taken as an "illusion" because Hindu Brahmins were forced for conversion. However, the resistance of the Hindu Brahmins was not lesser (239). This reference clearly proves that forceful acts happen in the world of globalization but not in the world of glocalization. Just like Hindu Brahmins became helpless in front of the forceful attacks of the Muslims and others in Kashmir, Shalimar looks helpless in front of the forceful attack upon his wife Boonyi and Kashmir at large. Shalimar becomes "defenseless and vulnerable" as Boonyi "ruined" him. However, he still has a desire to dance with her and wants her to be his true wife forever. Shalimar explores, "Dance, my wife, he told her silently. I will dance with you again one day, for one last time" (241).

Shalimar's wife is not with him but he still believes in re-union. Here, Shalimar's desire to dance with Boonyi refers to the dance of glocalization and transcultural hospitality.

Rushdie further argues that Shalimar's act of murdering Max looks justifiable because he assumes that his death might indicate the strength of bilateral relation of India with Pakistan. After the end of Kashmiri movement, the agreement between Pakistan and India was made promising, "that the status of Kashmir would be decided bilaterally at a future date; that the Indian military tightened its choke hold on the valley" (243). Here, Rushdie's quest for bilateral relation refers to his quest for transcultural living and transcultural hospitality which Derrida calls the home of cosmopolitanism because a true home of cosmopolitanism is born out of negotiation and compromise. (*On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* xi).

The sense of insanity in Shalimar irritates his mother. His insanity, at the broader level, is the resistance against western stereotyping of the Muslims and others. Even Shalimar's mother is surprised when she observes uncanny behaviour of Shalimar. His unusual acts and behaviours terrify her. Rushdie states, "It was moonless night and Shalimar the Clown was wearing dark clothes and had been lying low in the fields and he jumped up in front of Firdaus like a popular coming to life and scared her" (247). Here, Shalimar's lunatic behaviour is the result of the domination of western hegemony. Such domination has been done through Maximilian Ophuls, a western representative. In his anger and rage, Shalimar looks aggressive even to his mother and expresses, "Be glad you're not a mother in these times" (248). It clearly proves that Shalimar has been abnormal. The devastating and ultimate effect of so-called globalization is the birth of lunacy and abnormality. Rushdie assumes that glocalised world looks free from such insanity. However, it is not seen in practice. Shalimar's mother has experienced the same feeling of pain though. She expresses, "I recognize the pain in your eyes because I have the same pain in mine"



(249). In fact, all the Muslims have been treated as insane or terrorist because of western stereotyping and insanity among Muslims will make an end for ever if they are embraced rather than stereotyped. Rushdie, thus, believes that glocalization may end Muslim stereotyping. For Shalimar, killing the American ambassador will be just like killing of “bastards” (250). Killing of Max refers to the killing of western erotic gaze. Shalimar speaks, “May be killing bastards is what the time requires. Maybe if my hands still worked I would struggle a few myself” (250). As earlier planning “Shalimar the Clown left Pachigam the next morning carrying nothing but the clothes he stood up in and the knife in his waistband and was not seen again in the village for fifteen years” (251). Shalimar’s decision of leaving Pachigam is his resistance against Muslim stereotyping.

For Shalimar, Kashmir as paradise becomes just like “a fairy-tale” (253). It has been so because of western world’s erotic gaze upon Kashmir and Kashmiri people. In his tragic state, Shalimar the Clown involves in fund-raising activities keeping two principles in mind:

The first principle of this work was that operatives working in the financial field could not be sent back to their own localities, because fund raising was sometimes no joke and such humorlessness never went down well with one’s own folks. The second principle was that it was a well-established fact that the poor were more generous than the rich.

(253)

This proves that Shalimar the Clown is the man of generosity although he looks terrorist in western eyes.

Shalimar and Boonyi are facing unexpected tragedy in life although their inter-caste love is full of romance and full of innocence initially. Their love is unconditional because they do not need to read any “books” while falling in love (258). Similarly, Kashmir’s beauty of the past is

just like the romantic love of Shalimar and Boonyi. Shalimar becomes nostalgic about the lost values of Kashmir and explores, “On the far side of the mountains is freedom, the part of Kashmir that is free ... Our lost place. I am going to see what Kashmir looks like when it’s free, when its face is not veiled in tears” (259). Shalimar feels his life has been just like the ruined destiny of Kashmir.

Glocalized world embraces the principle of truth, a path of globalization. Shalimar the Clown is presented in the novel as the man of truth. In other words, Rushdie believes that where there is truth there lies hospitality. When people follow truth, there is brotherhood, there is motherhood and there is home. Western civilization does not seem to be true so it cannot embrace the others. Shalimar expresses, “Only the truth can be my mother. Only the truth can be your brother, but in the truth you will be a brother to all men.-Only the truth can be my brother.-Only the truth can be your wife.-Only the truth can be my wife” (266). By saying so, Rushdie envisions that man should be guided by truth. Boonyi’s present condition proves that she wants to live in truth- probably Kashmir is her truth but not America. Shalimar is her truth but not Max. For Shalimar, Max is “invisible” and “naked” commander (267). It shows the existing world of globalization is defective in the core because its strategies are invisible like virus and its physical presence looks like naked whore.

Rushdie believes that true education should enhance change “in person’s character” (269). However, western education does not seem to bring any change. For instance, Max’s character is not changed through education because western education itself is defective as it condemns moral values. Therefore, Shalimar dares to kill Max in order to protect the identity of Kashmir. Regarding it, Shalimar expresses, “I am ready to kill but I am not ready to stop being myself” (271). Thus, Shalimar determines to protect his identity -- his true identity is his origin

Pachigam of Kashmir and of Muslim. Shalimar claims that he needs to be ready to kill the Ambassador although it is not his interest to kill him but it looks like a compulsion. Justifying the reason of using gun by Shalimar, Rushdie explores:

Our lives touch again, Shalimar said silently to the ambassador. Maybe the gun I'm holding was brought to this region by you. Maybe one day it will point at you and fire. But he knew he did not want to shoot the ambassador. His weapon of choice had always been the knife. ... He was ready for battle. (273)

It shows arrival of the gun in Kashmir, India from the west is uncanny because its arrival destroys the beauty of Kashmir. This gun is destructive not only for the Indians but also for the Americans themselves. Rushdie seems to prove that globalized world has been inhospitable because of excessive presence of weapons. Weapons create fear in mind rather than peace.

Shalimar looks so furious that he finds himself “deaf” and “dumb” and he is unable to “talk” to Max and he does not want to listen what he is saying except killing his paramour Max (274). Here, Rushdie indicates that the westerners are more interested in guns rather than solving the problems with talk and dialogue. As a result, hospitable living in the west has been just like a fairy tale. Shalimar argues that unless he gets rid of his “pain” Max cannot get rid of his “indifference” (281). The main cause of his pain and tragedy is the indifference in the nature of Max towards others, for instance, misbehaving Boonyi and betraying Shalimar. Although Shalimar's mother “Firdaus Noman came to see Pyarelal at his house to assure him that Pachigam's Muslims would protect their Hindu brethren” the Muslims could not stop scaring the Hindus (295). The Muslims attempted to “kill one, scare ten. Kill one, scare ten ... Hindu community houses, temples, private homes and whole neighborhoods were being destroyed” (295-296). Salman Rushdie interrogates why different issues of Kashmir and Kashmiri people

are not addressed by the Indian government. Rushdie blames Indian government of being irresponsible in crisis management or conflict management of Kashmir. There were various problems they need to solve -- such as the “massacre” of “pandits”, starvation, basic needs, water supply, disease, camp management and so on (296-297). The major problem was government’s indifference in solving people’s problems. The government’s indifference in solving the problems of Kashmir is rooted in western interest or the interest of multicultural project of the west.

Rushdie investigates western erotic gaze and touch irritate even the highly respected and senior Muslims. For instance, Shalimar’s mother Firdaus feels someone’s “hand” over her mouth while she was sleeping with her husband at night (300). For Rushdie, he might be Max who might have gone there with the feeling of sexual intercourse with Boonyi. It indicates so many innocent women are being raped by Indian armies in Kashmir but the government looks indifferent. By closing his eyes, Shalimar “pictured his Kashmir” in order to recall the lost values of Kashmir (305). He feels the destiny of Kashmir has been ruined due to the presence of Indian military. To protect the harmony of Pachigam “several of the dead boys had been involved in the defence of Pachigam against the LeP” because protecting Pachigam was the pride of every Kashmiri people (306). In other words, Rushdie believes that so-called globalization is meaningless until and unless the terrorism of Kashmir is measured through global scale. Analyzing Kashmir through deconstructive mode and emphasizing on the need of transcultural living, Rushdie further justifies:

So, to repeat: there was no Pachigam anymore, Pachigam was destroyed. Imagine it for yourself. Second attempt: The village of Pachigam still existed on maps of Kashmir, but

that day it ceased to exist anywhere else, except in memory. Third and final attempt: The beautiful village of Pachigam still exists. (309)

It quite clearly gives the clue of Rushdie's thesis. His thesis is that Kashmir and its identity has been glocalized because he claims Pachigam still exists. Its identity seems to have lost only through the perspective of so-called globalization. Shalimar's mission was suicidal but he survives. He survives because the world of glocalization is not dead.

Rushdie presents Shalimar not just his driver but "He was more than a driver. He was a valet, a body servant, the ambassador's shadow-self. There were no limits to his willingness to serve. He wanted to draw the ambassador close, as close as a lover" (322). For Rushdie, Shalimar is not a terrorist but a nationalistic figure for protecting lost Indian identity. Such sense of closeness never comes in Max as he engages in extramarital affair with his wife Boonyi. After she engages in him Shalimar warns her expressing, "I'll never forgive you. I'll have my revenge. I'll kill you and if you have any children by another man I'll kill the children too" (323). Consequently, Shalimar wears the mask of terrorist and kills his beautiful wife Boonyi and his paramour Max. It is obvious that the globalized world declares Shalimar terrorist but his mission is different. His hesitation in murdering his daughter India proves that the so-called globalized world needs to be re-ordered with the principle of glocalization.

The fifth or the last chapter gives the idea for transcultural justice or the idea of glocalization. Here, Kashmira has been centralized. Rushdie claims about the failure of global justice in which Boonyi has been made victim. Addressing her mother Boonyi, Kashmira explores, "What was justice ... there was no justice, the women keened, your husbands died, your children abandoned you, your fathers were murdered, there was no justice but revenge" (327). The so-called globalized world has betrayed Kashmira. This is the world that "cruelly

continues”, “lust continues”, “power continues”, “craziness continues”, “black magic continues” and “the darkness never ends” (330). Rushdie resists such cruelty and imagines new world of glocalization.

Kashmira does not know the actual cause of the murder of her father Max. She believes that her father has been murdered by Shalimar and justice has not been given. She exposes:

Where was justice? Shouldn't justice be done? Where were the forces of justice, where was the justice league, why weren't superheroes swooping down out of the sky to bring her father's murderer to justice? But she did not want the justice league, really, those goody-goodies in their weird suits (331).

It shows the world of globalization lacks justice. There is no any justice league to control crimes. The globalized world looks totally indifferent in such matter. Kashmira further asserts that “The murder of Ambassador Maximilian Ophuls was being mourned worldwide” (334). But the globalized world never mourns about the lost values of Kashmir. They do not mourn about the dead ones in Kashmiri movements. The western world looks totally indifferent about the huge loss of Kashmir. Kashmira still questions:

‘What then was justice? Was she, in mourning her butchered parent, crying out (she had not wept) for a guilty man? Was Shalimar the assassin in fact the hand of justice ... had justice been done to Max ... how many trophied corpses, like stags' heads, adorned his secret walls?’ (335).

