

## **Chapter-I: Salman Rushdie, *Shalimar the Clown* and Issue of Globalization**

This research problematizes the concept of globalization in terms of Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* in which Pakistani and Muslims are presented as terrorists. Shalimar is victimized by the narrow-mindedness of American policy and politics within the space of globalized territories societies. This novel questions the biased representation of Muslim people as the 'Other'. The stereotypes and prejudice constructed by the western policies about non-western people, especially Muslims, are the main focus of the study. Rushdie illustrates the picture of Kashmiri people who are described as violent and terrorist by the western diplomats and behaves accordingly. So this research is an attempt to show the politics of globalization dominated by American Imperialism and its agents like Maximillian Ophuls generates with in itself an option of fundamentalism.

Literature is, in part, the business of finding new angles in order to enter reality; but any account, whether it is given the status of history or fiction, is a reinterpretation, an attempt to read significance into events according to a selected frame of reference. Rushdie takes some points to reveal the interests at stake in choosing one frame of reference over another. Ginny Dougary in his essay "The Incredible Lightness of Salman" argues that *Shalimar the Clown* is a lamentation on the loss of a harmonious and peaceful world:

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

was Kashmir. (2)

In *Shalimar the Clown*, we see the annihilation of the idea of Kashmir as it is caught between violent and opposing political interests. Here too, it is the ordinary village Kashmir which suffers and dies as a result of antagonisms that are fostered and manipulated by distant national leaders in pursuit of equally distant national ideals.

Rushdie's novel asserts the need to recognize the honorable, even utopian, intentions behind the post-war allied efforts to impose a global consensus or creating a global village. However, the novel also emphasizes the need to recognize those initially honorable intentions which have gone sour, or at least been kidnapped and corrupted by forces that are more pragmatic and cynical. Hence Max Ophuls, hero of the wartime resistance, whose parents have died in concentration camps, and who started his political career as an idealist and optimist, finds himself, at the height of the Cold War, defending the American idea of a free world by manipulating religious factionalism in unstable regions, and engaging in covert, strategic arms deals with the Taliban and al-Qaeda. "Ambassador Max Ophuls," the narrator keenly observes, "these days was supporting terror activities while calling himself an ambassador for counterterrorism" (272). During the post cold war, America is taking keen interest in Muslim affairs and realizing the threat from Muslim community, it is focusing on the concept of global village. To unveil this politics, Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* has become very prolific.

The novel questions what we normally understand as 'fact' or 'truth'; again this is a way of blurring the boundary between real and fantasy to create a voice outside the discourse of mainstream countries. Rushdie tries to break the binary by using a very different kind of narrative, a mixture of an oral narrative style with all the colloquialisms typical of that style, on the one hand, and a very formal style typical of

written language on the other. These elements serve to place the novel outside the Western tradition, even though it uses a language, English and a format, the novel which are central to the western literary cannon. By using these techniques, Rushdie is also giving voice to the marginalized people, in this case, to the so-called Muslim terrorists.

While giving space to the marginalized, Rushdie in this novel has also critiqued the inside politics of Western countries like America regarding globalization which has been working as a means to American imperialism. Focusing on the political relevance of the novel, critic Ron Charles writes:

*Shalimar the Clown* seems to have allowed Rushdie the time and space to sublimate his terrors into a story of deep humanity and unsettling insight. . . Yes, Rushdie has written an intensely political novel, infused with recent events, but its emotional scope reaches so far beyond our current crisis and its vision into the vagaries of the heart is so perceptive that one can imagine *Shalimar the Clown* being read long after this age of sacred terror has faded into history. (5)

What are simple, and in the pages of *Shalimar the Clown* most wrenching and final, are Rushdie's descriptions of the destruction of paradise. There is nothing cutesy here, no pages of puns to hide the naked pain of the horrors that one house can inflict on another, but simple, extraordinary writing. In the tradition of Shakespeare and the Mahabarata, stories about people are stories about countries and vice versa, and these stories have lived in our midst for years. If the world is only now waking up to old stories of terror and destruction it is, perhaps, because white people are losing their heads in western cities.

*Shalimar the Clown* gives us a vivid, if not always realistic, picture of Kashmir. At first, Hindus and Muslims live in harmony, a tolerant tribalism ensures the marriage of the young lovers, Muslim Shalimar and beautiful Boonyi, the daughter of a Hindu pandit. When destructive, anti-social desires for sex, power and food arise, they are mediated by a ritual folk theatre. All this is undone by the twin forces of nationalism and religious fundamentalism. As usual in Rushdie's novels, these forces are not the enemies of enlightenment as much as they are the enemies of freedom, and that means they are the enemies of the natural. Having shown the reader the first Kashmir, Rushdie must also destroy it. This only can provide the authentic resistance for globalization. When Boonyi, transplanted from Pachigam to Delhi grows bloated and ugly from neglect and despair, she turns on Max with a speech which, in fact, is an attack on the globalization of America:

Look at me, she was saying. I am your handiwork made flesh. You took beauty and created hideousness, and out of this monstrosity your child will be born. Look at me. I am the meaning of your deeds. I am the meaning of your so-called love, your destructive, selfish, wanton love. Look at me. Your love looks just like hatred. I never spoke of love, she was saying. I was honest and you have turned me into your lie. This is not me. This is not me. This is you. (205)

In this instance, Western interest in Kashmir is ciphered by American Ambassador to Kashmir, Maximilian Ophuls, who in his younger days fought in the resistance against the Nazis, but who latterly has become a secret negotiator for American interests around the globe. His involvement in Kashmir is registered through his impact upon the lives of Boonyi, whom he seduces, impregnates and abandons, and the eponymous Shalimar, her husband, who, disillusioned by the loss of his wife,

becomes involved in guerrilla conflict. Having trained in Afghanistan using weapons that Ophuls has himself provided when the US was covertly arming Islamic terrorists after the Russian invasion in 1979, Shalimar becomes an assassin in Europe and the US, and finally murders Ophuls on the doorstep of his daughter's apartment block.

