

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY**

**Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**

**Repression and Resistance of Women in Salman Rushdie's *Shame***

**A Thesis**

**Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan  
University in Partial Fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of  
Arts in English**

**By**

**Amir Regmi**

**Central Department of English**

**Kirtipur, Kathmandu**

**September, 2007**

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY****Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences****Approval Letter**

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “Repression and Resistance of Women in Salman Rushdie's *Shame*” by Amir Regmi, submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Acknowledgements**

At first, I would take an opportunity to extend my sincere and heartfelt gratitude to my respected supervisor and the Head of the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, Dr Krishna Chandra Sharma for his scholarly instructions and genuine responses. I would equally thank him for providing me with invaluable materials and easing up my way ahead by his amiable and smiling encouragement. I really appreciate his demeanour towards me.

Likewise, I owe a great debt of gratitude to Dr. Arun Gupto and Dr. Sanjeev Uprety for their constructive ideas at times. Similarly, Prof. Dr. Shreedhar Prasad Lohani, Prof. Dr. Abhi Narayan Subedi, Prof. Chandra Prakash Sharma, and Dr. Birendra Pandey have become the inspiring sources to me. I am sincerely indebted to Mr. Nirmal Prasad Adhikari, who assisted me in shaping the ideas and, at times, removing my confusions. Thanks equally resides in my sincere teachers: Mr. Devi Gautam, Mr. Hem Sharma Poudel, Mr. Puspa Acharya, Mr. Saroj Ghimere, Mr. Baikuntha Poudel, Mr. Shankar Subedi and Mr. Sadan Adhidari. On occasions, suggestion from my teachers: Kamal Krishna Khanal, Lal Bahadur Chetri Jagadish Ghimire, and Krishna Poudel from Birendra Multiple Campus, Chitawan, has also yielded much.

In addition, I extend my special thanks to my brother Sameer Regmi and my friends: Anod Bhattarai and Ranjan Kumar Khatri whose accompaniment has added up much to the completion of my present thesis. At the same time, I cannot forget my all well-wishing friends: Buddhi Raj, Som Nath, Kedar Sharma, Yubaraj, Dinesh, Khagendra, Anup, Rum, Hom Nath. At last but not the least, I would like to remember my parents and my brothers for their emotional support not only for its completion but also for my whole study till now.

Also, I thank a lot to my brotherly friends Jeeten Maharjan and Bibek M. from Jee Computer Center for their excellent service in technical output.

September, 2007

Amir Regmi

### **Abstract**

The research entitled “Repression and Resistance of Women in Salman Rushdie’s *Shame*” concerns the trials and tribulations of women and their concomitant resistance under postcolonial context by showing their silent means of revolt. The depiction of women characters have been assigned full treatment so as to bring forth the context in which they have undergone the sufferings and have revolted against it silently. Male characters have imposed unwanted troubles on the women. In all the events, women characters are left uncared. Women have been just used as objects -- either for producing children or for becoming mere wives. On the other hand, the effects of colonialism have also aggravated their conditions even more by leaving the societies in the traditional chaos and, thereby, not refurbishing their poor state. So, the concept of ‘double colonization’ works here beneath the surface. Rushdie, indeed, strives to show how women lived their pitiable lives in the transitional period in Pakistan after the literal end of colonialism. In the same way, the chaos and disorder left by colonialism has made wide space for the males to exploit the women. Similarly, the power politics is another mode wherein women have been again victimized by no one save men.

## Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	III
ABSTRACT	IV
I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1-11
<b>RUSHDIE AS RENOWNED WRITER</b>	1
<b>OVERVIEW OF MAJOR WORKS</b>	4
<b>ORUTLINE OF <i>SHAME</i></b>	9
II. REVIEW OF POSTCOLONIAL STUDIES AND FEMINISM	12-30
<b>POSTCOLONIAL STUDIES</b>	12
<b>FEMINISM</b>	18
<b>RESISTANCE OF WOMEN</b>	26
<b>NEXUS BETWEEN POSTCOLONIALISM AND FEMINISM</b>	28
III. TEXTUAL ANALYSIS	31-52
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	31
<b>POSTCOLONIALISM AND FEMINISM IN <i>SHAME</i></b>	32
IV. CONCLUSION	53-55
WORKS CITED	

## I. INTRODUCTION

### RUSHDIE AS RENOWNED WRITER

Born in Bombay, India on June 19, 1947, Salman Rushdie is a British-Indian essayist and fiction author. The only son of Anis Ahmed, a Cambridge University-educated Lawyer turned businessman, and Negin Butt, a teacher, Rushdie was born and grew up in a Muslim family. When he was fourteen, his family moved to Pakistan. After sometime he moved to England. So, he was educated at Cathedral and John Connon School in Mumbai and Rugby School in Warwickshire, England. He attended King's College at Cambridge in England where he studied history. Therefore, we find the various cultural traces in his works. His childhood upbringing developed in India and Pakistan, whereas his writing career embarked on in Britain. Hence, he is sometimes called British writer of Indian descent.

Rushdie has been married four times. His first wife was Clarissa Luard, to whom he was married from 1976 to 1987 and with whom he has a son, Zafar Rushdie. His second wife was the American novelist, Marianne Wiggins; they were married in 1988 and divorced in 1993. His third wife, from 1997 to 2004, was Elizabeth West; they have a son, Milan Rushdie. Since 2004, he has been married to the Indian actress and model Padma Lakshmi, the host of American reality-television show *Top Chef*. Though he was born in Bombay and stayed sometime in Pakistan, he ultimately settled in United Kingdom. He currently lives in New York City.

He worked for TV show in Pakistan for sometime after the completion of his graduation in 1968. He became an actor at theatre group at Oval House in Kennington and from 1971 to 1981 Rushdie worked sporadically as a freelance copywriter for two advertising agencies: Ogilvy & Mother, and Charles Barker.