Initially, Kashmira assumes that injustice has been done from Shalimar and she thinks he should be punished heavily. She confidently claims “Her father's killer was her mother's husband” (338). Kashmira becomes sentimental and remembers her mother Boonyi as if she is still alive

for her and intends to find the truth. Regarding it, Rushdie attempts to investigate the lost identity of the Indians through this novel as he states:

She went to her bedroom ... slowly her mother's face began to form in her mind's eye, blurry, out of focus, vague. ... Tell me about her, she cried. Tell me about my mother, who wanted to go back to you ... she's still alive. Maybe it wasn't true about her dying, and she's still alive. (340- 341)

Kashmira's "desire to understand the killer had been fighting against more vengeful longing" (341). Kashmira, thus, believes that her father's killer might have been engaged in killing others just like murdering of Max. However, Shalimar has no answer for Kashmira. Depicting the vengeful rage of Shalimar, Rushdie exposes:

He [Shalimar] had no answers for her. He was inchoate, contradictory, storm clouded. He was a hunted animal living in a ravine, like a coyote, like a dog. He was starving and thirsty. ... He had no answers for her. He faded, like a dream. The sudden silence in her head was like a theft. For a moment she could not breathe, and gasped asthmatically for air. Then she cried. (341-342)

Shalimar's insanity is not natural though it looks so on the surface. His insanity is the result out of repression and western stereotyping of the Indians, particularly the Muslims.

In order to look courageous, Kashmira wears "men's clothing" because she has to be ready for revenge against Shalimar and find out her mother as well (345). Kashmira knows she can not fight against Shalimar unless she develops courage. About growing consciousness in Kashmira, Rushdie further narrates "By the age of seven the young girl was becoming a problem child, a savage ... she became solemn, nonviolent, still, and her transformation" begins as she grows (345). Not only that, Kashmira's complexion looks "Un-English" or there is no "any trace

of Peggy Rhodes's genes" (346). It is the evidence that Kashmira is Boonyi's daughter.

However, Peggy Rhodes argues, "I am your mother. I have been your mother since the first days of your life. You have no other mother or father, there's just me, I'm afraid, and I will not have these blasted questions" (346). In her temper Peggy tells to Kashmira that Boonyi "is dead to everyone now" (348). Whatever Peggy Rhodes expresses, it is not truth but just fakery.

Kashmira is shocked in hearing such words of bad news. She becomes curious and enquires further from Peggy about her true mother and Peggy tries to convince her stating that she is real mother of her. However, Kashmira is not convinced and claims her real mother is Boonyi or Kashmir in symbolic sense but not Peggy. Peggy further assures Kashmira stating, "I'm your mummy" but Kashmira is not still convinced (349). It shows the world of glocalization is the world of the quest for true mother.

Rushdie claims that the world of so-called globalization is the world of confusion, for instance, the birth of "India Ophuls" in the novel is full of confusion (349). It shows the power of globalization lies in creating confusion. The more the confusion is created the powerful the world of globalization looks. For Rushdie, Chaos prevails everywhere in the world of so-called globalization. He writes, "Everywhere was a mirror of everywhere else. Executions, police brutality, explosions, riots: Los Angeles was beginning to look like wartime Strasbourg, riots: like Kashmir" (355). He means to say that true globalization should be free from police brutality, riots, executions and crimes.

For Rushdie, the life of immigrants who are being globalized is just the life full of remembrances because they are compelled to live the life full of nostalgia. This happens because global village has been full of pains, sufferings and stereotyping. For instance, Kashmira is the representative character in this novel who frequently remembers her dead mother or lost



Kashmir. The novel states, “She stood by her mother’s grave and something got into her. Her mother’s grave was carpeted in spring flowers: a simple grave in a simple graveyard at the end of the village near the place where the forest had reclaimed the iron mullah’s vanished mosque” (366). Kashmiri not only observes her mother’s grave but also the hut where her mother had grown up happily in her childhood. Kashmiri further explores, “The hut in the woods was in ruins; the roof had fallen in” (368). Kashmiri also knows Boonyi’s killer might be Shalimar because he has been associated with “terrorist group” (371). Kashmiri further exposes, “Who! Looks like I don’t lose my touch.’ The man in custody had been positively identified as Noman Sher Noman, a known associate of more than one terrorist group, also known as ‘Shalimar the Clown’” (371). Although Shalimar has been arrested in America, Kashmiri, however, believes that it was Kashmiri story and her own story. For Rushdie, Shalimar’s arrest in Los Angeles of America is the arrest of Kashmiri people. Justifying Shalimar’s arrest as the story of the invasion of Kashmir, Rushdie explores:

Kashmir lingered in her, however, and his arrest in America, his disappearance beneath the alien cadences of American Speech, created a turbulence in her that she did not at first identify as culture shock. She no longer saw this as an American story. It was a Kashmiri story. It was hers. (372)

Rushdie, thus, believes that globalization has not just created family fragmentation but also turbulence and unrest in Kashmir changing everything into a story. Shalimar’s arrest by Los Angeles police was broadcasted in “the front page” of newspaper that made Kashmiri look positive until she knows the truth (372). Shalimar not only kills Max but also Boonyi although she had planned again to live the rest of her life in Kashmir.

Finally, Shalimar and India both look ready to kill each other (372). Rushdie claims that “Shalimar the Clown was their property, their villain. He was you could say their happy ending” (373). Neither Kashmira kills Shalimar nor does Shalimar kill Kashmira. Thus, the novel ends with mysterious note of “happy ending” (373). Kashmira (India) writes to Shalimar that Max was the man who “taught” her “about entering the house of power” (373). Kashmira tells Shalimar through her letters that she will go on writing to him even till after his death because he has murdered her father. She explores:

My letters are courses they will shrivel your soul. My letters are threats they should frighten you and I will not stop writing them until you are dead and may be after you die I will go on writing them to your spirit as it burns and they will torment you more agonizingly than the inferno. You will never see Kashmir again but Kashmira is here and now. (374)

Here, Kashmira’s rage looks more than inferno or conflagration. She believes that after taking revenge of Shalimar, there will be no existence of Kashmir but only Kashmira. Kashmira tells to Shalimar that he will be her target now. She expresses, “Now you are my target and I am your marksman however my arrows are not dipped in love but hatred. My letters are arrows of hate and they will strike you down” (374). Kashmira, thus, believes that her letters are not just letters. Rather they are the letters of hatred of Shalimar. She says so because Shalimar has done unimaginable crime by murdering her mother Boonyi. Now, Shalimar is kept in “Men’s central jail” (375). Rushdie argues that Shalimar’s imprisonment looked grand only on the basis of face value as he writes, “at face value Shalimar the Clown was dully indicated by the grand jury for the murder of Ambassador Maximilian Ophuls” (375). Shalimar’s arrest as a murderer is not a big issue for Rushdie. The problem he observes is that of Shalimar’s safety and security in prison

for Shalimar as America generalizes all the Muslims including Shalimar as terrorist after the attack on world trade center in 9/11. Doubting about the security and safety of all the Muslims, he explores:

After the bombing of World Trade Center in New York- eight years later ... he sat across a table from his lawyer in a striking meeting room and expressed his fears for his safety. Even in his maximum – security, solitary-confinement wing, it was a dangerous time in prison for a Muslim man accused by the state of being a professional terrorist. Shalimar the Clown dressed up for his meeting with Tillerman, as finely as prison allowed, wearing his “bonneros”, prison-issue blue jeans and a prison – issue denim overcoat.  
(377)

The problem, Rushdie raises in post 9/11 situation through this novel is that even the prisoners feel uncomfortable and insecure in staying even in prison in America. In that sense, post 9/11 America is full of fear mainly for the Muslims.

From Kashmira’s final note, it can be clearly assumed that mere blame of Shalimar is meaningless because she changes her from the state of “fire” to the state of “ice” (398). Although Shalimar the Clown kills Boonyi and Max, he has killed nobody but he has just demonstrated his ego. It shows egotism becomes obstacles in creating hospitality in the existing world of so-called globalization. For Kashmira, the murder of Boonyi and Max is nothing but just the demonstration of Shalimar’s ego. Kashmira assumes Shalimar may think Max and Boonyi are dead. But they are not dead. Regarding it, Kashmira exposes:

You bathed your honour in their blood but you did not wash it clean it’s bloody now. You wanted to wipe them out but you failed, you killed nobody. Here I stand. I am my mother

and my father I am Maximilian Ophuls and Boonyi Kaul. You achieved nothing. They are not dead not gone not forgotten. They live on in me. (379)

It clearly proves that Rushdie's quest is transcultural living that eschews various evils of the world of globalization. It also shows transcultural living remains in the shadow until western hegemony and western imperialism are resisted throughout the globe with a big campaign. The memory of Kashmir and the role of Shalimar frequently occurs until the so-called globalized world and its existence remains. Kashmira blames Shalimar of being "assassin" and "mister joker" (379). She hates Shalimar so badly stating that, "My mother whom you butchered torments you now and my slaughtered father too. I am Maximilian Ophuls and Boonyi Kaul and you are nothing, less than nothing. I crush you beneath my heel" (380). The textual evidence proves that Kashmira is unknowingly blaming Shalimar as murderer of her parents. As she knows the truth she is herself convinced that Shalimar's resistance is against western world's fakery and against their hegemony.

The research explores, "The Twin Towers bombers" and their act as "the new, senseless kind of sense" (384). In other words, Rushdie wants to prove that 9/11 terrorism is the testimony to justify that the so-called globalized home is unhome that needs to be re-ordered to embrace the differences. Rushdie's claim is that hospitality cannot be prevailed as people involve in senseless kind of acts. On the surface, Shalimar looks senseless both in his action and thought. But in the depth, Shalimar resists such senseless acts illustrating Indian armies' atrocities in Kashmir. He investigates:

It's dog eat dog up there in the Himalayas, ladies and gentlemen, the Indian army against the Pakistan-sponsored fanatics, we sent men out to discover the truth and the truth is what they brought home. You want to know this man, my client? The defence will show

that his village was destroyed by the Indian army. Razed to the ground, every structure destroyed. The dead body of his brother was thrown at his mother's feet with the hands severed. Then his mother was raped and killed and his father was also slain. And then they killed his wife, his beloved wife, the greatest dancer in the village, the greatest beauty in all Kashmir. (385)

It justifies that true senseless man is not Shalimar but they are Maximilian Ophuls and Indian armies. Rushdie also justifies why Shalimar has been presented as assassin. According to Kashmira, Shalimar committed "a blood crime" assuming the Americans his real enemies. She explores:

This is a man against whose whole community a blood crime was committed that he could not avenge, a blood crime that drove him out of his mind. When a man is out of his mind other forces can enter that mind and shape it. They took that avenging spirit-and pointed it in the direction they required, not at India, but here. At America. At their real enemy. At us. (385)

Ironically Rushdie has presented Shalimar as assassin, in true sense, the real assassin, is western world as represented by Max. In her furious mood, Kashmira expresses, "Now my arrow is in your heart and I am satisfied. When the time comes to execute you I will come and watch you die" (386). Before Kashmira knows the truth of Shalimar's intention, she seems to be in illusion and claims that she is both Boonyi and Max Ophuls although they both are killed by Shalimar. She is still determined she will kill Shalimar as a revenge.

Finally, as Kashmira sees Shalimar's arrival in her dressing room in the posture "from attack to defence," she also becomes cold like "ice" from "fire" (398). This tone of epiphany of her origin makes her strong enough. Now, she feels, Shalimar cannot be terrorist or assassin as

she had thought before; rather he is fighting for transcultural hospitality. The final paragraph of the novel proves it as Rushdie concludes:

He stopped moving suddenly, and she knew he had sensed a wrongness in the dark and was moving from attack to defence ... He came towards the dressing room. She was ready for him. She was not fire but ice. The golden bow was drawn back as far as it would go. She felt the taut bowstring pressing against her parted lips, felt the foot of the arrow's shaft against her gritted teeth, allowed the last seconds to tick away, exhaled and let fly. There was no possibility that she would miss. There was no second chance. There was no India. There was only Kashmira, and Shalimar the clown. (398)

This ending note of the novel quite clearly depicts the idea of glocalization that Rushdie dreams. Interestingly, Rushdie's novel begins with the description of the character India who looks innocent and revengeful to Shalimar but the last chapter gives a clear clue that India has been transformed into Kashmira, a true glocalized citizen and Shalimar's realization also proves that he is no more assassin now. He is also a truly glocalized citizen and a man of ideal personality. The final embrace of both Shalimar and Kashmira to each other gives the message to the world that global home can exist no longer. Rushdie's dream of glocalization resembles unconditional hospitality of Jacques Derrida and Mireille Rosello. Glocalized world needs to follow Derrida's "The law of unlimited hospitality" eschewing "the laws" (*Of Hospitality* 77). The first one refers to unconditional hospitality and the second refers to conditional hospitality. Unconditional hospitality is the need of present but just the opposite is happening now. Similarly, Mireille Rosello argues for the need of "mutual metamorphosis" between the guests and the hosts (176). However, the western world seems to be unaware and because of their practice of conditional hospitality the immigrants as guests have to live the life of "imprisonment or exile" (165).