Yet, as his writings on Kashmir and, more recently in the *Times* of London, on Islamic fundamentalism demonstrate, Rushdie is a writer intensely immersed in a world less finely created than literature. Metaphor is a dangerous weapon, he suggests, often imperfectly used especially if the motives themselves are imperfect. The origins of war, the origins of terrorism are complex subjects, and in *Shalimar the Clown*, Rushdie avoids placing easy blame on America. Max Ophuls is neither Uncle Sam nor Elder of Zion. Boonyi is not Kashmir. And *Shalimar the Clown*, Shalimar the Vengeful Lover, Shalimar the Assassin, is no simple subway bomber.

Frantz Fanon also comments upon similar issue: "All round me the white man, above the sky tears at its novel, the earth rasps under my feet, and there is a white song. All this whiteness that burns me [...]" (112). The orient people are fixed by the colonial discourse and they misrepresent their social phenomena according to the Western taste. The westerners internalize the ideology and hegemonies the non-west through different factors and globalization is the latest one. The various combinations, blends, and fusions of the seemingly opposed and incompatible, processes such as homogenization and fragmentation, globalization and localization, universalism, and particularism indicate the problem entailed in attempts to conceive the glocal in terms of singular integrated and unified conceptual framework. Arjuna Appadurai has rejected such attempts at theoretical integration to argue that global order must be understood as a complex, overlapping order. It can be conceived as involving sets of flows; of people, technology, finance, media images and ideas (33). Therefore the

notion of belonging defined physical proximity and emotional attachment is under attack for everywhere.

In this novel also to show the resistance, Rushdie gives the clear picture about how the West tries to misrepresent non-West. The westerns' representation is, obviously, subjective and their personal experience reflects what they absorb from the totality of the images. The agents of representation always play a discursive and hegemonic role. Rajeswary Sundar Rajan emphasizes the paradox between the real meaning of representation and the politics associated with it. She states: "[. . .] representation is something other than the 'representation of reality'. It is rather, an autonomous structure of meaning a code of system of signs that refers not to 'reality' but to the materiality of codes system and signs themselves" (167). The production of otherness is essential for West for its own existence. Their representation is, obviously, subjective and their personal experience reflects what they absorb from the totality of the images.

Rushdie is writing in a modern post-colonial context about India since Independence and the subsequent evolution of Pakistan and Bangladesh. He is engaged in acts of reclamations as they reread and rewrite the past. He reads history in a different way from those people actually involved, and distanced from the history. Rushdie is "out of country" (being an Indian but living in north London while writing about contemporary Indian history), so that he is forced to deal in broken mirrors, some of whose fragments have been irretrievably lost. His fiction is imaginative recreations, which he describes in very similar ways that he is actually doing of memory and about memory, so that his India was just that his India, a version and no more than one version of all the hundreds of millions of possible versions.

The versions of history proliferate endlessly, every version being a provisional

reconstruction, though as Rushdie would agree the broken mirror may actually be as valuable as the one which is supposedly unflawed, in the sense that it is never possible to know all the facts about anything, even the smallest act. On one side is the author as the knight of free speech, someone whose style, by its very audacity, makes tyrants quake and makes critics, those petty tyrants of the literary world, pound their keyboards in envious frustration. On the other, stands the novelist as a chronicler of injustice, a person whose heroic status derives from an ability to make us feel and understand the distress of people who are too far away or too hidden from our everyday life. Regardless of the proliferation of news reports, or even because of it, the novel has a role to play in enlarging our awareness of suffering and its causes. These two roles for authors are not necessarily incompatible, but, in Rushdie's case, they have become so. We may blame the effects of the fatwa, or the premature canonization of Rushdie's style by university academics as a revolutionary performance of anti-nationalist, anti-fundamentalist, counter-hegemonic "hybridity", though the flaw may have been there from the beginning, a frayed rope straining to cross an abyss between pleasure and responsibility.

*Shalimar the Clown* is nearly that much needed thing: a tragic novel about the growth of a terrorist's mind in one of those rogue regions of the world. Wasn't it supposed to bring us the news about the fate of Kashmir, the origins of global Islamic terrorism and the resentments caused by the careless lust and greed of great powers? We find it so hard to grasp the motives for suicidal violence that any attempt to imagine them would be welcome. Instead, the novel is by turns satire, old-fashioned revenge romance and Hollywood action movie, and it seems to flaunt its determination to put as much padding as possible between readers and feelings. There

is no doubt that this novel brings anti-terrorist awareness and at the same time more forcefully resistance to totalitarian concept of globalization.

This thesis is divided into four chapters. The first chapter of this research is about the introduction of the research and the background of the author and his works. The Second chapter is about the methodology to prove this research as the hypothesis demands. There is the brief discussion about the elements related to the postcolonialism. Chapter three is all about textual analysis mainly focusing on the postcolonial views of the text. Finally the chapter four will conclude the explanation and arguments put forward in the preceding chapters.

## **Chapter-II**

### **Representation and Politics of Globalization**

#### **Globalization**

Human societies across the globe have established progressively closer contacts over many centuries, but recently the pace has dramatically increased. Jet airplanes, cheap telephone service, email, computers, huge oceangoing vessels, instant capital flows, all these have made the world more interdependent than ever.

Multinational corporations manufacture products in many countries and sell to consumers around the world. Money, technology and raw materials move ever more swiftly across national borders. Along with products and finances, ideas and cultures circulate more freely. As a result, laws, economies, and social movements are forming at the international level. Many politicians, academics, and journalists treat these trends as both inevitable and (on the whole) welcome. But for billions of the world's people, business-driven globalization means uprooting old ways of life and threatening livelihoods and cultures. The global social justice movement, itself a product of globalization, proposes an alternative path, more responsive to public needs. Intense political disputes will continue over globalization's meaning and its future direction.

Globalization is a term used to describe a global society of people connected by commerce, trade, diplomacy and technology. The Internet has enabled virtually anyone, anywhere in the world the means of accessing information and therefore our world has, figuratively become smaller. Ashcroft et al. view as:

Globalization is the process whereby individual lives and local communities are affected by economic and cultural forces that operate world-wide. In effect it is I the process of world becoming a single

place. Globalization is the Is the perception of the world as a function or result of the processes of globalization upon local communities.

{110)

Globalization leads to homogenization of the culture. It increases contact with others other culture, other nation, other language. In contact with other it often paves the way of deconstruction of culture. On an economic level, the conception of globalization influences international currencies and exchange rates in support of global rather than local economies. One of the clearest manifestations of economic globalization takes place in terms of transnational corporation. Globalization also pertains to the increased need for cultural awareness and sensitivity, as our accessibility to various cultural practices and languages is facilitated by international travel, the internet and currency exchange.