Though he wrote *Grimus* for the first time, he gained in prominence with the publication of his second novel, *Midnight's Children* (1981), in that the book could win the 1981 Booker Prize and in 1993 was awarded the Booker of Bookers as the best novel to have received the Prize during its first 25 years. Similarly, the bringing forth of his fourth novel, *The Satanic Verses*, made him the talk of the world. Rushdie has gained a lot of plaudits from his writings including the European Union's Aristeion Prize for Literature, James Tait Black Memorial Prize (Fiction), English-Speaking Union Award, etc. Recently, Rushdie was knighted in Queen Elizabeth 11's birthday honour list for his service to literature, becoming Sir Salman. In his response to the award, he said, "I am thrilled and humbled to receive this great honour and am very grateful that my work has been recognized in this way" (*The Kathmandu Post*, 1).

Alongside the publication of his fourth controversial novel, *The Satanic Verses*, in September 1988, for which he is still best known, there occurred a turnabout in his both living and writing career. As the novel was perceived as an irreverent depiction of the prophet Muhammad, it caused an immediate controversy in the Islamic world. The book was labelled as blasphemous against Islam. Consequently, demonstrations and riots in protest of the novel took place in India, Pakistan and South Africa; and several nations banned its importation. Numerous irate religious and political leaders of the Muslim faith charged Rushdie with blasphemy towards both the founder of Islam, Mohammed, and the religious sacred text, the Qur'an. Thanks to this cause, Iran's revolutionary leader Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, head of the Shiite Muslim sect, issued the fatwa, a religious decree, on February 1989, calling for his execution. A bounty was offered for the death of Rushdie, who was, thereby, forced to go into hiding and live under police protection

for years now. Thousand copies of the novel were burned to ashes, bookstalls broken down, and even some publishers beaten and killed. The event occasioned the violent protests from radical Muslims worldwide and a diplomatic crisis between Iran and the west. Rushdie now 59 is granted a 24-hour police guard but still has to move house occasionally and can not tell his family members where he is living. In 1990 Rushdie published an essay "In Good Faith" to appease his critics and issued an apology in which he reaffirmed his respect for Islam. Yet, Iranian clerics did not back away from their threat. Although Iran's government declared that it would not implement the fatwa, some religious sects and leaders still threaten his death. Nevertheless, in midst of threats, he has begun to appear in public with his fourth wife more and more. Yet, in his hiding, he has written some famous books such as *East, West, Fury*, etc. He is currently working on a book set in the Mughal Empire.

Rushdie is one among the most significant postcolonial Anglo-Indian writers. Rushdie has also mentored younger Indian writers for long, and has influenced an entire generation of 'Indo-Anglican' writers, and has contributed towards shaping the postcolonial literature. Not only in the West, has he equally occupied the major position in the Third World Literature to write in English. However, he raises the issues of Non-Western people in his works. In most of his works, he employs tales from various genres such as fantasy, mythology, religion, oral tradition, etc. According to *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, "Rushdie's bicultural upbringing informs all his work" (885). He draws on the allegorical and fable-making traditions of both East and West. He is mostly known for his narrative style, that is, the magic realism in which the realistic mingles with the fantastic and the inexplicable. He writes the issues of Non-western from the perspectives of the west. By looking at Rushdie's life, we can construe his quest for identity to the greatest



extent. Born in Bombay, schooled in England and forced by parents to move to Pakistan, he was finally exiled back to Britain for fear of death. Because of the issues he raised in the novel, *The Satanic Verses*, he was not accepted well in any of his home. He possesses the “double perspective” (Imaginary, 19) of a migrant writer and, thereby, fuses his Indian childhood with the Cambridge education. Avowedly secular, he is a self-described atheist.

#### OVERVIEW OF MAJOR WORKS

Rushdie’s most of the novels contain postmodernist elements such as the employment of magic realism, the blend of history and fiction, meta-narration, the evocation of the myth, etc. But, the issues he mostly brings up are from the postcolonial scenario in Pakistan and India. His debut novel, *Grimus* (1975), a part-science fiction tale, was generally ignored by the book-buying public and literary critics. It was so because, firstly it proved to be a terrible failure, a big flop under the disguise of science fiction, and secondly, the novel is an insignificant work even in the eyes of his creator, Salman Rushdie, who seldom mentions it in his interviews or other critical writings. It is a bizarre fiction version of an old Sufi poem. The novel was Rushdie’s entry into a literary competition in the genres of fantasy and science fiction. The novel consists of a patchwork of myths collected from different parts of the world. Most importantly, the striking feature of the novel is the presence of the alchemic pattern. Nevertheless, the novel could put him nowhere.

However, the publication of his second novel, *Midnight’s Children* (1981), catapulted him to unprecedented fame and glory. As it contains one thousand and one stories of as many midnight’s children as born at the midnight hour of 15<sup>th</sup> August, 1947. The protagonist, Saleem Sinai, who is man, demon, and demigod in one, narrates these all one thousand and one adventures. He makes the protagonist

float above history and time, constantly decentering the outside and the inside of the nation. For this, he heavily resorts to the magic realism of Gunter Grass's *The Tin Drum*. In this novel Rushdie has twisted the myth out of their shape under the pretext of demythologizing. His association with Padma and Parvati, the witches; his description of Dr. Aziz, Polly Umrigar, Uncle Hanif, Naseem Aziz, Indira Gandhi, Vijayanti Mala; and a host of other fictional and real life characters present the readers with a phantasmagoria of the fragmentary realities. The whole narrative covers a time span of about sixty-two years from 1915 to 1977. The various postmodernist fictional devices used to recreate the whole history of the subcontinent only boomerangs the intentions of the writer. The novel is set in India and is the comic allegory of Indian history. *Midnight's Children* is the book which could bring international fame to him by winning two above-mentioned prestigious prizes. Sanders in his *The Short Oxford History of English Literature* writes that, “. . . the most striking and inventive single novel to discuss India's transition from Raj to Republic is Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*” (649). The novel focuses more on writing the history of the nation, India by way of blurring the line between history and fiction in the sense that history is no longer a set of fixed and objective facts to him; rather it is the interpretation of the events, the coherent presentation, and the making of them more intelligible to us. The central character, Saleem Sinai, is handcuffed to history.