Shalimar's role of being assassin and India's sense of revenge in the novel seem to be uncanny at first, but their final realization and understanding of not killing to each other proves that Shalimar's role is for transcultural living and Kashmira seems to support him fully. Rather than reiterating the evil acts of Max again and again, Rushdie's main focus is on the local terrorism in Kashmir and its citizens, their agreement, disagreement, their terrorist acts and compromises for harmonious living. Firstly, Rushdie shows Kashmiri people in conflict, Shalimar and his beloved Boonyi for instance. Eventually, he makes all realize their mistakes in order to live in transcultural world of glocalization. He clearly distinguishes between glocalization and globalization through this novel. For him, the world of glocalization is more hospitable because it follows the logic of "either – and" in order to embrace the difference rather than focusing on "either – or" logic of "Us" versus "Them" of globalization (Roudometof 143-144). Thus, fakeness or fakery created in the name of globalization from its root needs to be uprooted to feel and experience the pleasure of transcultural living, a true global. This is the pure home which will be friendly either for local Indians like Kashmiri people or for Americans western citizens who are genuine. In overall analysis of the novel, Rushdie's desire for glocalization shows immigrants are living the life of unstable identity.

In summary, *Shalimar the Clown* has been analysed through the perspective of glocalization, a true home for embracing the differences from below. In this novel, the Muslim character Shalimar marries a Hindu Lady Boonyi. First, he loves her and then changes that love into marriage. The couple's happiness becomes momentary after the arrival of Maximilian Ophuls at Pachigam of Kashmir as an American Ambassador to India just after the Kashmir conflict begins in 1965. Maximilian Ophuls's extramarital affair with Boonyi destroys familial bond of Shalimar and Boonyi. However, his affair does not last long. Boonyi is betrayed from

Maximilian Ophuls after India (Kashmira) is born out of their affair. Out of his aggression, Shalimar murders Maximilian Ophuls and Boonyi both. Shalimar is kept in prison. As he is released from the prison, he plans to murder India (Kashmira) out of his fury. Kashmira also wants to murder Shalimar out of her aggression. However, both hesitate to kill to each other. Here, the plot of the novel ends.



## CHAPTER SEVEN

### ENVISIONING TRANSCULTURAL HOSPITALITY IN MOHSIN HAMID'S *THE RELUCTANT FUNDAMENTALIST*

In *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, Mohsin Hamid criticizes stereotypical representation of the Pakistani Muslim immigrants as guests in America in the post 9/11 phase when cultural clash or civilizational clash has received a high pitch. Because of the engagement of the Muslims and the Americans in the discourse of civilizational clash, global peace remains in the shadow. In a sense, both Muslims and the Americans have been fundamentalists. Americans' belief in biblical literalism and their orthodox attitude of capitalism have made them irrational and thus they make quick generalization over Muslims and treat them all as terrorists and the Muslims' understanding of fundamentalism is palpable in their blame of Americans as undercover assassins on the basis of their religious principles. In this novel, America's greed for capitalism and Muslims' religious fundamentalism seem to be the twin problems in globalism or multiculturalism. The novel, however, shows that at least the Muslims have shown readiness or willingness to be transformed as perfect guests and hosts. For instance, the central character Changez's decision of becoming fundamentalist is his resistance against Americans' racist attitude towards Pakistani immigrants as guests, on the one hand and Changez's decision of returning home is his quest for hospitable living, on the other hand. His response to hospitality is underlined in his friendly dialogue with the American guest who has just arrived in Pakistan. Changez, as a Pakistani host, welcomes the unnamed American guest in friendly manner. Changez does so to prove that Pakistan can embrace the differences better than the Americans both as a guest and host. Changez's interest in "shared intimacy" is striking contrast from America's interest merely in business intimacy. The research explores America's multicultural

project looks defective because of its frequent engagement in capitalism. Human element is missing in the framework of so-called globalization. In contrast, Pakistan as a representative of Eastern world believes in shared values in order to include human element. Thus, it is argued that transcultural hospitality embraces the ethics of shared values as the core in a truly hospitable home. In order to achieve the aim of transcultural hospitality, Pakistan, as the novel shows, can play the perfect role of guest and host both. It is this message of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* which this chapter seeks to highlight through the following textual analysis in terms of transculturalism.

Transculturalism is openness to the other culture. The prefix “trans”, which means going beyond, suggests that one must extend through the culture of the other in order to embrace it to an extent. Mikhail Epstein explores the idea that transculture works as “a universal symbolic palette, from which individuals can freely choose and mix colors in order to paint their self-portraits” (Epstein 343). In the novel, Changez has been presented in such a way that he cannot take America as universal symbolic palette and he does not find himself as free individual to choose appropriate paint of his interest. After observing 9/11 event and aftermath scenario of American response, Changez realizes that Americans are still not liberated individuals from their nativeness. Because of the domination of others, western culture has been inhospitable. As Changez finds the sense of othering in Americans, he cannot adjust himself in western embrace; rather he feels the need of postcolonial embrace. What Epstein disregards is “growth of homogeneity” in globalization; but prefers “transcultural individuals, strangers and fugitives” who are transformed “from their native cultures” (349). Despite the stranger’s uncanny and suspicious appearance, Changez’s journey of home return and his friendly talk with the stranger seems to be the journey of being transcultural individual.

In the novel, the central character Changez has left America not as happy departure but as a resistance hero. His departure from America makes him think about a truly global society as an alternative, which is full of trust, sharing and intimacy that is highlighted by Changez's hosting of the stranger in his homeland Pakistan where the gates or doors of the hotel are kept open. Hamid, the writer, wants to show that Pakistanis are more liberal and open than the Americans regarding hospitality. The protagonist's imagination of transcultural and hospitable living resembles Mikhail Epstein's imagination of transculture. For Epstein, a truly globalized society can be taken as transcultural home as he argues:

The global society can be viewed as the space of ultimate diversity: diversity of free individuals rather than that of fixed groups and cultures. Once again, a rule of thumb for transcultural diversity: oppose yourself to nobody, identify yourself with nothing. No identities and no oppositions – only concrete and multiple differences. The deeper is differentiation, the better is the prospect for universal peace. (350)

Here, the phrase “a rule of thumb” is used to indicate that transcultural home may give equal justice for the people of various origins. Changez searches for that thumb but he cannot find it in America and he returns to Pakistan thinking that he will be able to change Pakistan as a truly global home. His friendly conversation with the stranger, a western guest indicates the impending demise of the so-called globalization of the western type and a search for globalization in actuality.

The plot of the novel is quite simple. The central character or the protagonist of the novel is Changez who completes his graduation from Princeton University of USA. After the completion of his graduation, he does not get any reputable job there. He plans to apply for job in Underwood Samson and Company. Jim, the interviewer, asks too personal and unrelated

questions to Changez. At the same time 9/11 occurs. His so-called girlfriend Erica and her parents look indifferent to him. While returning from Pakistan to America, his security surveillance in the immigration becomes quite irritating and unfriendly. Changez finds widespread inhospitable treatment in America. He finally decides to return to Pakistan. In Pakistan, a stranger is arriving. He is probably the American guest. Changez greets and welcomes him positively. However, the stranger looks suspicious because he has put something metallic under his jacket secretly. This is a kind of monologue in which Changez, the protagonist or a Pakistani representative speaks throughout the novel whereas the stranger, the American guest is silent listener. To address the listener, Hamid repeatedly uses the pronoun “You” in the novel.

In the novel, the narrator Changez frequently uses the words or expressions of euphemism such as “excuse me”, “sir” or “you” in addressing the stranger throughout the novel as the basic requirements to maintain politeness and hospitality in order to fulfill the aim of greetings that he has learnt from his homeland Pakistan (1). Changez is hospitable to the stranger (western guest) not only in the use of polite language, but he also seems hospitable in creating comfortable and friendly environment. After fulfilling such basic requirements for hospitality, he shares to the stranger how he was treated in America during his stay. Changez identifies the stranger not from his skin’s colour but character traits (1). He does so in order to avoid racist attitude unlike the Americans. Changez has bitter experiences of not getting such environment during his stay in America. Changez describes characteristic features of the place of Old Anarkali of Pakistan. The place looks hospitable where visitors can experience “quality of its tea” which “is unparalleled” (2). Changez asks the stranger to look informal and casual by removing his jacket. But the stranger seems to have kept some metal weapon under his jacket for

the purpose of his security assuming Pakistan as the land of terrorist. Thus, the stranger does not remove his jacket.

While staying in America after his graduation from Princeton University, the narrator goes through a long process in getting job at Underwood Samson and Company. The selection process is quite tough, boring and unfriendly for him although he is quite good in his field. His resume also proves that he is a perfect fellow. Jim, the interviewer of the company, asks him irrelevant questions and uses impolite language probably with the intention of belittling and insulting him, such as:

‘Come on in and take a seat.’...

‘Sell yourself’...

‘What makes you special? ...

‘Tell me something. Where are you from? ...

‘Are you on a financial aid?’...

‘Do your friends here know?’ (6-8)

First, the interviewer’s impolite language in welcoming Changez makes him feel uncomfortable. Second, the interviewer looks quite commercial and money minded. Changez is there to give interview but he is not there for selling himself. He is not the object to be sold in the market. Third, the question “what makes you special?” is not a genuine question. It is an absurd question. Instead of asking special skills in him, the interviewer is out of track. Fourth, Jim’s question “Tell me something. Where are you from?” is not job related question. Fifth, asking him about his financial status whether he is on a financial aid or not is irrelevant question. Sixth, Changez has friends in America or not is not job related question either. For Changez, such questions are asked “to broach religion, for example, and sexual orientation” (8). He hesitates in answering

these questions. He thinks that these questions are not related to the job he is searching for. The interview in which Changez participated can be taken as an example of how stereotypically the Americans in post 9/11 phase treat the foreign immigrants, mainly the Muslims.

After he returns to Pakistan, Changez, on the other hand, encourages the stranger or the western guest to feel comfortable. He encourages him to avoid fear and suspicion in Pakistan as a guest although Changez's own stay in America is full of fear and suspicion. Although Changez is from well-off family background, he is educated and talented but he cannot be "free of doubts and limits" in America (12). It shows transcultural individuals both as guests and hosts live the life "free of doubts." When Changez is in America, he lives there as a postcolonial guest and America is hosting him. But now, he has been postcolonial host and he is giving hospitality to the stranger in Pakistan. The stranger feels uneasy even to remove his jacket while communicating with Changez in a Café in Pakistan as he seems to have come as the man of mission in Pakistan. Changez assures the stranger not to be frightened by his beard. He states that his beard would create fear in others during his stay at Princeton University as well. However, Princeton environment cannot win his heart as he expresses, "Princeton made everything possible for me. But it did not, could not, make me forget such things as how much I enjoy the tea in this, the city of my birth" (15). Changez's hospitable welcome of the stranger in the city of Lahore is also the lesson to the American guest to depict how positively the hosts should treat the guests.