Throughout history, adventurers, generals, merchants, and financiers have constructed an ever-more-global economy. Today, unprecedented changes in communications, transportation, and computer technology have given the process new impetus. As globally mobile capital reorganizes business firms, it sweeps away regulation and undermines local and national politics. Globalization creates new markets and wealth, even as it causes widespread suffering, disorder, and unrest. It is both a source of repression and a catalyst for global movements of social justice and emancipation. These materials look at the main features of globalization, asking what is new, what drives the process, how it changes politics, and how it affects global institutions like the UN.

The community is urged to pay attention to new strategies in order to include the voices of individual or group traditionally silenced by the dominant group. For the creation of a global society, individuals are responsible for recognizing and respecting

difference while striving to attain equal opportunity for all. There is an assumption of a stable homogeneous and integrated cultural identity, which is both enduring and unique. In this sense it is often assumed that members of a locality form distinctive community with its own unique culture. This kind of community helps cultivate myths of belonging, organic, warmth and emotional attachment. Usually when we think of locality we have in mind a relatively small place in which everyone can know everyone else.

The contemporary world has not seen cultural impoverishment or shrinking of cultural resources. According to Jorge Larrain: "There has been an extension of cultural repertoires and an enhancement of the resourcefulness of various groups to create new symbolic modes of affiliation" (154). Larrain argues that, global culture is essentially the "third culture" is equal to the collectively of the nation states. The increasingly progressive movement of global relations implies that there is or will be a unified world society or culture something akin to the social structure of a nation state and its national culture. It is not possible to refer to the development of a global culture in a less totality sense by referring; to the basic logic of globalization.

### **Representation**

This researcher simply considers the politics associated with the very concept of representation in different circumstances. Therefore the condition of the represented whether they can speak or not within particular social structure is still another great problem in the field of representation.

The term 'representation' is always related to the notion of interpretation that pervades each and every cultured phenomenon. A postcolonial study incorporates the problem of representation in colonial writing under its subject of study. In this context, who does the representing is more important than what is being represented

because of the unequal distribution of power among cultures, and that ultimately affects representation of one culture by the other, what is obvious is that representation does not take place in a social vacuum. Regarding the same issue, Stephen Slemon has quoted Edward Said as: "What brought that purely conceptual space into being, argue Said, is a European style of thought based on an ontological and epistemological distinction" made between the Orient and the Occident (111-112).

When non-western world is being represented in literacy texts, it fulfills the western interest and purpose because of the western hegemony. Even if the westerners claim for representing the non-westerners or "others" in the response of the non-westerners, a substantive acting for representation becomes impossible because the western hegemony compels the others to accept their inferior condition in relation to the west. Rajeswary Sundar Rajan emphasizes the paradox between the real meaning of represent and the politics associated with it she states:

[. . .] representation is something other than the "representation of reality". It is rather, an autonomous structure of meaning a code of system of signs that refers not to "reality" but to the mate reality of codes system and signs themselves. (167)

The western authors of different centuries have been representing the easterners, in the history, according to their interest. The modern western authors as well as politicians create the image of the Muslim and non-western as terrorists in their texts, television, serials, newspaper and many programmes. In this same context, Radhakrishnan, therefore considers that "all representation is an act of violence and inauthentic" (42). Colonial mentality plays great role between eastern and western in

term of representation. We can find inequalities in various modes and process of representation that unmask the ideological disguises of imperialism reciprocal relationship between colonial power and knowledge.

In this context of creating binaries, representation means nothing more than misrepresentation because they represent the colonized as they like. The easterners are always misrepresented by the westerners to classify that they have been always superior. The binary representation constructs a conditions category between the two cultures that are equally import but colonial mentality creates binary oppositions between colonizer, white, human and civilization and colonized, black, bestial, and uncivilized respectively. *Key Concept in Post-colonial studies* states:

Clearly, the binary is very important in construction ideological meanings in general, and extremely useful in imperial ideology. The binary structure, with its various articulations of the underlying binary accommodates such fundamental binary impulses with imperialism as the impulse to 'exploit' and the impulse to 'civilize'. (25)

The notion of representation has very different applications depending on what is being made present or considered present and in what circumstances. The main mission of imperial ideology is to govern the non-west geographically, politically and culturally. Such unites have the romantic representation of the orient as exotica land and the people are cannibal. These numerous representation of the east by the west is also the outcome of the colonial mentality that creates hierarchy between east and west.

It is the colonial mentality that creates binary opposition to establish a relation of dominance. A simple distinction between center/margin; colonizer/colonized;

civilized/ primitive represents/primitive represents very efficiently the violent hierarchy. On which imperialism is based. In *Key Concepts in Post-colonial Studies*, Ashcroft, et al argue on the same vein as:

The existence of others is crucial in defining what is 'normal' and in locating one's own place in the world. The colonized subject is characterized as 'other' through discourses such as primitivism and cannibalism, as a means of establishing the binary reparation of the colonizer and colonized and assisting the naturalness primary of the colonizing culture and world view. (169)

No discourse is fixed for all time because discourse changes according to time and space. The discursive practices have no universal validity because it is historically and culturally associated with colonial discourse and it can be manipulated by the power in order to maintain the sense of superiority and authority over the "Other". It is an instrument of power, which is used to govern the "Other".

Representation of 'Other' and 'Terrorism' is a discourse formed by West about the non-West. It is created and made by the West to govern the East. The political purpose of representation is to expose the falsity of this mode of presenting the colonial subject as 'Other' to the self of dominant colonial culture. Frantz Fanon, one of the eminent postcolonial writers and critics, seems to be more radical on this issue. Fanon's colonial consciousness is most powerful contributions to the creation of an effective anti-colonial discourse. Fanon views that western thought, language, life style and culture are imposed to the non-western people through ideology. Fanon clarifies that the relationship between east and west is based on colonial mentality that differentiates between the western culture and language and the eastern culture and language. He says in his book *Black Skin White Masks*:

Every colonized people in other words every people in whose soul an inferior complex has been created by the death and burial of its local cultural originality –find itself face to face with the language of the civilizing nation, that is, with the culture of the mother country. The colonized is elevated above his jungle status in proportion to his adoption of the mother country's cultural standards. He becomes white as he renounces his blackness his jungle. (18)

He views that western hegemony and ideology created so-called reality about the other. It is a discourse, which is made by the western ideology to govern the non-western people. While differentiating these two contestants, the former one is placed at a superior position and the latter is placed in an inferior position. It creates hierarchy between the whites and the non-whites. It marginalizes the colonized people.