His third novel, *Shame* (1983), concerns the quasi- religious-politico-cultural lives of Pakistan through the overt and brazen manipulation of the borrowed fictional devices. The novel has fared the problematic and controversial reception, for it incorporates highly denigrating references to the sub-continental cultures and politics. The novel concerns Pakistan and depicts the political turmoil therein. The whole

narrative revolves around the protagonists, Omar Khayyam Shakil and Sufia Zinobia who take the readers to the heart of the murky politics of the Pakistan which involves the representative characters such as Iskander Harappa(Bhutto), Raza Hydr (Zia Ul Haq), Rani Harappa (Nusrat Bhutto), Arjumand Harappa (Benazir Bhutto), etc. The novel, in one way, employs the family history as a metaphor for the country's politics.

Rushdie is perhaps the best known as the author of *The Satanic Verses* (1988), an irreverent, iconoclastic novel that freely incorporates the events depicted in the Qur'an (Koran) and other aspects of Islamic culture. The book received the customary mix of enthusiastic and tepid reviews after British publication in 1988. Some rumbles had already been heard, when the book was banned in various Islamic countries, but, in February of 1989, it stirred up a hornet's nest by creating a still ongoing controversy when a Muslim leader, Ayatollah Ruholla Khomeini of Iran sentenced Rushdie to death for blasphemy against Qur'an and urged faithful Muslims to execute him. Thus, a novel which few had read and its author whose name not a man would have recognized earlier, set astir a controversy often more characterized by political and religious implications than literary ones. Muslims at home and abroad staged demonstrations which often culminated in riots and death. As a result, Rushdie had to go into hiding.

The title of the novel refers to a Muslim tradition which is related in the book. According to it, Muhammad (Mahound in the book) added verses (sura) to the Qur'an accepting three goddesses that used to be worshipped in Mecca as divine beings. According to the legend, Muhammad later revoked the verses, saying that the devil had tempted him to utter these lines to appease the Meccans. Hence, the verses were Satanic. Likewise, Gabreel, in the novel, dreams of stories set in ancient times, some of which seem to suggest aspects of Islamic theology and history. It is these passages

which many Muslim leaders consider sacrilegious. In the same way, Mahound, a businessman turned prophet, plays an active role in Gabreel's fitful sleep, and this dream character bears an uncanny and perverse resemblance to the Prophet Mohammed. The fictional treatment of the Prophet's twelve wives has also irritated some. Furthermore, the novel takes its title from one of Gabreel's dreams about the writing of the Qur'an, when a scribe named Salman inserts spurious items into the Prophet's dictations. Hence, his unnoticed additions become "the Satanic Verses" in a book, considering the absolute word of god.

*The Satanic Verses* opens with two major characters, Gabreel and Saladin, surviving a 29,000-foot fall from an exploding plane onto an English beach. Gabreel, a Bombay superstar famous for portraying Indian deities, acquires a halo like the archangel Gabriel, whom he dreamed himself into impersonating throughout the novel. Saladin, an Indian migrant who has become a snobbish Anglophile, grows horns and cloven hooves and turns into the Devil. The novel opens with the lines:

The novel unfolds between these characters through a series of fascinating and often irreverent narratives with the flavor of a twentieth century THOUSAND AND ONE NIGHT. Opponents in the struggle between good and evil, Gabreel and Saladin constitute the novel's thesis and antithesis. Yet because the novel blurs the distinction between good and evil, a thematic synthesis never occurs: Gabreel is involved in several deaths, Saladin in acts of compassion. (1)

Now we can say that most of Rushdie's works are centered on the issues of India or Pakistan. His fifth novel, *The Moor's Last Sigh*, about the last surviving member of a brilliant multiethnic Indian family that traces its lineage to the last Moorish sultan of Granada, Spain. The novel explores the tensions between inclusive

and exclusive forms of Indian nationalism through the dynamic interplay of inclusive and exclusive forms of satire. The novel presents a satiric view of the politics of India. Rushdie has been also called a satirist in many discursive contexts, but the transforming effects of satiric modes of writing on his novels have yet to be fully linked to his political vision of the nation. *The Moor's Last Sigh* begins not as *The Satanic Verses* does, with a sudden and literal as well as the fantastical descent from a sky, but, like *Midnight's Children*, with a line of descent, a less explosive fall. There is a family tree followed by a family history, a century-long look back to the root of the whole matter of family rifts and intrigues.

Besides, he has continued to write many other novels, the short story collections and essays even while living under the religious fatwa (the religious decree). *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*, published in 1990, is a fable that offers a clear message against literary censorship by despots. It is a cluster of short narratives strung together to give the semblance of a novel. The story revolves around how Rashid's son, Haroun, succeeds in destroying Khattam-Shud and restoring his father's power of storytelling. The fable is concerned with both its own inventive powers and its author's homage to his past, and his acknowledgment of the interdependence of all stories and of all writers and readers. Rushdie published his short collection, *East, West* in 1994, a collection of nine stories divided into three parts: 'East', set in India; 'West', set in Europe; and 'East-West', set in England. Each story holds characters, with diverse cultures, who interact on a variety of social and emotional levels. The trajectories and tendencies of narratology in this collection are various, jerky and highly exasperating to an average reader, not properly trained in the micro criticism of postmodernism. *The Jaguar Smile: A Nicaraguan Journey* (1987) is a non-fiction

travelogue which accounts the political and social condition he observed during a 1986 trip to Nicaragua.