Regarding his love affair with Erica, Changez is impressed by the "uncommon magnetism" of Erica; however, he is feeling uncomfortable with her "nudity" (22-24). He feels so because his origin is in Pakistan where nudity is taken as a taboo. For instance, Erica's appearance makes Changez look amazed whose boyfriend Chris dies of lung cancer but she is

unusually attached with him and she treats Changez as her first boyfriend (22-26). Changez feels homeless as he finds his “mannerisms” different from the mannerism of the Americans (28). Changez compares Old Anarkali or Lahore of Pakistan with Manhattan of America and he feels proud of Lahore’s richness or richness of old Anarkali as he knows Lahore is great in terms of “Local treasure” such as “unfamiliar surrounding”, their language of their own “Urdu”, locally prepared food “Samosa and Channa”, “civilization”, “meritocracy”, “pragmatism” and “professionalism” (33-37). The stranger is exposed in such a beautiful location Anarkali in Pakistan that may look “unfamiliar surrounding” for the stranger just like Changez who is exposed in “Manhattan” in America (34). Hamid’s reference of Old Anarkali or Lahore of Pakistan is to show the richness of Lahore which is no less than the beauty and richness of Manhattan of America. In other words, he seems to suggest America not to dominate the Muslims in terms of civilization.

For Changez, in the novel, nothing troubles him in America but the comparison made by the Americans makes him feel uncanny. This comparison, he feels, was, in fact the practice of alterity by the west. Hamid thinks that if the Americans really compare and compete with Muslims, they may fail because Muslims have richer civilization than that of Americans and Europeans. Changez argues that Americans’ comparison with the Muslims is vain because “those who would invade and colonize America were illiterate barbarians” (34). His assumption looks tenable because it seems true that those who compare with others are not truly educated people. He further claims that if the Americans engage just in making comparison with the Muslims, it would be “vast disparity” and shame but not the matter of pride (34). Changez thinks the stranger should not feel uncomfortable in new surroundings. However, Comparison made by the Americans in the name of civilization and “meritocracy” makes Changez feel “resentful”

(34-35). In Changez's experience, Americans' "systematic pragmatism" also known as "professionalism" means country's success for them (37). This may not be applied to the Muslim community. It does not mean that Muslims are barbarians and Americans are civilized.

The research investigates that the location of Princeton was center of "aura of creativity" for Changez (37). However, the narrator feels inhospitable because of the activation of "the dark side" of Americans in working places like Underwood Samson & Company (38). This darkness refers to the evil aspects of the Americans in not embracing the foreigners or strangers. The narrator claims that America should not dominate Pakistanis as they have similar status of being colonized by Britain in the past. If Americans dominate Muslims in the name of "mannerism" it would be their great mistake (41). The novelist assumes that if America and Pakistan have similar status, they should feel neither superior nor inferior because "like Pakistan, America is, after all, a former English colony" (41). Although the Pakistanis live in poverty facing the problem of power cut compared to "open-minded" and "cosmopolitan nature of New York city" along with their skyscrapers equipped with "decorative lights", Pakistanis are rich at heart compared to the Americans (47-50). He also argues that Pakistan may not be rich in grand narratives like the Americans but they are capable at least to write "novella" if not novel (51). As a case in point, Pakistanis feel uncomfortable in drinking alcohol and it is taken as illegal act in Pakistan and similarly, taking marijuana is illegal in USA (53). Positive otherness or positive discrimination must be maintained in globalism rather than discriminating in the name of cultural differences.

In the context of cultural differences, Pakistan should not dominate Americans and Americans should not dominate Pakistanis. However, Changez's relation with Erica becomes cold after 9/11. When Changez is invited at Erica's home, Erica's father insults not only



Changez but also the Pakistanis of being rapists and fundamentalists in front of Changez and Changez feels uncomfortable (55). Since then Changez is never invited at Erica's and their relationship becomes colder than before. Changez experiences that he has been the victim of Americans' "condescension" or their treating of foreigners as inferiors or others (55). Changez becomes nostalgic remembering the lost values of Pakistan due to British imperialism. He is irritated because he has been frequently exposed with "international music, piracy, downloads Chinese competition" during his short stay in America (66). It shows Changez has been aware about the difference between the fake and original.

In fact, Changez's resistance is against fakeness of Americans that they are particularly practicing since 9/11. In contrast, Changez thinks that his "Third World Sensibility" is a catalyst to a genuine embracing of globalism or transculturalism. Third world sensibility is generally taken as the critical perspective on western global inequality. Regarding the novel, the narrator Changez is encountered in USA with Philipino driver whose gaze upon the narrator in a traffic jam looks strange or uncanny in the beginning and the narrator terrifies. As they move closer to each other, Changez realizes that the driver is also from third world. Now, they "share [d] a sort of third world sensibility" (67). The novel is not just the mere response to 9/11 literature of the white Americans; rather it is taken as the project of "Third world sensibility" (67). In other words, third world people can be united embracing the ethics of shared intimacy which lacks in the first world although it looks affluent in its outlook. Till now Changez is not conscious about what third world is and its sensibility. But now "Third World Sensibility" emerges in him and he starts to think about Pakistan, about Lahore in closer way (67). In other words, finding postcolonial identity within "invisible core" is taken as third world sensibility (71). Changez, accustomed to his third world Sensibility of distorting the veracity of the American TV news,

initially takes the viral of the collapse of the twin towers as “a film” but as he keeps on watching he is ironically “pleased” to know that it is not a fake but genuine news. Changez’s pretension of being pleased at the tragedy of 9/11 is meant to be ironical, as he admits, “I am not indifferent to the suffering of others” but he “smiled” and becomes “pleased” as he watched the news of the event in western media because they present the event in exaggerated way (72). The Americans’ attitude to foreigners and Muslim immigrants, who were subjected to the aftermath of 9/11 makes him look rude. For him biasness has been done upon him just because he is a Muslim. Such practice is not the sign of embrace but prose of otherness in the name of religion or othering the others on the basis of minor differences that is mainly the focus of M. Dunja Mohr.

Although Changez is sympathetic to the loss of lives in the attack of 9/11 as World Trade Center collapsed. The Western media presents the event in such a way that it makes him negative towards Americans and he starts to react accordingly. In his initial reaction, he smiles while watching one sided reporting about the collapse of Twin Towers rather than crying (72). Twin Towers’ Ground Zero status after its collapse becomes sense of pleasure for Changez (74). Such pleasure is ironic because his smile is, in fact, upon the fake transmission and broadcast of 9/11 through western media. He looks sympathetic to the real victims in 9/11. The fear created by the Americans among the Muslims makes Changez feel so. Changez’s sense of resistance proves that he is not ready to make a contract but he seems to make the Americans think a lot for reciprocity and multicultural cohabitation. Such ideas are further explored and elaborated by Mireille Rosello in her theory of postcolonial hospitality.

Mireille Rosello’s tone of “a contract” for living in “Mutual Metamorphosis” resembles Derrida’s quest for unconditional hospitality through negotiation and compromise. Rosello finds two evils in western civilization -- they are cannibalism or parasitism and charity or generosity.

In other words, both the guests and hosts should be neither cannibalistic nor too generous. A true hospitality emerges in between. Like Levinas's supreme dignity, Mireille Rosello calls for "Mutual Metamorphosis" as a solution to the problem (Rosello 176). Rosello further argues that foreign immigrants in the western world have been presented as servant or prisoners. Mohsin Hamid explores the similar theme in the novel because the protagonist Changez in the novel has been treated as servant or prisoner in America. During his stay of America, Changez feels as if he is just the servant of American empire. He feels so mainly in post 9/11 phase. Recalling the bitter experience of the past, he argues, "I resolved to look about me with an ex-janissary's gaze" (157). He is sharing this bitter experience to the stranger now in his conversation with the American guest in Pakistan. Mireille Rosello stresses on the need of contract between the west and the Muslim world or postcolonial nations to fulfill the need of postcolonial hospitality or transcultural hospitality. Instead of showing interest to make "a contract" for living in "mutual metamorphosis" Americans look indifferent in such contract (Rosello 176). Changez's role in the novel proves that the Americans neither create environment to make contract with the immigrants nor they seem to be interested to listen to the proposal of contract from the Muslims. Rosello argues that immigrants' life in the west has been like the life of prisoner -- such as Changez's condition in the novel. In spite of these challenges, Changez believes in making the ties of shared intimacy with the Americans. Another instance of the experience of uncanny is that Changez feels uncomfortable in immigration and customs while returning to America from Pakistan. Then he is compelled to look different and starts thinking differently. Sharing his immigration experience, Changez speaks:

When we arrived, I was separated from my team at immigration. They joined the queue for American Citizens; I joined one of the foreigners. The officer who inspected my

passport was a solidly built woman with a pistol at her hip and a mastery of English inferior to mine; I attempted to discern her with a smile. ‘What is the purpose of your trip to the United States?’ our exchange continued in much this fashion for several minutes. In the end, I was dispatched for a secondary inspection in a room where I sat on a metal bench next to a tattooed man in handcuffs. My team did not wait for me; by the time I entered the customs hall they had already collected their suitcases and left. As a consequence, I rode to Manhattan that evening very much alone. (75)

The immigration officer’s question to Changez, “What is the purpose of your trip to the United States?” makes him feel that he is not at home (75). It proves that inhospitable treatment of Changez at immigration makes him feel uncanny and rebellious. Because of these various reasons, Changez feels “haunted” in New York (80). The Americans’ attitude to the foreigners and the Muslim immigrants, who were subjected to in the aftermath of 9/11 makes him look rude. The immigration officer’s question of asking Changez’s purpose of visiting America looks like security matter on the surface. In depth analysis of asking such question; however, proves that America accepts only conditional hospitality, the hospitality of invitation rather than hospitality of visitation preferred by Jacques Derrida.

Changez becomes quite sympathetic to the real victims of 9/11 but he looks critical to the western media that misrepresents the event stating “New York ... in mourning” assuming America as the space of “The mightiest civilization” that haunts Changez and attempts to resist such discrepancy through this novel (79-80). It shows the primary focus of western media is to depict America as superior and civilized nation than others. In order to inferiorize Changez, Erica’s sexuality has been used not as a means of pleasure but as a means and method of domination. Initially, Erica shows her interest in Changez but her enthusiasm towards him

declines after 9/11. Changez's claim that "her body had rejected me" is the evidence that Americans are unable to embrace the differences (90). It also shows American body of so-called multiculturalism and globalization fails in embracing the differences. After Erica's rejection, Changez feels himself a "stranger" and "boor" or insensitive while staying in America (92). Changez's journey of America in the novel quite clearly shows American civilization or the western civilization is still unable to welcome and embrace Changez-like people from South Asian nations, particularly the Muslims. Regarding such theme, Changez expresses:

I WONDER NOW, sir, whether I believed at all in the firmness of the foundations of the new life I was attempting to construct for myself in New York. Certainly I wanted to believe; at least I wanted not to disbelieve with such an intensity that I prevented myself as much as was possible from making the obvious connection between the crumbling of the world around me and the impending destruction of my personal American dream.

(93)

Ironically, Changez finds himself capable of being fundamental because of his feeling of "impending destruction" of his "American Dream", mainly because of the effect of America's "stagflation" or high inflation (93-96). It clearly shows American dream fails when America is in the trap of inflation. In other words, America is unable to embrace the immigrants when its economy is down. In Changez's experience, Americans change their mood in terms of economy and its change. Changez expresses, "When I was in college ... the economy was in bad shape" (96). The strange scenario of American economy is that it changes frequently creating uncanny consequences. So, the novel presents the change of American economy just like the changing mood of animal. The novelist argues that American economy is "an animal" (96). It justifies that

Americans look like animals or irrational beings, as irrational and bullish as animals as soon as their their economy is down. In that sense, changez has been the victim of American capitalism.

The narrator becomes fundamentalist reluctantly and decides to return home as the Americans become too much inhospitable to the Muslims due to various reasons. For instance, instead of finding rational solution to 9/11, they declare war in the name of the *War on Terrorism* against Afghanistan (99). The Americans make a quick decision and attack in Iraq and Afghanistan in which innocent civilians become victims.