The political purpose of representation is to expose the falsity of this mode of presenting the colonial subject as another to the self of dominant colonial culture. Likewise, Edward Said's *Orientalism* argues that representation is a discourse formed by the west about the non-west. It is created and made by the west to govern the east. Likewise, *Key Concept of Post-colonial studies* views about the misrepresentation of non-westerners as cannibal:

This term for an eater of human flesh is of particular interest to post-cultural studies for its demonstration of the process by which an imperial Europe distinguishes itself from the subjects of its colonial expansion, while providing a moral justification for that expansion ...

This definition is itself a very good demonstration of two related features of colonial discourse: the

separation of the 'civilized' and the 'savage', and the importance of the concept of cannibalism in cementing this distinction. To this day cannibalism has remained the west's key representation of primitivism, even through its first recording, and minded most subsequent examples, have been evidence of a rhetorical strategy of imperialism rather than evidence of an objective 'fact'. (29)

They misrepresent the east in order to prove that they are not in fact, willing to govern the easterners but it is compulsion for them. So, they exhibit colonial mentality, experiences and perception, and are written from the imperial perspective. In this way colonial mentality has created channels for the exchange of colonial images and ideals. The representation is just a created medium for the colonization.

The binary representation constructs a conditions category between the two cultures that are equally important but colonial mentality creates binary oppositions between colonizer, white, human and civilization and colonized, black, and uncivilized respectively. We can find inequalities in various modes and process of representation that unmask the ideological disguises of imperialism reciprocal relationship between colonial power and knowledge. Colonial ideology is inherent in a discourse which defines our identities always in relation to what we are not and therefore what we are not must be demolished as "Others". Thus colonial discourse deliberately produces "the other" in order to create its identity and imposes its power over the non-western.

### **Politics of Globalization**

Globalization is a 'maya', the term for illusion in classical Indian philosophy. It creates a world of make-believe which people happily inhabit. The victims tell us that their world is one of struggle for food, water, shelter, basic education, primary

medical needs, and so on. It is a very different world from the one which may be seen from the towers of trade centers and stock-exchanges. The world of maya cannot be a place to make a judgment on the situation of the world and plan its future. We need to interrogate the victims of our present world as to what globalization has brought to them. Has it really brought greater humanization or more poverty and destitution? What hopes and aspirations do the poor of the globe have? What would be their possible agenda for our world? Or is it just a politics of Western World to legitimize their loot upon Eastern world? Many non-western thinkers these days believes that globalization is just a discourse created by westerners just justify their interruption on non-western world.

Transforeign synthesis has been described as a new roadmap for friendship and togetherness by western societies because it is obvious that the respect and recognition of there is necessary if we want to be respected and recognized. Hence the global and local cannot be neatly separated. We can therefore refer to the term "glocal," the fusion of the global and the local. The glocal culture is also not an absolute category. It is negotiated among various forces.

The various combinations, blends, and fusions of the seemingly opposed and incompatible, processes such as homogenization and fragmentation, globalization and localization, universalism, and particularism indicate the problem entailed in attempts to conceive the glocal in terms of singular integrated and unified conceptual framework. Arjuna Appadurai has rejected such attempts at theoretical integration to argue that "global order must be understood as a complex, overlapping order. It can be conceived as involving sets of flows; of people, technology, finance, media images and ideas" (33). Therefore the notion of belonging defined physical proximity and emotional attachment is under attack for everywhere.

Like all social constructs, the cultural boundaries are impermanent, shifting, and inconsistent. A boundary is a symbol of power that imposes patterns of inclusion and exclusion. It is not a neutral demarcation line. It is what ultimately allows each of us to repeatedly define and refine the essence of and relationship between our "I home" and "foreign" realms. With the help of boundaries we outline our views of "home" and "foreign," and their relationship to each other. But the concept of home and foreign always bears within itself the possibility of the tension between the boundary placement and the boundary transcendence. Both are dynamic, shifting, and political procedures each inversely defining, regulating and controlling the other. The former visibly draws the line between realms and the latter allows us to jump back and forth over it. The more privileged, dominant, hegemonies side will actively control the border to keep border crossers out. The border- crossers acquire their identity with their bicultural or multicultural association. In this process individuals decide how much they want to identify with their cultures of origin or of adoption.

Globalization can not provide space for the dynamics of culture that is always alive and ever changing over time and place. This flexibility of openness helps to establish the all encompassing strategy of globalization. In recent time, nationalization of international images and internationalization of national images go side-by-side. Such border crossings eventually lead to the by-production of hybrid culture- the multiple forms of hybridities are the ways of celebrating empirical reality of the pluralism of human cultures in particular and all social activities in general. Mobility of workers, money, cultural goods and services and the westernization of global cultural change are the effects of globalization. Cultures of the locals react and form new ones. National cultures become imagined and construction is possible only through narratives, invented traditions, stories of origin, symbols etc. People, thus,

find themselves unable to equate them with their pure race, ethnicity or culture. Thus they lose their identity. In the state of global cultural forms and practices become commodities brought and sold in an international market place, cultural forms and practices are deterritorialized and local cultures react and renew forms. Anthony Giddens in "Consequences of Modernity" opines:

In pre-modern societies, space and place largely coincided, since the spatial dimensions of social life are, for most of the population... dominated by "presence"--by localized activity. Modernity increasingly tears space away from place by fostering relations between "absent" others, locationally distant from any given situation of face to face interaction. In conditions of modernity.... locales are thoroughly penetrated by and shaped in terms of social influences quite distant from them. (124)

Due to modernization people tried to change them a lot whether by changing the way of spending life or changing their nationality. By their movements they distanced themselves with their culture.