In *Fury* (2001), Malik Solanka, a former Cambridge professor, moves to New York to find a new life. He leaves his wife and son back and involves with two women: Mila, who looks like little Brain and Neela Mahendra, a beautiful freedom fighter. The novel centers on Solankas's consciousness and his gift for language. We find certain passages in *Fury* having chilling and prophetic qualities viewed in the context of the September 11, 2001 attack on the World Trade Center. Throughout 1980s, Rushdie also wrote many short essays; *Imaginary Homeland* brings most of these essays together with the several major statements he has written. His other works include *The Painter and the Pest* (1985), *The Riddle of Midnight* (1987), *The Ground beneath her Feet* (1999), etc.

#### OUTLINE OF *SHAME*

Published in 1983, Rushdie's novel, *Shame*, is set in Pakistan in the 1980s, with flashback to 1947. The novel is told in the third person viewpoint by an author who frequently intrudes into the narrative. In a superb parody and burlesque, he recreates the major strands of the contemporary history of Pakistan, and tells the story of a very small group of people who are responsible for the making of history and for the controlling of power, and for whom politics is a kind of a family quarrel. To this end, he deals with the rise and fall of three families of a country in the subcontinent, Pakistan. The three families include: Shakil family, Raza Hyder's family and Harappa's family. Though the book contains the multiple facets of meanings, yet the permeation of the 'waves of shame' is the ultimate.

*Shame* is a modern Arabian Nights fable set against a thinly disguised real background. The novel begins with the unusual accounts of how Omar Khayyam Shakil, one of the major characters, was born. After the death of father, the three sisters keep themselves locked inside the mansion. They do not even show up outside for buying foods and basic supplies. Rather they employ a dumbwaiter for this purpose. When one of them is pregnant, all of them simultaneously show the similar symptoms. Nobody knows who gives birth to Omar, yet they together raise him. Later on, the child leaves his home for study. As he becomes doctor, he comes across the treatment of Sufia Zinobia, the daughter of Raza Hyder. He even goes to the extent of marrying her but fails in consummation.

Now the plot shifts to trace the rise and fall of two men and their families: Iskander Harappa and Raza Hyder, characters based on Pakistan's Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and General Mohammed Zia ul-Haq respectively. The heart of the narrative is the complex relationship between the Hyder and Harappa families. The sophisticated future Prime Minister, Iskander Harappa, is a cousin by marriage to the Muslim-fundamentalist future President. As able young men in a new country, both rise rapidly. Although they help each other's career, there are strong antagonisms between them, ranging from sexual rivalry to political and religious differences. Harappa is more successful and makes Hyder his commander-in-chief and Hyder's son-in-law, Talvar Ulhaq, head of his political police. Harappa becomes more demagogic and humiliates Hyder amid others. Consequently, he is overthrown by an army group reluctantly headed by General Hyder, assisted by Ulhaq. Then, Harappa is hanged. President Hyder, who rules by fundamentalist Muslim law, eventually becomes so unpopular that he must seek refuge in Omar's childhood home. Here he

is killed by Omar's family in vengeance for his long-ago murder of Omar's brother, a member of a rebel tribal group.

However, Sufia also holds the position of central symbolic figure. Her father is ashamed because his first-born child is a girl. Her mother regards Sufia's simplemindedness as a sight of her own shame -- the retribution for an extramarital affair. She becomes a sponge who soaks up the shame of those around her and of those who feel no shame but should. So, the feelings of shame keep accumulating in the simple mind of the 'Beauty' who is gradually transformed into the 'Beast' of violence. The 'Beast' first breaks through when twelve-year-old Sufia bites off the heads of 218 turkeys. In the same way, the struggle within her body continues, and four young men are found beheaded and bespattered with semen stains. Sufia meets with an end when she seeks out Omar in his childhood home. Sufia, the 'Beast' of shame, explodes into a fireball after beheading Omar.

Relatively less importance is attached to the women characters though they are delineated in rich detail of their subordinations and, thereby, are attempted to bring into notice. Bilquis sees her father blown to bits before she becomes a refugee during the events surrounding the postwar Partition of India and Pakistan. The trauma eventually culminates in her madness. Rani weaves the ugly history of her husband's rise and reign into a series of eighteen shawls. Arjumand Harrapa, who becomes her father's votary, represses her femininity to act in a male-dominated society.



## II. REVIEW OF POSTCOLONIAL STUDIES AND FEMINISM

### POSTCOLONIAL STUDIES

After World War II, many countries from Asia and Africa began to get freedom from colonial trap. Most particularly, Britain and France held full sway over many underdeveloped territories. But, the Second World War paved the way for them to stay independent. Thereafter, scholars and theorists developed a new kind of approach to deal with the conditions and problems resulted from the colonialism of the long time. We call it the postcolonial theory or postcolonialism and, on this assumption, it can be concluded that postcolonialism is an attempt to analyze and understand the after-effects of the colonization and its aftermath. So, the theory centers on the cultural, social, and economic issues of the underdeveloped countries which are now categorized as 'Third World countries.' It can be also a form of transcending the historical definition of its primary object of study towards an extension of the historic and political notion of colonizing to other forms of human exploitation, normalization, repression and dependency. It forms a composite but powerful intellectual and critical movement which renews the perception and understanding of modern history, cultural studies, literary criticism, and political economy.