The excessive practice of American exceptionalism mainly after 9/11, America treats others as strangers. As a result, western hospitality seems to decline in the west although it had begun from the same western world. Changez's focus of being fundamental is based on "Underwood Samson's guiding principle" and also after "The bombing of Afghanistan" (98-99). The American attack on Afghanistan becomes uncanny for Changez because Afghanistan was not just his neighbor but also a close friend of Pakistan (100). Changez further justifies that it is not his intention to be rude with America; but because of his rise of "fury at seeing American troops enter Afghanistan" (102). In that sense, western media is also responsible as it presents 9/11 in such a way that the Americans were totally innocent and the Muslims were all terrorists. For Changez, the effect of 9/11 is more devastating for the Muslims rather than others. As a result, surveillance of the Muslims in immigration becomes intolerable and uncanny even for the intellectuals and university graduates like Changez in the novel. Furthermore, Changez's relation with Erica becomes uncanny and Changez is in "reproachful mood" in the invitation for drinking by Erica and becomes rude both with Erica and America. The response of Erica's mother to Changez is also uncanny as she responds in a conversation to him in a mysterious way. She says, "It's easy to tell why she likes you" (110). It is difficult for Changez to know why Erica is

distancing from him. He thinks it might be because of “the trauma of the attack on her city” in 9/11 or “powerful nostalgia” of her dead boyfriend Chris or something else (113). Therefore, “Living in New York” for Changez after 9/11 is just “like living in a film about the Second World War” (115). The Americans’ attitude of claiming themselves as “the mightiest civilization”, and the frequent use of insulting phrase like “Fucking Arab” makes Changez feel “outsider” (117-120). Anyway, cultural clash is the central focus here.

Changez also tells to the stranger or the American guest that his main reason of leaving America is “unwelcomed sensibility” of the Americans (124). Changez does not know what illness is of Erica. It looks like “mental disorder” or “illness of the spirit” (140). Changez argues that he cannot assimilate in “a process of osmosis” or in a process of unconscious assimilation in main stream American culture (141). Erica wants Changez to assimilate in American way of life unconsciously but he cannot do so. It shows Changez prefers salad bowl type of multiculturalism rather than that of melting pot type. In fact, Changez wants to create distinct identity of Pakistani Muslims in America but his dream fails as he knows they prefer to be assimilated only with the process of melting pot type.

Changez assumes that South Asian immigrants, particularly the Muslims “lack stable core” and suffer just like Changez in the novel. Changez shares to the American guest stating, “I lacked a stable core. I was not certain where I belonged - in New York, in Lahore, in both, in neither” (148). In this way, the mobility of the global home creates the problem of stable core mainly in the immigrants like Changez in the novel that global home has been the center for terrorism, tourism, origin of hospitality and also the end of hospitality (Korstanje 1-176). It has been so because the westerners’ central focus is on capitalism and capitalism has been promoted by western media in an uncanny way.

Changez assumes himself of being “a modern-day janissary, a servant of the American empire” and plans to return home (152). Changez’s attempt of home return and his friendly talk with the stranger seems to be the journey of being transcultural individual. Changez realizes that Americans’ constant interference in the affairs of others like him has compelled him to leave America. For Changez, America’s “constant interference in the affairs of others” has been “insufferable” and this type of treatment of the Americans is nothing other than “project of domination”, a hegemonic treatment of “ex-janissary’s gaze” (156-157). This clearly indicates that the Americans are still racist. Mohsin further writes:

I reflected that I had always resented the manner in which America conducted itself in the world; your country’s constant interferences in the affairs of others was insufferable.

Vietnam, Korea, the straits of Taiwan, the Middle East, and now Afghanistan: in each of the major conflicts and standoffs that ringed my mother continent of Asia, America played a central role. Moreover, I knew from my experience as a Pakistani-of alternating periods of American aid and sanctions- that finance was a primary means by which the American empire exercised its power. It was right for me to refuse to participate any longer in facilitating this project of domination. (156)

It justifies that America has been inhospitable because of its interference to the issues of others. Mohsin takes such interference as the project of domination. It also proves that western model of globalization has been unhome because of the unfriendly treatment of the immigrants who live and struggle staying in the western world.

Changez’s sense of “alien” becomes more intense after Erica commits “suicide” (163). In this way, Changez’s romantic relation with Erica begins in September and ends along with the end of 9/11 attack and after the *War on Terrorism* (165). In Changez’s thought, America’s



problem is the problem of superiority complex. As a result, its citizens have been irresponsible and insincere. This theme seems tenable as Changez expresses the reasons of distancing himself from the Americans. As Americans are “unwilling to reflect upon the shared pain”, Changez is disoriented from them and leaves America. Mohsin Hamid’s quest for “shared intimacy” as well as “shared pain” links up to the idea of supreme dignity of Immanuel Levinas. From the above detail, it is clearly assumed that western world should move towards the world of shared human intimacy eschewing the world of mere business intimacy. Regarding such thought Mohsin Hamid in the novel writes:

As a society, you were unwilling to reflect upon the shared pain that united you with those who attacked you. You retreated into myths of your own difference, assumptions of your own superiority. And you acted out these beliefs on the stage of the world, so that the entire planet was rocked by the repercussion of your tantrums not least my family, now facing war thousands of miles away. Such an America had to be stopped in the interests not only of the rest of humanity but also in your own. (168)

It shows America’s dominating nature is destructive not only for themselves but also for the entire global humanity.

Although Changez is an intellectual and a product of Princeton University, he suffers in America because the “waves of mourning” frequently haunt him activating “invisible moon” at his “core” (170). Thus, he feels Pakistan is inviting him where he can experience peace and rest. Changez assures that he is “a believer in non-violence” and also assumes the stranger to be the same (181). Being confident in front of the stranger, he argues, “you should not imagine that we Pakistanis are all potential terrorists, just as we should not imagine that you Americans are all undercover assassins” (183). Hamid’s neutrality in his argument is quite obvious here because he

condemns the tendency of generalizing either from Americans or from Muslims.

Overgeneralization based on a specific event like 9/11 is uncanny for both. The novel ends with the obligation to live in “shared intimacy” eliminating various doubts (184). In that sense, the novel is an appeal to create brotherhood and harmony in global community. He thinks it is possible because both Pakistan and America are two brothers who have equal status of the past because both were the colonies of Europe. Therefore, neither America is superior nor is Pakistan. They both are equal in the sense that they both were under British imperialism in the past. If America and Pakistan have equal status of the past, neither Americans are superiors nor the Pakistanis. In this way, Mohsin Hamid aims to create a world of transcultural living embedded with transcultural hospitality. The novel should not be analyzed only through the lens of civilizational clash or cultural differences; rather it should mainly be analyzed through the lens of hospitality. Erica’s hospitable invitation looks like Derridean conditional, for Changez.

Derrida situates unconditional hospitality in such a way that it is stick to hospitality of visitation where visitors can enter a house even without any permission of hosts or without any sorts of surveillance by the hosts. In contrast, he situates conditional hospitality as “hospitality of invitation” where visitors or guests are trapped in such a condition in which they are controlled, checked and supervised by the hosts through the construction of not only house but its doors, windows, thresholds, keys and key controller (*Hostipitality* 14). Derrida’s theoretical insight of hospitality can be linked to the romantic relation of Erica and Changez. The romance collapses all of a sudden, rendering them implacable foes of each other. Their relation becomes so cold that all the doors of their relation are closed. But the same doors are open for both of them before 9/11. Changez needs unconditional hospitality but he feels weighed down by the chain of conditional hospitality. Changez’s desire of hospitality of visitation or unconditional hospitality

is replaced by the hospitality of invitation or conditional hospitality in America. In other words, Changez wants to be embraced in Derridean, “The law of unlimited hospitality” (*Of Hospitality* 77). The various sorts of fakenesses created in Changez’s temporary stay in America are all “the laws” made in order to stereotype the foreigners like Changez. In fact, America’s practice of hospitality looks like the “hospitality in the world of concrete realities” (qtd. In Andrew Shepherd’s *The Gift of the Other* 60). It clearly proves that American civilization embraces only the world of concrete realities or the world of materialism in post 9/11 phase. Because of such uncanny practices, “The welcomed guest” like Changez in the novel are “treated as ... an enemy” or “stranger” in America (*Hostipitality* 4). Derrida concludes his argument stating that “a Copernican revolution” is to come to challenge western thought regarding hospitality (Shepherd 81). The same is happening in the novel. Changez’s resistance looks like Derridean quest for the change in western thought. Derrida’s ultimate goal is that he says a true cosmopolitan society needs to emerge through the “negotiation between the unconditional and the conditional” (*On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* XI). Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* attempts to embrace this theoretical insight in order to create transcultural home. Similarly, theoretical insights of Immanuel Levinas can be linked up in analyzing the novel because Levinas’s ethics of supreme dignity resembles Hamid’s quest for transcultural living embedded with “shared intimacy” and “shared pain.”

*The Reluctant Fundamentalist* is written in the spirit of the ethics of transculturalism focusing on the line of ethics of Immanuel Levinas. Immanuel Levinas argues for “Ethical Hospitality” in which both the guests and hosts need to look sincere and responsible. In *Totality and Infinity* (1969), Levinas eschews western thought of totalitarianism. However, his *Ethics and Infinity* (1985) comes as a solution. He defines ethics as “the task of genuine thinking” (Levinas

2). Such genuine thought gives birth to “responsibility” and “sincerity” (Levinas 13).

Responsibility and sincerity lead to “Inter-human relationship” (Levinas 97). Levinas views inter-human relation can strengthen inter-subjective relation. Immanuel Levinas’s quest is the quest for “supreme dignity” that emerges through genuine thought, responsibility, sincerity, inter-subjective relation and justice (101). In the novel, it is quite clear that Changez looks fundamentalist on the surface as he resists but he looks genuine as he plays the role of true host in welcoming the stranger in Pakistan after he returns from America. It shows Americans are unwilling of sharing both the pains and pleasures to the immigrants. As a result, the others are excluded from the umbrella of so-called globalism and multiculturalism.

Hospitality is the matter of embracing the self and others. The defect of the western embrace is that it embraces just their self but not others. Their embrace is full of xenophobia, xenophilia and alterity. In other words, western civilization seems to be friendly to their citizens but not about foreign immigrants. Xenophobia refers to fear of strangers, xenophilia refers to the demonstration of erotic posture to otherness. Mohr believes that reciprocity, multicultural cohabitation and only positive embrace can strengthen living togetherness. Changez’s problem is the problem of exclusion or unfitness created for him in America. Changez’s exclusion symbolizes the exclusion of foreign immigrants, particularly the Muslim immigrants in America. For Changez, in the novel, nothing troubles him in America but the comparison made by the Americans makes him feel uncanny. This comparison, he feels was, in fact the practice of alterity by the west. Changez is excluded from the embrace of Erica after 9/11. Erica and her family start to look at him with suspicious eyes. Their deep relation changes into light. After that, Changez feels uncomfortable to live any longer not only in their relation but also in America.

Mireille Rosello's tone of "a contract" for living in "Mutual Metamorphosis" resembles Derrida's quest for unconditional hospitality or his hospitality of visitation through negotiation and compromise. Rosello finds two evils in western civilization -- they are cannibalism or parasitism and charity or generosity. In other words, both the guests and hosts should be neither cannibalistic nor too generous. A true hospitality emerges in between. Instead of creating home for hospitable living, the Americans after 9/11 are found being engaged in populism. Its root goes in George W. Bush's administration because his "administration opened the gates of hell after it led the invasion of Iraq (qtd. In Korstanje 1). Maximilian E. Korstanje's claim of western world's "modern tourism" as a "form of terrorism" proves that hospitality's birth and its end both occur in the same western world. Therefore, it looks meaningless of the west to blame the others who do not belong to them. Such failure of Changez's American dream indicates the failure of western civilization regarding hospitality. Also, America's pride in fear creation in the world looks uncanny. Korstanje says, "the greatest fear monger today is the American Empire" (174). In the novel, Changez has been made the victim of American empire.