Globalization refers to an advanced stage of development which covers every Stage of our lives. It bears the scope for raising the living standards of the people. It has encouraged the developed countries to raise their standards in various fields of transportation, communication, flow of ideas, technologies etc. But in some poorer countries, those which were the colonies once, there seem the impacts of globalization very miserable in the condition of the people. The process of globalization is not a new phenomenon as it has many precedents. Its embryonic form was probably Pax Romana, while its teen was gained during hey days of imperialism of the European powers from the eighteenth to the mid of the twentieth century.

Thus, globalization addresses the dilemma of cultural diversity brought about by the movement of people within and without the nation state. Almost every part of the world is occupied by significant groups of strangers with cultural and ancestral links to the places outside the place of their current residence. Such a movement of people across the globe, for permanent settlement or for temporary travel, form a strong basis for the rise of cultural diversity worldwide. Many conflicts are arising day-by-day and different cultural formations and social relations are developing within and outside. Thus, globalization is not simply about the creation of a global village and the blurring of boundary and shortening of distance but creates cultural complexities.

### Chapter III

#### **Politics of Globalization in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown***

This research problematizes the concept of globalization in terms of Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* in which the protagonist Shalimar, a Kashmirian, is victimized by the prejudice of mainstream people within globalization. This research questions the biased representation of the Islamic as well as so-called third world people as the Other and terrorists. The stereotypes and prejudice constructed by the mainstream policies towards Islamic people which forced them to become so-called terrorists are the main focus of the study. Rushdie illustrates the picture of Kashmiri and Afghan people who are described as the criminal and violent by the western officers.

Fundamental logic of globalization creates a friendly atmosphere in which the discrete communities are able to interact, and enrich a new consensual culture in which they recognize reflections of their own identity. It accepts the poststructuralist denial of centre, presence and coherence to embrace the postmodernist logic that cultures are artificial arbitrary products of endless series of interactions and exchanges. In a global society neither individual is supposed to be subjected to the hegemony of national cultural traditions, nor ethnic group is subjected to the tyranny of either the state or a dominant group within it. This society is expected to negate racism and other prejudices and seeks to enhance respect for the identity of the "Other".

Generally, globalization is associated with a situation where people can not find themselves in a specific location; but because of its egalitarian perspective, the new and distanced reality it advocates becomes inauthentic since it loses the defining cultural legacy of the marginalized people. This inauthenticity has a negative

aspect because it does not provide a power of resistance against monocultural policies of globalization itself. The shift brought about by globalization makes us ignore the history and material forces that only can strengthen the construction of cultural identities. Contrary to its ideologies, globalization continues the traditional monoculturalist notion of centre and periphery and be manipulated in the hands of so-called centre.

It is supposed that globalization makes entire society stronger because the society benefits from the breadth and depth of the diverse cultural assets, including languages, beliefs, and practices. A diverse workplace has a larger pool of skills, talents, contacts, languages, points of view and creativity. When American ambassador reached Kashmir for the first time he also puts similar concerns:

The loss of one man's dream, one family's home, one people's rights, one woman's life [...] is the loss of all our freedoms; of every life, every home, every hope. Each tragedy belongs to itself and at the same time to everyone else. What diminishes any of us diminishes us all.

(223)

However, the conflict heightens the sense of the boundary between the insider and the outsider, rich and poor, civilized and uncivilized, and between so-called intellectuals and barbarians.

In *Salimar the Clown*, Kashmir is simply presented as the thorn in the side of Indian and Pakistani post-Independence optimism. In the first place, it is offered up as a symbol of the inherent weaknesses of the US led efforts to establish a global political and economic consensus in the wake of the Second World War. In the second place, and inter-connectedly, it is used to announce the decisive abortion of the idea, promoted by American neo-conservative intellectuals after the conclusion of

the Cold War, that history was coming to an end because western capitalist 'liberal' democracy was triumphing. One form of history may have ended with the collapse of state Communism, the novel reminds us, but US machinations against Russia during the Cold War had also brought new forms of history into being that were now bearing fruit in regions such as Afghanistan and Kashmir. *Shalimar the Clown*, in this sense, adds other elements into the mix of South Asian politics. The resulting difference is that where Kashmiriness is shown, being gunned down by the opposing forces of Pakistan and India, here it is shown being crushed in a three-way power struggle between US interests, the Indian army, and Islamic insurgents from Pakistan.

Like all social constructs, the cultural boundaries are impermanent, shifting, and inconsistent. A boundary is a symbol of power that imposes patterns of inclusion and exclusion. It is not a neutral demarcation line. It is what ultimately allows each of us to repeatedly define and refine the essence of and relationship between our "I home" and "foreign" realms. With the help of boundaries we outline our views of "home" and "foreign," and their relationship to each other. But the concept of home and foreign always bears within itself the possibility of the tension between the boundary placement and the boundary transcendence. Both are dynamic, shifting, and political procedures each inversely defining, regulating and controlling the other. The former visibly draws the line between realms and the latter allows us to jump back and forth over it. The more privileged, dominant, hegemonies side will actively control the border to keep border crossers out. The border- crossers acquire their identity with their bicultural or multicultural association. In this process individuals decide how much they want to identify with their cultures of origin or of adoption: "“In civilization there are no borderlines,” Max senior taught him (Max Ophuls). But when barbarism came to Europe, that erased borderlines as well” (228). Globalization,

thus, can not provide space for the dynamics of culture that is always alive and ever changing over time and place. This flexibility of openness helps to establish the all encompassing strategy of globalization. In recent time, nationalization of international images and internationalization of national images go side-by-side. Such border crossings eventually lead to the by-production of hybrid culture- the multiple forms of hybridities are the ways of celebrating empirical reality of the pluralism of human cultures in particular and all social activities in general.