Postcolonialism, in essence, refers to the effects and impacts of colonization on culture and societies of non-western countries. It also explores the political, social, and cultural effects of decolonization, continuing the anti-challenge to western dominance. It usually designates the study of works written at any point after colonization in a given country, though it is sometimes used more specifically to refer to the analyses of texts and other cultural discourses that arose after the end of the colonial period. It is a type of cultural criticism which usually involves the analysis of

literary texts produced in countries and culture that have come under the control of European colonial powers at some point in their history. It is a set of theories in literature and philosophy that grapples with the legacy of colonial rule. As a literary theory, it tackles the literature produced in countries that were once colonies of other countries, especially the major European colonial powers. It also deals with literature written in or by citizens of colonizing countries that takes colonies or their peoples as its subject matter. The phrase “postcolonial studies” has diverse meanings. It also designates the analysis of texts written about colonized places by writers from the colonizing culture. M. H. Abrams, in his *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, views it as, “The critical analysis of the history, culture, literature, and modes of discourse that are specific to the former colonies of England, Spain, France, and other European imperial powers” (236). So, it concerns about the in-depth study of the issues like culture, history, etc., and the texts written about the colonized people. Generally, postcolonial studies focus upon the ‘Third World countries’ in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean islands, and South America. As Abram points out, “Some scholars extend the scope of such analyses also to the discourse and cultural production of such countries as Australia, Canada, and New Zealand . . .” (236).

Postcolonialism sometimes incorporates the aspects of British literature in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, viewed through a perspective that reveals the extent to which the social and economic life represented in the literature was tacitly underwritten by colonial exploitation. In many cases, it abounds with many issues for societies that have come across colonialism: the dilemmas of developing national identity in the wake of colonial rule; the ways in which writers from colonized countries attempt to articulate and even celebrate their cultural identities; the ways the knowledge of colonized people have served the interests of colonizers, and how

knowledge of subordinate people is produced and used: and the ways in which the literature of the colonial powers is used to justify the colonialism through the perpetuation of images of the colonized as inferior. The term, 'postcolonialism' is, in one way or the other, destined to hint at the issues in the countries that have once passed by colonial experiences.

In 1978, the Palestinian-American scholar, Edward Said, wrote the text, *Orientalism* which contributed a lot towards establishing this theory and practice in the recently developed field of study. Said has adopted the revised form of Michel Foucault's historicist critique of discourse and has, thereby, shown to us the ways in which the colonizing 'First World' has invented fake images and myths of the 'Third World.' That is, the west has invented some stereotypical images and myths whereby it has accelerated western domination and exploitation. Said's *Orientalism* is a study of how the western colonial powers of Britain and France represented North Africa and Middle Eastern lands in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. 'The Orient' is the collective noun Said uses to refer to these places. Moreover, Said asserts that negative stereotypes of the region and its people have long been exploited to justify western economic and political domination of the Middle East.

Postcolonialism appeared in the context of decolonization that marked the second half of the twentieth century and has been employed by contemporary critical discourse in a wide range of domains mapped by at least half a dozen disciplines. However, in spite of some two decades definitional debates, this term remains a vague concept expanding from a strictly historical definition to the more encompassing and controversial sphere of its contemporary kin-terms such as poststructuralism, postmodernism and the like.

Postcoloniality, on the one hand, may refer to the status of a land that is no longer colonized and has regained its political independence. In this sense, postcoloniality will pertain to the set of features like economic, political, social, etc. which characterize these countries and the way in which they negotiate their colonial heritage. It is in this sense that the long periods of forced dependency inevitably had a profound impact on the social and cultural fabric of these societies. It may also apply to the former colonizers in that both the colonizers and the colonized kept up contacts with the alien societies they overcame, and the eventual loss of these profitable possessions deeply impacted the course of their economic and cultural evolution.

Postcolonialism, on the other hand, may designate the new forms of economic and cultural oppression that have succeeded modern colonialism, sometimes called “neocolonialism.” The term tends to point out that cooperation, assistance, modernization and the like are, in fact, new forms of political and cultural domination as pernicious as the former imperial colonialism. That is to say, it is the devaluation of autochthonous ways of life and their displacement by the ethos of dominant nations that are technologically more advanced. Obviously, these two senses are intimately linked but foreground different aspects of a single process.

In the twentieth century, though the term ‘postcolonialism’ has been widely used to refer to the various cultural notions, yet the problem of its definition still exists. Does the term refer to texts or to practices, to psychological conditions or to concrete historical processes? Or does it perhaps refer to the interaction of all these? In this context, Padmini Mongia views that, “postcolonial theory becomes the locus of complex debates and the target of virulent criticism” (2). She analyses the importance

of postcolonialism in terms of its complex and dialectic criticism. Further, while defining the term more clearly, she views:

Homi K. Bhaba asserted ‘the term postcolonial is . . . to describe that form of social criticism that bear witness to those unequal and uneven processes of representation by which the historical experience of the once colonized Third World comes to be framed in the West.’ (1)

Thus, Bhabha regards the postcolonialism as the social criticism that conveys how the unequal and uneven representation of the non-West is the true framework in the eyes of the west. Likewise, in the book *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies*, Bill Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin put the definition of the term ‘postcolonialism’ as, “. . . study and analysis of European territorial conquests, the various institutions of European colonialisms, the discursive operations of empire, the subtleties of subject construction in colonial discourse . . .” (187). These statements, hence, place emphasis on the processes and the elements of colonialism and postcolonialism.

Though the cultural after-effects seem only to be the ends of postcolonial theory, it is also the contested space in which writers and theorists from the once-colonized lands have forced their voices against the mainstream of western scholarship. Postcolonialism has often occupied such a wide area that it includes multiplicity of identities and subject positioning which result from displacement, immigration and exiles without policing the border of identity along essentialist and original lines. To put it another way, it holds within it the multicultural perspectives and represents the multiplicity of experiences. In this regard, Bill Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin write:

Postcolonial theory involves . . . migration, slavery, suppression, resistance, representation, difference, race, gender, place, and

responses to the influential master discourses of imperial Europe such as history, philosophy and linguistics, and fundamental experiences of speaking and writing by which all these come into being. None of these is 'essentially' postcolonial, but together they form the complex fabric of the field. (2)

That is to say, postcolonialism is not a single form of literature, linguistics, culture, etc., but it is the blend of all these together.