The advent of the birth of populist discourse and conspiracy theory in post 9/11 world is the result of western world's belief in binary logic of "Us" versus "Them" as a result of their failure of genuine logic mainly after 9/11. George W. Bush's hell-like administration resembles Korstanje's claim of the open of "the doors for populist discourse, like Trump's one" (175). For Korstanje, it is vain and meaningless to blame ISIS's and their involvement in terrorist acts. Rather it is the western media that needs to be blamed for creating uncertainty in America. In other words, populists are "xenophobioic and racist" in nature (Norris and Inglehart 3). Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart write, "Populists have disrupted long-established patterns of party

competition in many contemporary Western society” who do not have “any core principle” of political experience (3). In the novel, Changez is in the trap of the populist Americans.

Hamid’s novel echoes the same tone of Derrida’s unconditional hospitality and Gideon Baker’s understanding that “no host has the right to close his door” (51). Regarding hospitality, Korstanje opines, “hospitality should be understood as an ancient inter-tribal pact oriented to scrutinize the otherness” (173). Baker quite clearly draws the scenario of the western hospitality that it became debatable from early modern to Kant and even till date. He finds that even Kant’s “tripartite system” of domestic law, international law and cosmopolitan law could not guarantee universal hospitality or unconditional hospitality (Baker 115). In that vein, Mohsin Hamid’s interrogation to the western civilization symbolizes the possibility of transcultural living. Changez’s final suggestion to the Americans that they should not blame all Pakistanis as “potential terrorists” and his assertion that the Pakistanis should not blame all the Americans as “undercover assassins” makes everyone aware that Muslims are ready to join hands with the Americans for global peace and harmony (183). Changez prefers to live in the environment of “Shared Intimacy” which is possible only in transcultural living but not in globalism or multiculturalism (184). Thus, shared intimacy is the key for transcultural living.

In conclusion, the research has attempted to prove that cosmopolitan justice has been replaced by hostility from the western world. As a result, true guests and hosts are yet to come in order to embrace all with the means of sharing intimacy, sharing pain and sharing emotional bonding or human element eschewing business intimacy. The practice of business intimacy of the Americans is seen in the distribution of business card or visiting card to the visitors or guests. The stranger has business cards in his pocket. He has not brought these cards to maintain inter-human relation. He has brought them in order to fulfill his business motives. For Hamid, a truly

hospitable home, known as transcultural home is the home which is equipped with transcultural ethics, transcultural hosts and transcultural guests, that is envisioned in this novel but it is yet to come. Quest for transcultural hospitality proves that Muslim immigrants are living the life with unstable identity or the identity of becoming.

Thus, this chapter has critically observed *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* in which Hamid has proposed Pakistan a true home, a perfect place for hospitality. Making a synoptical reading of the central characters Changez and the unnamed American guest You, Hamid proves that America is unfit as a guest. He also proves that America cannot be a true host either. Changez is compelled to return to Pakistan as a result of failure of America as a true host.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### CONCLUSION: CRITIQUE OF TRANSCULTURAL HOSPITALITY

#### IN POST 9/11 FICTION

Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* develops the theme of transcultural hospitality and calls for an end to both Muslim and American fundamentalisms. The ironic hiatus in guest-host interaction between Changez and the American stranger is quite vivid because he plays the role of perfect host in welcoming the American stranger in his homeland Pakistan but the Americans fail in hosting him in similar manner. The desire for shared intimacy, an emotional bonding of intimacy in the central character Changez, is shown throughout the novel which registers as a lack in the American guest. Instead, the American guest's fascination lies in business intimacy only, which limits his hospitableness. The ultimate quest in his novel is transcultural hospitality, transcultural guest and also transcultural host.

Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* also deals with host-guest relationship. His transnational imagination lies in his advocacy for glocalization for transcultural living with true hospitality. Rushdie makes a critique of America's division between local terrorism of Kashmir and global terrorism of 9/11 of America. He dismisses such a distinction and provides with an alternative approach of glocal terrorism as he asserts that the local affects the global. He seems to say that Kashmir's terrorism has global ramifications, that is, an offshoot from the bloody decolonization in 1947. Rather the cause of terrorism in Kashmir extends to western imperialism and the west's game plan of creating a bond of contention between independent India and Pakistan. Both Shalimar and Boonyi, a Muslim husband and Hindu wife respectively, have been victimized by Maximilian Ophuls, an American Ambassador to India. Boonyi represents mother India and Shalimar a Kashmiri Muslim. Her illegal possession by the Ambassador is the reason behind



Shalimar's so-called terrorist activities in America. Thus, Rushdie dramatizes glocal terrorism in *Shalimar the Clown*. The novel implicitly suggests that until and unless such a realization is drawn upon the Americans, America cannot remain immune from glocal terrorism. For true transculturalism to flourish in America the realization and the abandonment of neo-imperialist policies must be discontinued. His ultimate quest is globalization along with glocal guest and also glocal host.

Just like Rushdie's resistance of the America's notion of global terrorism, Kunzru resists transmission of America's fakeness. In *Transmission*, Kunzru resists fakeness of the Americans in post 9/11 era in order to live a peaceful life of transcultural hospitality. Such fakeness or neo-slavery is not just a challenge for others, rather it has been self-destructive for them.

Transcultural hospitality is still far from the threshold of western world because they are not still interested to end their fakeness and neo-slavery. For instance, the central character Arjun Mehta is not paid wages according to the agreement made before his departure to America. The novel highlights American's misbehaviour with Arjun Mehta. They tend to prove that Arjun Mehta is wrong and declare him the most wanted terrorist. As he finds not any positive sign from the Americans to ensure his demand, he creates Lila Virus to destroy their whole computing system. In overall analysis, Arjun Mehta's resistance is not a revolt against Americans as it seems so but it is his quest for genuine host and guest for hospitable living eliminating the other side of so-called globalism and multiculturalism.

Arjun Mehta's resistance for equal wages for Indian immigrants in America through *Transmission* resembles the resistance of the central character Chanu in *Brick Lane* for equal status of Bangladeshi immigrants in London. Ali, in *Brick Lane*, exposes racism or racial stereotyping experienced by Bangladeshi immigrants in multicultural London, starting

particularly from 1971 till post 9/11 phase in order to open the door for transcultural living. Instead of providing space for respectable living, the British people subject them to a prose of otherness. As a result immigrants are compelled to live the life of inferiority complex. Ali is not only sympathetic observing the pitiable condition of the Muslim immigrants and their donkey work in Tower Hamlets in London, she resists such injustice through writing. Ali makes a clear mission of creating transcultural home resisting the prose of otherness or racial stereotyping. The protagonist Nazneen is shown as a new woman who struggles hard for her family survival and happiness of her daughters. Ironically, Nazneen herself pretends to be happy in London but she has inexplicable pains and sufferings in her every effort. Nazneen suffers experiencing the bitter reality of multicultural London whereas her sister Hasina suffers dreaming about beautiful and happy life of London. Hasina's originality is lost after her parents die and her sister Nazneen leaves for London. Hasina faces numerous rapes, divorces and unemployment. Chanu returns to Bangladesh as he is unable to get respectable job according to his qualifications and capabilities. Nazneen and Hasina's parents are presented as the victims of first generation Muslim family who work throughout their life staying in Bangladesh but they are not free from colonialism and British domination. Bibi and Shahana, the daughters of Nazneen and Chanu have been innocently victims of British domination. Thus, Ali's message through the novel is her call for non – racist guests and host in order to create new home that looks fit for any generations of the immigrants. That is the home Monica Ali desires for hospitable living.

The questions of how and why these writers have gone through in order to develop the theme of transcultural hospitality is of critical importance. Ali presents three generations of Muslim immigrants who have been the victims of so- called multicultural London directly and indirectly. The protagonist's decision of the return in his homeland Bangladesh is his quest for

dignity and equal justice. The protagonist's call for the recognition of Indian education system and Indian civilization is also justifiable. For instance, the protagonist's qualification of Master Degree in English has been devalued in London and his children Shahana and Bibi are misguided in their schools because their teachers never teach about Eastern philosophy and Indian values. They never teach his children about Tagore and Gandhi. The whites of London are irresponsible and insincere about his family security. Similarly, Kunzru resists fake contract made by the American company which is designed for labour exploitation and profiling the immigrants in the status of slaves. Here also the protagonist's anger of creating Leela Virus is his resistance of global injustice. Rushdie's imagination of glocal world comes against western thought of so-called global terrorism and their labelling of Kashmir's terrorism as local and minor issue. The change in Shalimar not to murder Kashmira and his move from attack to defence and Kashmira's change from fire to ice clearly fulfills Rushdie's quest for glocalization. It is quite obvious that Hamid's novel is an experimentation of the westerners whether they are true host and guest or not. In the existing scenario, it has been found that America is failure both in the status of being true host and responsible guest. This is shown from Changez's own experience of being guest in America and America's misbehaviour of him as outsider. The role of Changez looks perfect in hosting the American guest in Pakistan but the arrival of American guest in Pakistan is strange because he has kept something made of metal secretly into his jacket. The business card he is holding also proves that Americans never feel free from business intimacy. In other words, Americans' conditional positioning both as guests and hosts is uncanny. Unconditional hospitality for them is a far cry.

The selected novels' common call lies in their quest for shared intimacy, new world order of glocalization, end of neo-slavery and racial stereotyping through Hamid's *The Reluctant*

*Fundamentalist*, Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*, Kunzru's *Transmission* and Ali's *Brick Lane* respectively. They all eschew conditional hospitality or the hospitality of invitation of the westerners, uncanny exposition of so-called globalism and multiculturalism, western world's fakeness and its transmission through media, vulnerable positioning of autoimmunity and rooted racism. The theoretical insights drawn from various theorists expose the common understanding for the formation of new world order of transcultural living. They are Epstein's transculturalism and transcultural identity following the rule of thumb and transformation, Derrida's unconditional hospitality or hospitality of visitation, Levinas's ethical hospitality through inter-human relationship and inter subjective relation being sincere and responsible, Rosello's Postcolonial hospitality embracing the principle of mutual metamorphosis, Mohr's transcultural embrace through reciprocity, multicultural cohabitation, Waldenfels's intercultural identity, Stuart Hall's metamorphic identity, Roudometof's glocalization and Jennifer M. Brinkerhoff's transnational identity. Similarly, Maximilian E. Korstanje's call for an inter-tribal pact and Gideon Baker's call for making the door open for the immigrants and critical overviews of various critics. These methodological and critical strands have been a great help for strengthening the knot of transcultural living and the conclusion drawn by these writers that the existing world of globalization is inhospitable to embrace all and their imagining of alternative new world order looks happy home for all irrespective their geographical, cultural, and political grounding. The selected novels, have given this message to the world that transcultural living should be full of hospitality.

American models of multiculturalism and globalism were expected as if they should have come as the pride of minority and mass culture both but it never happened so because of western world's embrace of determinism and their distancing position from free will. Everyone dreams of

globalism as it should come as the umbrella for the protection of all the differences but it just becomes the voice of the majority profiling all the communities of the minority groups as outsiders and others and blaming them terrorists instead. The conclusion developed from the analysis of these novels is seen twin in nature. They subvert prose of otherness as a counter discourse against representing and generalizing the Muslims as terrorist in the literature of 9/11 by the mainstream white American writers, on one hand and they all call for an alternative home with pure hospitality and absolute welcoming in order to embrace the differences, on the other. This is termed as unconditional hospitality by Rosello and Derrida both. Until and unless Muslims way of life is appreciated with their true recognition in the western world, hospitality never comes. So transcultural home seems to be the urgent need of the twenty first century or in post 9/11 phase in order to come out of the deterministic models of globalism and multiculturalism. Such new home known and pronounced differently -- as transcultural living, transnational hospitality, and the world of glocalization is assumed and expected happy home for all which will be new issue for future researchers as well.

The findings are drawn based on set objectives. It has been found that hospitality emerges as an important category in postcolonial thinking, a thinking of all embracing by the logic of “either –and” and addressing the fissures in post 9/11 multicultural American society in order to subvert western thinking with the logic of “either – or,” or the logic of excluding the differences. For postcolonial thinkers, an embracing of the “Other” and the immigrant as co-inhabitants is a must. The host- guest relationship turns out to be a problematic moment when hospitality is a mere lip service, that is when the “Other” is mistreated rather than protected. There exists an intersection between cultural differences and issues of white American world view, leading to

the formation of systems of hospitality clash. This condition, which can be undone by embracing the “Other”, exposes the fragility of hospitable and multicultural America.