Ophuls' seduction of Boonyi, and their subsequent relationship – during which he gluts her with goods and comestibles before abandoning her out of hand when he loses interest in her - can clearly be read as America's power seduces, its affections imprison, its commodities corrupt, and it abandons once it has taken what it wants. Boonyi is thus a product of America's love for the world, and when she speaks, she speaks in the voice of Kashmir. "I am your handiwork made flesh", she tells Ophuls:

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

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

The transformation of Ophuls from a liberator with unquestionable moral justification into an agent of a new imperial power which presides over the same kinds of moral atrocity that he once fought against, is registered most uncomfortably, when he finds himself, suddenly, playing the same kind of role once played by those he despised. “When Boonyi Noman danced for him in the Dachigam hunting lodge in Kashmir” the narrators says:

He thought of those feathered dead-eyed showgirls wreathed in Nazi cigar smoke, flaunting their gartered thighs. The clothes were different but he recognised the same hard hunger in her stare, the readiness of the survivor to suspend moral judgement in the presence of imagined opportunity. But I’m not a Nazi, he thought. I’m the American ambassador, the guy in the white hat. I’m for God’s sake one of the Jews who lived. She swung her hips for him and he thought, and I’m also a married man. She swung her hips again and he ceased to think.  
(227-228)

Rushdie is not here claiming that American neo-Imperial activities are identical to the activities of the Nazis in the Second World War. More subtly, Rushdie is arguing that whilst the US lacks the evil and programmatic intent of the fascists, it nevertheless, in the name of self-interest, allows, even encourages that are not dissimilar to the things that the Nazis made happen by more direct means. It also tends to look the other way, to willfully ‘forget’ what it does with its power, and so is surprised when it finds the rest of the world treating it in the way victims treat an oppressor. Such indirection allows it to maintain the illusion that it is “the guy in the white hat” (228). Rushdie implies that the stance is clearly a hollow one, because the US, whether it likes it or not, is now sitting in the seat of power. “The wheel had turned,” as Ophuls realises,

confronting the fallen Boonyi. “In this moment of his story he was not the victim. In this moment she, not he, had the right to claim kinship with the lost” (205).

*Salimar the Clown* tries to present that India and Pakistan would survive the political abuses that Rushdie was satirising, that there was an outside to the fictional world into which a more utopian hopefulness could be projected, even if it was never shown. Kashmiriness is annihilated without redemption, and the slogan “Kashmir for the Kashmiris” becomes a joke, “a moronic idea” (101), but no longer an option.

Kashmir itself may have been annihilated, but the seduction of Kashmir by America has produced a bastard child – India Ophuls a.k.a. Kashmiria Noman - a hybrid being, who lives in America and who loves her American father, “she didn’t like this name” (6) because the narrator says:

“India” still felt wrong to her, it felt exoticist, colonial, suggesting the appropriation of a reality that was not hers to own, and she insisted to herself that it didn’t fit her anyway, she didn’t feel like an India, even if her color was rich and high and her long hair lustrous and black. She didn’t want to be vast or subcontinental or excessive or vulgar or explosive or crowded or ancient or noisy or mystical or in anyway Third World. (7)

Initial mentality of India shows western teenager’s psyche regarding non-west.

Though west talks about global village, it is just surfacail and the reality is that this discourse of globalization is formed according to their interest. Global politics may be such that old Kashmir no longer exists, Kashmiria’s story tells us, but globalisation has also generated new combinations, new ethnicities, that exist in complex relationships with the power systems that have produced them, and in which the possibility of new

forms of political equilibrium reside - neither fully sympathetic to the US, nor in the arms of absolutist militants.

A conversation among McGeorge Bundy (a national security adviser of USA), his eventual successor Walt Whitman Rostow, Max Ophuls and a man who would follow Max to New Delhi shows their attitude towards India:

Bundy advised Johnson that India, the “largest and potentially most powerful non-Communist Asian nation” was “the biggest prize in Asia”, and that on account of the United States’ handing seven hundred million dollars in military aid to Pakistan, that prize was in danger of being lost. The tail was wagging the dog. Rostow agreed. “India is more important than Pakistan.” And Bowles argued that America’s unwillingness to arm India had pushed the late Jawaharlal Nehru, and now Lal Bahadur Shastri, into the Russians’ arms. “Only when it became clear that we were not prepared to give India this assistance, did India turn to the Soviet Union as its major Source of military Equipment.” (295)

This shows that though America seems taking interest to solve the problem prevalent in Kashmir but their reality is to sell weapons to both countries, India and Pakistan. So the attempt to establish peace and create global village is just a politics of western countries to fulfill their capitalistic interest. In a sense, Global culture is essentially the "third culture" and the increasingly progressive movement of global relations implies that there is or will be a unified world society or culture something akin to the social structure of a nation state and its national culture. It is not possible to refer to the development of a global culture in a less totality sense by referring; to the basic logic of globalization.

Not all of the political stances struck in this novel are convincing. It is Rushdie's conceit that Kashmir was a haven, a paradise of peaceable village traditions, and multi-cultural, multi-faith tolerance. Rushdie demonstrates this by introducing the Shalimar-Boonyi plot with a potential tragedy; Shalimar is a Muslim, Boonyi a Hindu, and they consort in secret because they fear possible consequences. The reader, expectations already primed with an epigraph from *Romeo and Juliet*, immediately jumps to the conclusion that the star-crossed lovers will come to a sticky end as a result of religious hostility, and that the novel's crisis will stem from here. These expectations are dashed, however, when the village decides to overcome its reservations about the conduct of the relationship and to allow their marriage: "We are all brothers and sisters here", Shalimar's father argues: "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" (180). This clearly shows that Kashmir's problems stem not from inherent Hindu-Muslim antipathy, but from a Hindu-Muslim antipathy that has been brought into being by political processes and historical forces. This idea of Kashmir is yet another entry in the growing list of idealised, multi-cultural utopias in Rushdie's fiction that are under threat from the forces of singularity and oppression. The problems in Kashmir, however, seem too present, too rooted in a long history of antipathies. Kashmir's religious problems did not spring into being fully formed in 1947, and each time a village elder observes that "in Kashmir, our stories sit side by side on the same double bill, we eat from the same dishes, we laugh at the same jokes" (71) the reader's faith in the fiction is tested.

The narrative is engaging, the political commentary is astute and provocative, and the female characters (particularly India/Kashmira) are amongst the strongest

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

There were six hundred thousand Indian troops in Kashmir but the pogrom of the pandits was not prevented, why was that? Three and a half lakhs of human beings arrived in Jammu as displaced persons and for many months the government did not provide shelters or relief or even register their names, why was that? When the government finally built camps it only allowed for six thousand families to remain in the state, dispersing others around the country where they would be invisible and impotent, why was that? [...] There was one bathroom per three hundred persons in many camps why was that ... and the pandits of Kashmir were left to rot in their slum camps, to rot while the army and the insurgency fought over the bloodied and broken valley, to dream of return, to die while dreaming of return, to die after the dream of return died so that they could not even die dreaming of it, why was that why was that why was that why was that why was that.