Postcolonialism addresses all aspects of the colonial process from the beginning of the colonial contact. It is not entirely meaningful to consider the meaning of the term as 'after-colonialism' or 'after-independence.' The reason simply is that all the postcolonial societies are still subject, in one way or the other, to subtle form of neocolonialism. The gaining of independence has not solved these problems. The development of new elites within independent societies; the development of internal divisions based on racial or religious discrimination; the continuing unequal treatment of indigenous peoples in settler/ invader societies are all the factors which testify to the fact that postcolonialism is a continuing process of resistance and reconstruction. All these can add up to the fact that postcolonial writing has a long history of its own.

Similarly, postcolonialism studies the colonial condition wherein people were deprived of human rights and subdued by violence into a state of ignorance and misery. Frantz Fanon, a key theorist of anti-imperial nationalism, in *The Wretched of the Earth* writes his ideas on the nature of colonialism this way, "Colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding people in its grip. . . . by a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of the oppressed people and distorts, disfigures, and destroys it" (210). We see the formal end of colonialism in present time. But, we observe that the

new form of colonialism is still pervasive in the societies. Therefore, the process of resistance has not yet come to an end.

In the same way, Gayatri C. Spivak, a prominent postcolonial figure, formulates different terms to refer to the colonized people as constructed by colonized as subaltern, secondary, weak, feminine and others to Europe. In particular, the female writers like Spivak, Trinh T. Ming-ha, Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Lata Mani, Sara Suleri, etc., have raised the issues of female exploitation in the time of postcoloniality.

In conclusion, we can say that postcolonialism, explicitly or implicitly, revolves around the cultural issues and after-effects of colonialism. It touches upon the marginalized sides -- be it colonized people as margin, or subaltern as margin, or women as margin (which is the focus point of this research). To this end, the writers like Edward Said, Spivak, Frantz Fanon, Homi Bhaba have come up with the similar postcolonial cultural issues.

#### FEMINISM

Feminism is a modern tradition of literary commentary and polemic devoted to the defence of women's writing of fictional female characters against the condescensions of a predominantly male literary establishment. It was inaugurated in the late 1960s as a distinctive and concerted approach to literature. It had to pass almost two centuries of struggle so as to be recognized as the women's cultural roles and achievements, and their social and political rights. Such books as Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, John Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Women*, and Margaret Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* marked this struggle. But from 1980s, this theory has developed and diversified in a number of ways and is now characterized by a global perspective.

Feminism comprises of a number of social, cultural and political movements, theories and moral philosophies concerned with gender inequalities and discrimination against women. It is also described as an ideology focusing on equality of the sexes. It is a part of women's movement, formulated to develop their personalities and to make them aware of their deteriorating existence in a patriarchal society. The establishment of this movement was obviously to examine the ways in which literature, alongside other cultural productions, reinforces or undermines the economic, political, social and psychological oppression of women. In regard with the ends of the movement, J. A. Cuddon argues:

It questions the long-standing, dominant, male, phallogentric ideologies . . . patriarchal attitudes and male interpretations in literature . . . . It attacks male notions of values in literature -- by offering critiques of male authors and representations of men in literature and also by privileging women writers. . . . it challenges traditional and accepted male ideas about the nature of women and about how women feel, act and think . . . (315)

Thus, the feminist movement endeavours to disrupt and dismantle the hitherto male-rooted dominion in all spheres of lives. It questions the numerous prejudices and assumptions about women made by male writers, not least any tendency to cast women in stock character roles. In the same way, Arvonne S. Fraser defines the movement as:

. . . feminism was to elevate the equal rights and human rights status of women of race, language or religion, in order to achieve equality with men in all fields of human enterprise and to eliminate all discrimination against women. (44)



Fraser also focuses on the male dominations and discriminations upon women, and how the feminist movement has occurred to disrupt this ideology. It studies women as people who are either oppressed or suppressed or denied the freedom of personal expression.

Feminism as a movement came in response to long domination upon women by men. Since the human civilization, women have been regarded as inferior and secondary, while men have been perceived as the superior and primary beings. Because of her supposed inferiority, she has been assigned subordinate, peripheral, marginalized and secondary position in the society. It was believed that women were made to serve the men's purposes. They were supposed to serve men physically, sexually and mentally. They have always been dominated, violated and subjected to male supremacist ideology. To this end, in *Letters on the Equality of Sexes and the Conditions of Women*, Grimkes asserts, "The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpation on the part of men towards women, having in direct object, the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her" (37).

Since the ancient time, women have been relegated to an insignificant position. The society formulated certain restrictions and dictated certain rules over sexes; and consequently men continued showing their leadership by imposing his authority over female. We cannot discern any such rules or restrictions to justify the hierarchy, however. By quoting Aristotle, Seldem remarks that, "the female is female by virtue of a certain lack of qualities" (134). Similarly, by quoting St. Thomas Aquinas, Seldem again addresses woman as "imperfect man" (134). To strengthen these ideas, Seldem himself writes, "In pre-Mendelian days men regarded their sperm as the active seeds which give form to the waiting ovum which lacks identity till it

receives the male's impress" (134). Through these statements, Seldem shows how women's marginal position was fed and watered in the very beginning of century.