So far as the contribution to knowledge concerns, the research concludes that 9/11 literature gives knowledge of misrepresentation and knowledge of true hospitable living. The new knowledge, which accrues from this study is that Americans merely trumpet to be fidel to the principles of hospitality and co- habitation in what they claim is a multicultural polity. However, as the analysis shows their adherence to these principles is not borne out by the practice of liberalism rather than a mere literalism of transcultural living. This analysis locates this line of thinking in postcolonial 9/11 novels but it will be interesting to explore, whether this limitation of American multiculturalism, is also available in the mainstream white American fictional responses to the trauma of 9/11.

Regarding the areas for further research, it will engage future researchers in judging 9/11 literature of the mainstream American writers as well as of South Asian diasporic writers in depth. The research will also help to encourage further researchers and academicians in judging the language of otherness or language of inhospitality and the language of hospitality extensively. Furthermore, the dissertation will work as a milestone for future researchers to research and find out more about how creative the postcolonial diasporic writers are in imagining alternative home of transcultural hospitality rather than engaging in the politics of mere resistance and stereotyping others. Last but not the least, the thesis can be a great asset for foreign policy makers as a support because the whole dissertation interrogates upon American foreign policy and its impact mainly from Bretton Woods Agreement till date in the third world countries like India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Afghanistan, Iraq and many more.

## Works Cited

- Abdel-Malek, Kamal, and Mouna El Kabla, editors. *America in an Arab Mirror: Images of America in Arab Travel Literature, 1668 to 9/11 and Beyond*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Agel, Jerome. *War and Peace in the Global Village: Marshall McLuhan Quentin Fiore*. Simon and Schuster Inc., 1989.
- Alexander, Claire. "Making Bengali Brick Lane: Claiming and Contesting Space in East London." *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 62, no. 2, 2011, pp. 201- 220.
- Ali, Monica. *Brick Lane*. Black Swan, 2003.
- Azm, Sadiq Jalal. "Islam, Terrorism, and the West." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, Vol. 25, no. 1, 2005, pp. 6- 15.
- Bachelor, Bob. "Literary Lions Tackle 9/11: Updike and DeLillo Depicting History through the Novel." Rev. of *Falling Man* and *Terrorist* by Don DeLillo and John Updike respectively. *Radical History Review*, no. 111 (Fall), 2011, pp. 175-183. Doi: 10.1215/01636545-1268785.
- Baelo-Allue, Sonia. "The Depiction of 9/11 in Literature: The Role of Images and Intermedial References." *Radical History Review*, 111 (Fall), 2011, pp. 184-193.
- Baker, Gideon, editor. *Hospitality and World Politics*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Balfour, Lindsay Annie. "Risky Cosmopolitanism: Intimacy and Autoimmunity in Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, vol.58, no.3, 2016, pp. 1- 12.
- Banita, Georgiana. *Plotting Justice: Narrative Ethics and Literary Culture after 9/11*. University Of Nebraska press, 2012.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. *Liquid Modernity*. Polity Press, 2000.

- Beigbeder, Frederic. *Windows on the World*. Folio, 2003.
- Bell, Lenore. *The "Other" in 9/11 Literature*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Berry, Ellen E. and Mikhail N. Epstein. *Transcultural Experiments: Russian and American Models of Creative Communication*. St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Biggam, John. *Succeeding with your Master's Dissertation: A Step-by-Step handbook*. Open University Press, 2008.
- Bond, Lucy. "Compromised Critique: A Meta-Critical Analysis of American Studies After 9/11." *Journal of American Studies*, Vol. 45, no. 4, 2011, pp.733-756.
- , *Frames of Memory after 9/11: Culture, Criticism, Politics, and Law*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Bradley, Arthur and Andrew Tate. *The New Atheist Novel: Fiction, Philosophy and Polemic After 9/11*. Continuum International Publishing Group, 2010.
- Braz, Albert. "9/11, 9/11: Chile and Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, vol. 42, no. 3, 2015, pp. pp. 241-256.
- Braziel, Jana Evans and Anita Mannur, editors. *Theorizing Diaspora: A Reader*, Blackwell Publishing, 2003.
- Brenkman, John. *The cultural Contradictions of Democracy: Political Thought Since September 11*. Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M. *Digital Diasporas: Identity and Transnational Engagement*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Brock, Richard. "An onerous Citizenship": Globalization, cultural flows and HIV/AIDS Pandemic in Hari Kunzru's *Transmission*." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, Vol. 44, no. 4, 2008, pp. 379- 390.
- Brouillette, Sarah. "Literature and Gentrification on *Brick Lane*." *Criticism*, vol. 51, no. 3, 2009,



pp. 425- 449.

Callier, Bernadette. "Totality and Infinity, Alterity, and Relation: From Levinas to Glissant."

*Journal of French and Francophone Philosophy*, Vol. XIX, no.1, 2011, pp.135-151.

Carroll, Hamilton. "September 11 as Heist." *Journal of American Studies*, Vol. 45, no. 4, 2011,

pp. 835-851.

Cavallaro, Giusi. *Exploring Grammar in Context: Upper Intermediate and Advanced*. Cambridge

University Press, 2000.

Chakravorty, Mrinalini. "Brick Lane Blockades: The Bioculturalism of Migrant Domesticity."

*MFS Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 58, no.3, 2012, pp. 503-528.

Cohen, Robin. *Global Diaspora: An Introduction*. Routledge, 2008.

Cormac, Alistair. "Migration and the Politics of Narrative Form: Realism and the Postcolonial

Subject in *Brick Lane*." *Contemporary Literature*, vol.47, no. 4, 2006, pp. 695-721.

Cowburn, John SJ. *Free Will, Predestination and Determinism*. Marquette University Press,

2008.

Croes, Rob. "The Ascent of the Falling Man: Establishing a Picture's Iconicity." *Journal of*

*American Studies*, Vol. 45 (2011), e47. Doi: 10.1017/Soo21875811000995.

Crownshaw, Richard. "Deterritorializing the "Homeland" in American Studies and American

Fiction after9/11." *Journal of American Studies*, Vol. 45, no. 4, 2011, pp. 757-776.

Damai, Puspa. "Messianic-City: Ruins, Refuge and Hospitality in Derrida." *Discourse* Vol. 27,

no. 2/3: MLA International Bibliography (Spring) 2005. pp. 68-94.

Darda, Joseph. "Precarious world: Rethinking Global Fiction in Mohsin Hamid's *The*

*Reluctant Fundamentalist*." *Mosaic: a journal for the interdisciplinary Study of*

*Literature*, vol. 47, no.3, 2014. Pp. 107- 122.

Davis, Walter A. *Death's Dream Kingdom: The American Psyche since 9-11*. Pluto Press, 2006.

Delillo, Don. *Falling Man*. Scribner, 2007.

Derrida, Jacques. *Dessimination*. Trans. Barbara Johnson. The Athlone Press, 1981.

---. *Aporias*. Trans. Thomas Dutoit. Standford University Press, 1993.

---. "Hostipitality." *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities*, Vol.5, no. 3, 2000, pp. 3-18.

---. *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle invites Jacques Derrida to respond*. Translated by Rachel Bowlby, Stanford Up, 2000.

---. *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. Mark Dooley and Michael Hughes. Routledge, 2001.

---. "Autoimmunity: Real and Symbolic Suicide." Translated by Pascale- Anne Braut and Michael Naas. *Philosophy in the Time of Terror*, Chicago UP, 2003, pp. 85-136.

---. *Rogue: Two Essays on Reason*. Trans. Pascal Anne- Braut and Michael Naas. Stanford UP, 2005.

Desai, Kiran. *The Inheritance of Loss*. Atlantic Monthly Press, 2006.

Epstein, Mikhail. "Transculture: A Broad Way between Globalism and Multiculturalism." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, vol. 68, no.1 (Jan.) 2009, pp. 327-51.

Estevez-Saa, Margarita and Noemi Pereira-Ares. "Trauma and Transculturalism in Contemporary Fictional Memories of 9/11." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, Vol. 57, no. 3, 2016, pp. 268-278.

Fernandez-Kelly, Patricia. "On *Shalimar the Clown*." *Sociological Forum*, vol. 24, no. 2, 2009, pp. 471- 474.

Filipeczak, Iwona. "Immigrant to a Terrorist: On Liquid Fears in Hari Kunzru's

- Transmission.*” *Brno Studies in English*, vol.40, no.2, 2014, pp. 67- 76.
- Foer, Jonathan Safran. *Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close*. Houghton Mifflin, 2005.
- Fragopoulos, George, et al., editors. *Terror in Global Narrative: Representations of 9/11 in the Age of Late-Late Capitalism*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Frank, Svenja, editor. *9/11 in European Literature: Negotiating Identities Against the Attacks and What Follows*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Franzen, Jonathan. *Freedom*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010.
- Friedl, John. *The Human Portrait: Introduction to Cultural Anthropology*. Prentice – Hall, Inc., 1981.
- Geesey, Patricia. “Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest by Mireille Rosello.” *Research in African Literature*, vol. 34, no. 3 (Autumn), 2003, pp 215- 217.
- Gray, Richard. *After the Fall: American Literature since 9/11*. A John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2011.
- Greenblatt, Stephen J. and Giles Gunn, editors. *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Studies*, MLA, 1992.
- Griffin, Gabriele, editor. *Research Methods for English Studies*. Edinburgh University Press, 2005.
- Grusin, Richard. *Premediation: Affect and Mediality after 9/11*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Haider, Nishat. “Globalization, US Imperialism and Fundamentalism: A Study of Mohsin Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*.” *South Asian Review*, vol.33, no.2, 2012, pp. 203- 238.
- Hamid, Mohsin. *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*. Penguin Books, 2007.

- Hartnell, Anna. "Moving through America: Race, Place and Resistance in Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, Vol. 46, no. 3-4, 2010, pp. 336- 348.
- Haslett, Adam. *Union Atlantic*. Nan A. Talese, 2009.
- Hellinger, Daniel C. *Conspiracies and Conspiracy Theories in the Age of Trump*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
- Hiddleston, Jane. "Shapes and Shadows: (Un) veiling the Immigrant in Monica Ali's Brick Lane." *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 40, no. 57, 2005, pp. 57-72.
- Hoffman, Paul. "Human Rights and Terrorism." *Human Rights Quarterly*, Vol. 26, no. 4, 2004, pp. 932- 955.
- Holloway, David. *9/11 and the War on Terror: Affect and Mediality after 9/11*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Ilott, Sarah. "Generic Frameworks and Active Readership in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*." *Journal of postcolonial writing*, vol. 50, no.5, 2014, pp. 571- 583.
- Iyer, Nalini. "Rushdie's Shalimar the Clown, National Allegory, and Kashmiriat." *South Asian Review*, vol.35, no.1, 2014, pp. 125- 137.
- Jacobs, Keith, et al., editors. *Philosophy and the city: Interdisciplinary and Transcultural Perspectives*. Rowman and Little Field International, 2019.
- Johansen, Emily. "Becoming the virus: Responsibility and Cosmopolitan Labor in Hari Kunzru's *Transmission*." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, Vol. 49, no. 4, 2013, pp. 419- 431.
- Kaffus, Ken. *A Disorder Peculiar to the Country*. Harper Collins, 2006.
- Kanwal, Aroosa. *Rethinking Identities in Contemporary Pakistani Fiction*. Palgrave