(297)

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

Who lit that fire? Who burned that orchard? Who shot those brothers who laughed their whole lives long? Who killed the sarpanch? Who broke his hands? Who broke his arms? Who broke his ancient neck? Who shackled those men? Who made those men disappear? Who shot those boys? Who shot those girls? Who smashed that house? Who smashed *that* house? Who smashed *that* house? [...] Who killed the children? Who whipped the parents? Who raped that lazy-eyed woman? Who raped that grey-haired lazy-eyed woman as she screamed about snake vengeance? Who raped that woman again? Who raped that woman again? Who raped that woman again? Who raped that dead woman? Who raped that dead woman again? (308)

Such question-asking is characteristic of Rushdie's fictional response to political events. Indeed, Rushdie sees the asking of questions as the principal job of the political novelist. Rushdie does not, however, see it as the job of the novelist to offer answers, and, in accordance with this belief, no direct responses are offered to the pertinent questions posed in *Shalimar the Clown*. On the contrary, Rushdie's question-asking serves at least two constructive political functions. In the first place, the very act of posing the question, of bearing witness to atrocity, constitutes a potent political gesture: a demand for attention and a demand for redress. In the second place Rushdie's question-asking also functions as a plea to moderate Muslims to seek to reform their religion, and a plea to European and North American politicians to create a global political context that helps rather than hinders their progress.

Rushdie's Edenic Verona is the village of Pachigam, a shtetl of Hindu and Muslim actors and cooks, who present a kind of Kashmiri dinner featuring "the legendary *wazwaan*, the Banquet of the Thirty-Six Courses Minimum...'Here in

Kashmir,’” says the Hindu *pandit* Pyarelal Kaul, “‘our stories sit happily side by side on the same double bill, we eat from the same dishes, we laugh at the same jokes’” (71). Rushdie’s Juliet is the daughter of this *pandit*, the preternaturally sensuous Boonyi. Her Romeo is a boy named Noman, the son of the Muslim headman. In his childhood, Noman was the double-threat star of Pachigam’s troupe, a genius of both comedy and the high wire, who traded the anonymity of his birth name for the *nom de guerre* of Shalimar the Clown. In pre-lapsarian Pachigam, no one told either Shalimar or Boonyi that they could not fall in love or told their fathers that, with a few variations to the wedding ceremony, they could not marry. In Pachigam, if the stars do not cross it is because they have better things to do.

But later Boonyi joins the troupe and makes a signature of the seductive dance of Anarkali, an Aida of a slave girl who dares to fall in love with a prince and pays for it with her life. The dance draws the attention of the local Indian Gauleiter. More dangerous still, it draws the patronage of the truly star-crossed star of Shalimar, a man who is not a Kashmiri at all, but an American and a Jew. He is Maximilian Ophuls. Most importantly, during the early 1960’s, Max is America’s best-loved, and then most scandalous, ambassador to India. Like the great knights of Kennedy’s Camelot, when politics was still attractive to men with brains, his shield is emblazoned with equal quadrants of charm and wit. “India is chaos making sense,” is his most famous epigram (41) and another is, “Freedom is not a tea party. Freedom is a war” (35). He was “the Rudyard Kipling of ambassadors,” (41) one beautiful Indian actress, Zainab Azam, tells Max.

Yet for all his brains and sophistication, this circumsized *übermensch* cannot keep his head. Boonyi dances, Max beckons, Shalimar sulks, a daughter is born, Paradise fractures. But the narrator warns readers from the beginning that this is no

mere love triangle. On page five, Shalimar decapitates Max on the doorstep of his daughter's apartment in Los Angeles, "like a halal chicken dinner." (5)

The impossible is what people pay to see,'" Shalimar's father tells his performers in one pre-game pep talk. "Always do something impossible right at the beginning of the show...Swallow a sword, tie yourself in a knot, defy gravity. Do what the audience knows it could never do no matter how hard it tries. After that you'll have them eating out of your hand. (93)

There are few writers who could pull off such an act. But Rushdie defies gravity and dispatches his characters on journies leading up to the assassination, leading away from the assassination, entertaining and dazzling but all the while leading us on an examination of this precarious high-wire we find ourselves walking in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The guide for one of these *hejiras* is Max and Boonyi's love-child, Kashmirira. Kashmirira goes to pieces upon seeing her father's murder. But she rises up and re-invents and prepares herself for a cycle of venge and revenge. Like Max Ophuls, Rushdie seems to optimistic that:

Ending of his age would be happy, and that the new world which would come after would be better than the one that would die with him. Europe, free of the Soviet threat, and America, free of the need to remain permanently at battle stations, would build that new world in friendship, a world without walls, a frontierless newfound land of infinite possibility. The doomsday clock would no longer be set at seven seconds to midnight. (20)

Rushdie continues to write with a belief in the power of reformation both of the politics of the west and the religion of Islam. Kashmir is still a Paradise to be

Lost. The gods and the satans are amongst, which means the possibility of salvation is still at hand. "The beautiful village of Pachigam," like Anatevka and Atlantis, "still exists" (309).

A fair observation enhanced by a sharp simile about the ravages of the free market in the age of globalization leads to a melancholy awareness of a local injustice, even if it is only about beautiful people. We can forgive the slight redundancy of the huge herds and the transferred pathetic as part of a gregarious narrator's excitement at the spectacle of so much beauty undone. But he goes on: "The city was a cliff and they were its stampeding lemmings. At the foot of the cliff was the valley of the broken dolls" (311).

The omniscient narrator plays the ringmaster and cracks the whip and the motley array sets off with trumpets blaring. Style is action and vice versa. Rushdie's characters also compete with the gilded and glamorous. They are stars and they are described in breathless superlatives. No longer do they have personalities, they have resumes. In LA lives a beautiful young woman called India. In her spare time she watches pornography (to help her fall asleep), makes documentary films, and practises the arts of self-defence; not only does she box, she knows kung-fu, not only does she know kung-fu, she is a fair shot with the pistol, not only does she shoot guns, she is a regular Diana on the archery range.