Basically, feminism is that western civilization which is entirely patriarchal, male-centered, and designed in such a way that women are trapped to male subordination in various forms: familial, religious, political, economical, social, legal, etc. It is a voice against inadequacy, the distortion, and the fake ideologies that the males have created to their benefit. The feminist writers accentuate the women's rights and emancipation. It concerns itself with the subordination and marginalization of all women, and makes efforts to rid them off it. They show their disagreement over the inferior role inflicted upon them by the patriarchal culture. Guerin in, *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*, explains the term 'Feminism' "as a matter of absent rather than what is present . . . . Feminist literary critics try to explain how power imbalance due to gender in a given culture reflected in or challenged by the literary text" (196).

Feminist scholars have divided feminism history into three waves, each with the different aspects of the same feminist issues. The first wave refers to the feminist movement of the nineteenth through early twentieth centuries which dealt mainly with the 'Suffrage movement.' The second wave which inclusively concentrated on the inequality of laws and culture, refers to the period from 1960s to 1980s. The third wave of feminism starts after 1990s and still continues. It is seen as both a continuation and a response to the perceived failures of the second wave.

In the same way, we find the voices of women against the male in three phases. Women from the past have revolted against the male-domination in their own way, depending on time and context. In *In Women Writing and Writing About Women* (1979), Showalter has distinguished three phases of modern women's literary

development: Feminine Phase (1840-1880), and Feminist Phase (1880-1920), and Female Phase (1920-present). In the first phase, women imitated masculine tradition. The women writers of the feminine phase have constructed a very narrow notion because their efforts were only to imitate and parallel the male values and achievements. They were not radical feminist in that they were confined in the narrow structure of the male entrapment. Women of this period only performed their traditional roles. Elizzbeth Gaskell and George Eliot were the famous female writers of the phase. Likewise, in the second phase, women became more conscious of their positions and rights in the society. Many literary works are constructed to oppose the myth of the patriarchy. Women (writers) have come out to directly protest against the unjust treatment through literature. Major female writers like Showalter, Virginia Woolf, Elizabeth Robins are the famous figures of this phase. And, finally, it is the female phase in which their own autonomous female perspectives get expressed. It is the period of self-discovery. New and innovative writings are created against the patriarchy. They deal with their own self-created knowledge. They search the separate identity and language within the cultures to give expression to their ownness. They want to know about who they are through the self-created knowledge. So the self-created knowledge is the focus of this phase. Rebecca West, Katherine Mansfield and Dorothy Richardson are the prominent figures of the period.

It is only after the beginning of the twentieth century that women started bringing out the revolting voices through writings. Until then, they were not courageous enough to face male violation. Feminism itself comprises of repression and resistance, whereas the resistance came about quite late, that is, after nineteenth and early twentieth century. The writers like Virginia Woolf, Mary Woolstonecraft, Simone de Beauvoir, Elain Showalter, Sandra M. Gilbert, Susan Gubor, etc.,

emerged with both the nature of patriarchy the revolting voices against it. But, till now, revolt found expression only in writings. Virginia Woolf, an important precursor of feminism, has depicted the situation of women writers throughout modern history in her most popular work, *A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas*. Woolf's feminism always displayed its own kind of independence. She concerns herself with men's anger at women, misunderstanding between the sexes, and above all "the psychological conditions under which women -- and men -- were brought up" (Adams, 817). Adams, further, adds:

Woolf addresses the question of why a sister of Shakespeare would not likely have been able to write anything, let alone a play. She would have had none of the material resources -- breadth of human experience, money, time -- to do so. She would have been discouraged by everyone . . . . Woolf held for radical changes that would or should occur as women's freedom and their suppressed values began to affect conceptions of power, family, and social life . . . (817)

Thus, Woolf not only touches on the women writers, but also on all the women condition of the time, and hopes that it they would culminate in equality.

Another important figure is Mary Wollstonecraft who also severely condemns the constructed framework of women. She was the first woman to write about women's right issues. In her book, *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, she advocates that it is essential for women to acquire rights, and she thinks that men are responsible for women deprivation and subordination. For her women should be allowed to freely exercise and use their knowledge and abilities to govern their own conduct. To clarify these statements, Adams asserts:

. . . fundamental principles enunciated are that the mind does not know the sex and that, as Claire Tomalin has remarked “. . . society is wasting it’s assets if it retains women in the role of convenient domestic slaves and alluring mistresses, denies them economic independence and encourage them to be docile and attentive to their looks to the exclusion of all else.” (394)

French critic like Simone de Beauvoir has established the fundamental questions of modern feminism in her most recognized work, *The Second Sex*. She holds that men have assigned the tag of inferiority to women and the oppressions of women have resulted from that very idea. Men have always ignored the abstract ‘notion of equality.’ The basic view is that the cultural construction of the women as the inferiority is the problem. In this connection, Seldem argues, “When a woman tries to define herself, she starts by saying ‘I am a woman.’ No man would do so. This fact reveals the basic asymmetry between the terms ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ ” (135). Similarly, Elaine Showalter in her famous work, *A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Bronte to Lessing*, has divided feminist criticism into two types: woman as a writer and woman as a reader. She has accentuated the issue of woman as a writer instead of woman as a reader. This study is called “gynocriticism.”

In addition, Kate Millet’s *Sexual Politics* (1977) deals with the idea of political feminist writing on literature. In her view, patriarchy is the cause of women’s oppression. Seldem further clarifies this ideas, “Patriarchy subordinates the female to the male or treats the female as an inferior male. Power is exerted directly or indirectly in civil and domestic life, to constrain women” (137).