- Macmillan, 2015.
- Keeble, Arin. *The 9/11 Novel: Trauma, Politics and Identity*. McFarland & Company, Inc, 2014.
- Khan, Sobia. "Alienated Muslim Identity in the Post-9/11 America: A Transnational Study of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*." *South Asian Review*, Vol. 36, no. 3, 2015, pp. 141-160.
- Kimberley, Emma. "Politics and Poetics of Fear after 9/11: Claudia Rankine's *Don't Let Me Be Lonely*." *Journal of American Studies*, Vol. 45, no. 4, 2011, pp. 777-791.
- Klein, Giovanna Borradori. *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*. University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Korstanje, Maximiliano E. *Terrorism, Tourism and the End of Hospitality in the 'WEST'*. Palgrave Macmillan (Springer International Publishing AG), 2018.
- Kral, Françoise. "Shaky Ground and New Territorialities in Brick Lane by Monica Ali and The Namesake by Jhumpa Lahiri." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, vol.43, no. 1, 2007, pp. 65-76.
- Kristopher K. Robinson, et al. "Ideologies of violence: The Social origins of Islamist and Leftist Transnational Terrorism." *Social Forces*, Vol. 84, no. 4, 2006, pp. 2009-2026.
- Kunzru, Hari. *Transmission*. Hamish Hamilton, Penguin, 2004.
- Lau, Lisa. "Post-9/11 re-orientalism: Confrontation and Conciliation in Mohsin Hamid's and Mira Nair's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*." *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 53, no.5. 2016, pp. 1-14.
- Lechner, Frank J., et al., editors. *The Globalization Reader*. Wiley Blackwell, 2015.
- Leonard, Philip. "A Revolution in Code? Hari Kunzru's *Transmission* and the Cultural Politics

- Of Hacking.” *Textual Practice*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2014, pp. 267-287.
- Levinas, Immanuel. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Trans. Duquesne UP, 1969.
- . *Ethics and Infinity*. Trans. Richard A. Cohen. Duquesne University Press, 1985.
- Liao, Pei- Chen. *‘Post’-9/11 South Asian Diasporic Fiction*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- . *Post-9/11 Historical Fiction and Alternate History Fiction: Transnational and Multidirectional Memory*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2020.
- LP Centre. “9 Hospitality Ethics Every Professional Should Know.” LP Centre, 9 Oct, 2020.
- <https://www.lpcentre.com/articles/9-hospitality-ethics-every-professional-should-know>.
- Accessed 15 July 2023.
- Lune, Howard, and Bruce L. Berg. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*, Pearson, 2017.
- Madiou, Mohamed Salah Eddine. “Mohsin Hamid Engages the world in the *Reluctant Fundamentalist*: “An Island on an Island,” Worlds in Miniature and “Fiction” in the Making.” *Arab Studies Quarterly*, vol. 41, no. 4, 2019, pp. 271 -297.
- Marrouchi, Mustapha. “Introduction: Colonialism, Islamism, Terrorism.” *College Literature*, Vol. 30, no.1, 2003, pp. 6- 55.
- Matar, Hisham. *In the Country of Men*. Viking Press, 2006.
- McCarthy, Cormac. *The Road*. Picador, 2006.
- McClanahan, Annie. “Future’s Shock: Plausibility, Preemption, And the Fiction of 9/11.” *Symploke* Vol. 17, no. 1-2, 2009, pp. 41-62.
- McEwan, Ian. *Saturday*. Random House, 2005.
- McInerney, Jay. *The Good Life*. Alfred A. Knopf Books, 2006.
- McQuillan, Martin. *Deconstruction After 9/11*. Routledge, 2009.

- Melnick, Jeffrey. *9/11 Culture: America Under Construction*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2009.
- Messud, Claire. *The Emperor Children*. Knopf, 2006.
- Miller, Cheryl. "9/11 and the Novelists." *Commentary*, Vol. 126, no. 5, 2008, pp. 32-35.
- Miller, Kristine A., editor. *Transatlantic Literature and Culture After 9/11: The Wrong Side of Paradise*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Mohr, M. Dunja, editor. *Embracing the Other: Addressing Xenophobia in the New Literatures in English*. Ropodi, 2008.
- Molz, Jennie Germann and Sarah Gibson (Eds.). *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*. Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007.
- Morey, Peter. "The rules of the game have changed: Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and Post-9/11 Fiction." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, vol. 47, no. 2, 2011, pp. 135-146.
- Morley, Catherine. "How do we write about That ?" The Domestic and the Global in the Post-9/11 Novel. " *Journal of American Studies*, Vol. 45, no. 4, 2011, pp. 717-731.
- Morton, Stephen. "There were collisions and explosions. The world was no longer calm: Terror and precarious life in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*." *Textual Practices*, vol. 22, no. 2, 2008, pp. 337-335.
- M. Naydan, Liliana. *Rhetorics of Religion in American Fiction: Faith, Fundamentalism, and Fanaticism in the Age of Terror*. Bucknett University Press, 2016.
- Munos, Delphine. "Possessed by whiteness: Interracial affiliations and racial melancholia in Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, Vol. 48, no. 4, 2012, pp. 396- 405.

- Nadel, Alan. "Falling Man's Descent into Meaning: A Response to Rob Kroes." *Journal of American Studies*, Vol. 45, no. 4, 2011, 16-20.
- Norris, Pippa, and Ronald Inglehart. *Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism*. Sheridan Books, Inc, 2019.
- O'Gorman, Daniel. *Fictions of the War on Terror: Difference and the Transnational 9/11 Novel*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- O' Neill, Joseph. *Netherland*. Harper Perennial, 2008.
- Orvell, Miles. "Against Iconicity: Photography and 9/11: A Response to Rob Kroes." *Journal of American Studies*, vol. 45, no. 4, 2011, pp. 11-15.
- Oscherwitz, Dayna. "Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest by Mireille Rosello." *Substance*, Issue 104, vol. 33, no. 2, 2004, pp.161-165.
- Pease, Donald. E. "9/11: When was American Studies After the New Americanists?" *Boundary*, Vol. 233, no. 3, 2006, pp. 73-101.
- . *The New American Exceptionalism*. University of Minnesota Press, 2009.
- Perfect, Michael. "The Multicultural Bildungsroman: Stereotypes in Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, Vol. 43, no. 3, 2008, pp. 109-120.
- Pickering, Michael, editor. *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*. Edinburgh University Press, 2008.
- Pitkin, Annabella. "Salman Rushdie Loses His Cheerfulness: Geopolitics, Terrorism and Adultery." *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 61, no.1, 2007, pp. 257-262.
- Poon, Angelia. "To know what's what: Forms of Migrant Knowing in Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*." *Journal of Postcolonial writing*, Vol. 45, no. 4, 2009, pp. 426-437.
- Porter, Patrick. *The Global Village Myth: Distance, War, and the limits of Power*. Georgetown



- University Press, 2015.
- Redfield, Marc. "Virtual Trauma: The Idiom of 9/11." *Diacritics*, Vol. 37, no. 1, 2007, pp. 55-80.
- Rezaie, Ali. "Cultural dislocation in Monica Ali's Brick Lane: Freedom or anomie?" *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 51, no.1, 2014, pp. 1-14.
- Roeper, Richard. *Debunked! Conspiracy Theories, Urban Legends, and Evil Plots of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Chicago Review Press, 2008.
- Rosello, Mireille. *Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest*. Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Roudometof, Victor. *Glocalization: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge, 2016.
- Roupakia, Lydia Efthymia. "Cosmopolitanism, religion and ethics: Rereading Monica Ali's Brick Lane." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, vol. 52, no.6, 2016, pp. 1-14.
- Roy, Bidhan. "From Brick Lane to Bradford: Contemporary Literature and the Production of South Asian Identity in Britain." *South Asian Review*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2007, pp. 106-122.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Shalimar the Clown*. Vintage Books, 2005.
- Sachs, Jeffrey D. *The Ages of Globalization: Geography, Technology, and Institutions*. Columbia University Press, 2020.
- Saukko, Paula. *Doing Research in Cultural Studies: An Introduction to Classical and New Methodological Approaches*. Sage Publications, 2003.
- Sayyid, Mustafa Al. "Mixed Message: The Arab and Muslim Response to Terrorism." *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 25, no. 2, 2002, pp. 177-190.
- Scanlan, Margaret. "Migrating from terror: The Postcolonial novel after September 11." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, Vol. 46, no. 3-4, 2010, pp. 266-278.
- Schwartz, Sharon. *Writing on the wall*. Counterpoint, 2005.

- Scraton, Phil, editor. *Beyond September 11: An Anthology of Dissent*. Pluto Press, 2002.
- Seidler, Victor Jeleniewski. *Remembering 9/11: Terror, Trauma and Social Theory*. Palgrave, 2013.
- Seval, Aysem. "(Un) tolerated Neighbour: Encounters with the Tolerated Other in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist and The Submission*." *ariel: a review of international English literature*, vol. 48, no. 2, 2017, pp. 101-125.
- Sharma, Mukul. "Reconstructing Transnational Identities in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*." *IJELLH: International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*, vol. 3, no. 10, 2015, pp. 62-75.
- Sharma, Phurailatpam Sanamacha. "Contesting Globalization in Hari Kunzru's *Transmission*." *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*, vol. 2, no. 3, 2014, pp. 22-34.
- Shelden, Ashley T. "Cosmopolitan love: The love and the World in Hari Kunzru's *Transmission*." *Contemporary Literature*, vol. 53, no. 2, 2012, pp. 348- 373.
- Shepherd, Andrew. *The Gift of the Other: Levinas, Derrida, and a Theology of Hospitality*. UK: James Clarke & Co, 2014.
- Shepherd, David. "Transcultural Experiments: Russian and American Models of Creative Communication by Ellen E. Berry; Mikhail N. Epstein." *Slavic Review*, vol. 60, no. 2, 2001, pp. 460-462.
- Sherman, Alexie. *Flight*. Black Cat, 2007.
- Shirazi, Quratulain. "Ambivalent identities and liminal spaces: reconfiguration of national and diasporic identity in Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*." *South Asian Diaspora*, vol. 10, no.1, 2018, pp. 15- 29.

- Shiva, Vandana. "Ecological Balance in an Era of Globalization." *The Globalization Reader*, edited by Frank J. Lechner and John Boli. Wiley Blackwell, 2015, pp.566- 574.
- Siddiqi, Yumna. "Power smashes into private lives: Violence, Globalization and Cosmopolitanism in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*." *South Asia Research*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2007, pp. 293- 309.
- Silverman, David, editor. *Qualitative Research: Issues of Theory, Method and Practice*. SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd, 2012.
- Sinha, Kamaljit. "Deconstructing Patriarchal Structures in Mahasweta Devi's "Draupadi." *European Journal of English language and literature studies*, vol. 4, no. 5, 2016, pp. 1-4.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Writing and Sexual Difference in "Draupadi." by Mahasweta Devi." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1981, pp. 381-402.
- Stadtler, Florian. "Terror, globalization and the individual in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, vol. 45, no. 2, 2009, pp. 191-199.
- Svenja, Frank, editor. *9/11 in European Literature*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Turk, Austin T. "Sociology of Terrorism." *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 30, 2004, pp. 271-86.
- Updike, John. *Terrorist*. Penguin Books, 2006.
- Ustinova, Irena. "Transcultural Experiments: Russian and American Models of Creative Communication by Ellen E. Berry; Mikhail N. Epstein." *American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages*, vol. 44, no. 4, 2000, pp. 667-669.
- Waldenfels, Bernhard. *Phenomenology of the Alien: Basic Concepts*. Trans. Alexander Kozin and Tanja Stahler. Northwestern University Press, 2011.
- Waldman, Amy. *The Submission*. Macmillan Picador, 2011.

Walker, Joseph S. "A Kink in the System: Terrorism and the Comic Mystery Novel." *Studies in the Novel*, Vol. 36, no. 3, 2004, pp. 336-351.

Westwell, Guy. "Reading the Pain of Others: Scenarios of Obligation in Post-9/11 US Cinema." *Journal of American Studies*, Vol. 45, no. 4, 2011, pp. 815-34.

White, Mandala. "Framing Travel and Terrorism: Allegory in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*." *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 54, no. 3, 2017, pp. 1- 16.

Winegar, Jessica. "The Humanity Game: Art, Islam, and the War on Terror." *Anthropological Quarterly*, Vol. 81, no. 3, 2008, pp. 651 -81.

Woltmann, Suzy. "She did not notice me: Gender, Anxiety, and Desire in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*." *Humanities*, Vol. 7, no. 104, 2018, pp. 1-7.

Zelizer, Barbie, et al., editors. *Journalism After September 11*. Routledge, 2002.