Max Ophuls is aristocratic, impeccably mannered, with a weakness for beautiful women, and he is also a former American ambassador to India who helped arm the Taliban; before that he was an economist and one of the architects of the Bretton Woods agreement, and before that, a member of the French Resistance. The gigantic mode doesn't change much when the elderly Max's throat is cut on his daughter's doorstep, and the novel switches into a long retrospective account of how

and why this powerful man came to be assassinated by an ex-tightrope walking Kashmiri acrobat, possibly acting in the name of some Islamic terrorist organization:

[...] the huge splash of blood across the glass, the thick drag of blood down towards the ground and the body of her (India) father, Ambassador Maximilian Ophuls, war hero and holder of the Legion d'Honneur, lying motionless and soaked in a darkening crimson lake. His throat had been slashed so violently that the weapon, one of his own Sabatier kitchen knives, which had been dropped beside his corpse, had all but severed his head. (66)

The scene may be Kashmir or Occupied France during the Second World War, but the paragraphs remain jammed with all sorts of references to films, pop music, Erasmus, the Ship of Fools, Machiavelli and the Ramayana to list a few. There is even the Borscht-Belt humour of the concierge, Olga the Volga, the last potato witch of Astrakhan, a character who seems to have taken a wrong turn on her way to the latest Harry Potter novel.

In this way, Rushdie transforms his refusal to bow to the times into a capitulation to the voice of public opinion. Our larger culture exhibits a disturbingly split attitude to violence. We have a fascination with it. The twin industries of movies and video games make millions out of our desire to experience the horrible at a safe distance. And yet we still believe that there is something particularly awful about real violence; news organizations deem us too squeamish for photographs of real corpses or real torture, be it in Los Angeles, Kashmir, or Iraq, though we may turn on the television and see make-believe versions of them at any time. So we have a camp culture of violence that seeks to rationalize our obsession by emphasizing its safe unreality. Rather than explore the crossing points between Western civilization which

aestheticizes violence and Islamic civilizations which sanctify it, Rushdie writes himself in on the side of the aestheticizers.

Thus, globalization addresses the dilemma of cultural diversity brought about by the movement of people within and without the nation state. Almost every part of the world is occupied by significant groups of strangers with cultural and ancestral links to the places outside the place of their current residence. Such a movement of people across the globe, for permanent settlement or for temporary travel, form a strong basis for the rise of cultural diversity worldwide. Many conflicts are arising day-by-day and different cultural formations and social relations are developing within and outside. Rushdie illustrates this kind of postcolonial experiences by presenting four characters Shalimar, Boonyi, Ophuls and India. In the age of twenty first century, globalization is inevitable but it is moving according to the interest of west and western agents like Max Ophuls who can never act for the benefit of Third World rather serve their capitalistic interest.

## Chapter IV

### Conclusion

Globalization is a normative position that accepts diversity of population composed of discrete communities with regard to language, culture, and social organization. The project of modernity is fundamentally paradoxical. In its rationalist mission the pursuit of sameness and familiarity become both a matter of pride and a ground for the repression of differences. However, by imposing the discourse and ideology the mainstream cultures, in *Shalimar the Clown*, tries to fulfill their economic motif rather than serving suffering countries.

Discourse of globalization, in fact, serves the colonial purpose in an effective manner because it attempts to design the fixed geographical, cultural and political concept about the non-western people in the mind of the readers. Shalimar is unhappy because the foreigner Max Ophuls interrupted Kashmir's peace and Boonyi. On the one hand, the ideals of reason, equality, in citizenship are the means and end of enlightenment, on the other the same ideals turn to be strategies to legitimize the civilizing mission of colonialism abroad and nation building at home.

Kashmir, before the intervention of the foreign diplomats, was like utopia where Hindus and Muslims used to live in harmony but Ophuls as an agent of globalization ruined its peace rather than mending the peace process. For west, globalization is essential to extend their market as well as to lessen the danger of counter attack from Muslim fundamentalists and former colonized countries. By saying this, this researcher is not in the favor of violence but is trying to unmask the politics of globalization hidden behind it.

Thus, globalization is not simply about the creation of a global village and the blurring of boundary and shortening of distance but creates cultural complexities: All

of these characters struggle with their cultural identity and forces of modernization while trying to maintain their emotional connection to one another" (Carlisle 34). In sum, *Shalimar the Clown* shows the failure of globalizing notion of incorporating the all differences and cultural practices of all people. Rushdie's novel does it by exposing how the mainstream American "Others" the Indians and Muslims in particular and non-western in general, by taking recourse to the essentialist tendencies of cultural legacy of Western past and at the same time, Rushdie also reveals the impact of racially prejudiced thinking of Americans as they consider the Afghani and Kashmiri people as criminals. The very egalitarian notions of globalization fails to hold true in practice because of the lopsided relationship between one cultural group and the others; a relationship which preserves the dichotomies between centre and margin. India and Max Ophuls may have advocated the globalizing locations of identity politics with a utopian vision of respecting all the differences but the novel deconstructs and destabilizes this idea by showing the contradiction between ideologies and practices of globalization.

## Works Cited

- Ashcroft, Bill, et al. eds. *The Empire Writes Back*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- - - . *The Post- Colonial Studies: Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- - - . *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. London.: Routledge, 2004.
- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large*. New York: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- Boskovic, Aleksandar. *The Image of the Other – friend, Foreiner, Patriot?* Istanbul Bilgi: University of Istanbul, 2002.
- Fanon, Frantz. “The Negro and Language.” Trans. Charles Lamb Markmann. *Black Skin White Masks*. New York: Grove Press, 1967. 110-140
- Larrain, Jorge. *Ideology and Cultural Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.
- Pitik, Annabela. “Salman Rushdie Losses his Cheerfulness: Geopolitics, Terrorism and Adultery.” *Journal of International Affairs*. 61.1(2007): 257-262.
- Radhakrishna, R. *Theory in an Uneven World*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Shalimar the Clown*. London: Vintage. 2005.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Vintage, 1994.
- Slemon, Stephen. “Post- colonial Critical Theories.” *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*. Ed. Gregory Castle. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Stoler, Ann and Frederick Cooper, eds. *Tensions of Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Vollman, William T. “Shalimar the Clown.” *Publisher Weekly* 925 (2005) 39-35.
- Watson, Conrad William. *Multiculturalism*. Buckingham. Open University Press, 2002.