In the present time, silence has also been one major issue in the study of feminism. In the past, it was regarded as the weakness or the lack of capacity on the part of women. Many women writers have attempted to “rediscover the whole tradition of books by women ‘silenced’ by the traditional male canon” (Peck, 171). And, therefore, it was never studied. But, recently critics like Steiner and Susan Sontag have spoken about it. Silence has become women's ultimate weapon for resistance. In this regard, Steiner says, “Silence has ‘another speech than ordinary saying,’ but it is meaningful speech nevertheless” (72). Silence as a part of communicative interaction can be one of the forms of speech that speaks meaningfully but differently. An Algerian popular poet Tahar Djaout writes, “If you do not speak you die / So, speak out and die” (45). Thus, silence has become one most important way for women to reveal their suppressed voices. Therefore, to understand the lives of women, we need to observe their silences minutely.

However, Valerie Bryson has very vividly outlined the nature of feminism, by blending both its traditional definition and the present radical view about it. She holds:

. . . it is essentially a theory of, by and for women; as such, it is based firmly in women’s own experiences and perceptions . . . it sees the oppression of women as the most fundamental and universal form of domination, and its aim is to understand and end this . . . women as a group have interest opposed to those of men; these interests unite them in a common sisterhood that transcends the division of class or race, and means that women should struggle together to achieve their own liberation. . . . power is not confined to the public worlds of politics . . . but that it extends into private life; this means that traditional

concepts of power and politics are challenged and extended to such 'personal' areas of life as the family and sexuality, both of which are seen as instruments of patriarchal domination. (181)

In short, what she brings out is that the theory entirely pertains to women and, therefore, it should not be seen in the viewpoint of politics. It, thereby, threatens the traditional notion of power in patriarchy.

#### RESISTANCE OF WOMEN

Resistance is a form of revolt, struggle, weapon, reformation, or energetic power, etc., directed against any type of the unjust to attain the just. It dominates all the traditional values and systems, and attempts to bring about the enlightenment and light to all. It adopts various forms as per the nature of the repression or oppression. It is, after all, the oppression that gives birth to the resistance. Most generally, resistance refers to the revolt against the unjust and established-evilness of patriarchal society.

Resistance can take place in many places in many forms, but here we are focusing upon the women resistance that is against the patriarchy under the veil of postcolonialism. It can bring the freedom to the women by dismantling the traditional patriarchal domination. The term 'resistance' can resemble the revolution and might assist in fighting with the ideas, thoughts and notions of male-domination. So, it is an intellectual fight against the thought to bring forth the new system -- the system of women freedom. This type of resistance can be intellectual in the sense that only women of wisdom pose themselves against it. Resistance is mainly concerned with the reformation of the society, that is, the reformation of the patriarchal society. Hence, it is a revolution in favour of women against men.

The world was and is still under the control of men and they manipulate the women the way they like. But now when the idea of feminism is heard everywhere, women have begun to raise their voices against the male. It is only with the power of resistance that women can establish their rights in the society. We can say that resistance is a natural instinct that creeps into the mind of women when they find their position in the society critical. When they are oppressed more, they come up with the ideas of resistance with a view to bringing up changes in the established society and, thereby, creating the favourable female framework. Resistance does not come about per se; for it, the fatal waves of male oppression have to go to the optimum level. When resistance, indeed, turns up, it endeavours to shake and dig out the long-rooted evilness of male domination.

Obviously women do not resist for nothing. Rather they are compelled to it. The radical idea of resistance has begun in the twentieth century. The dissemination of education, knowledge and their conscious souls make them resistant. The radical outbreak of education has made them aware of the human rights that men and women are equally liable to. They become very conscious of the idea that each human being is born with equal freedom and that they are not to be deprived of it by other. This consciousness has encouraged them to revolt against any type of oppression and domination. At the same time, it is the instinct of all human beings -- be it man or woman -- to lead an independent life. In this context, when women are not even able to live their own life, it is justifiable on their part to resist the patriarchal domination. In fact, women resist for the justification of their rights and want to change the unjust rule that has snatched their rights. The equality of rights and privileges between man and woman is what the resistance of women aims to realize.



## NEXUS BETWEEN POSTCOLONIALISM AND FEMINISM

Postcolonialism and feminism pertain to each other in the sense that they share the intimate experience of the politics of oppression and repression, and resistance consequently. Women, like colonized subjects, have been also sidelined as other by various forms of patriarchal forces. So, both the postcolonial and the feminist have the marginal side. Both as men in patriarchy and Europeans in postcolonialism are the colonizing factors whereas women in the former and the non-western in the latter are the colonized factors. In *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*, Bill Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin have stated:

Feminist and post-colonial discourses both seek to reinstate the marginalized in the face of the dominant, and early feminist theory, like early nationalist postcolonial criticism was concerned with inverting the structure of domination, substituting, for instance, a female tradition or traditions for a male-dominated canon. (249)

These two terms have more in common, especially, in terms of marginalization and emerging resistance. Feminists have highlighted a number of the unexamined assumptions within postcolonial discourse, just as postcolonialism's interrogations of western feminist scholarship have provided timely warnings and led to new directions.

We know from some critics that the issues of gender differences were raised in colonial and anti-colonial discourses, and the representations of women also got equal currency at the time. Women have been subordinated since the outset of civilization, and, when the colonialism began, their sufferings persisted even more. It was intensified from two levels: from patriarchy itself and from the pervasion of colonialism. As marginalized factors they could not put their heads above the patriarchy. Some feminist critics have pointed out that postcolonialism can appear as

a male-centered field in the sense that almost all the founders of postcolonialism are male. In the same way, the system of patriarchy also invests power in men and marginalizes women. Like colonialism, patriarchy manifests itself in both concrete ways such as disqualifying women a vote and at the level of imagination. Furthermore, like colonialism, patriarchy exists in the midst of resistance to its authority. Thus, both postcolonialism and feminism have the common purpose of challenging the forms of oppression.

To refer to the ways in which women have simultaneously experienced the oppression of colonialism and patriarchy, Kirsten Holst Petersen and Anna Rutherford have used the phrase ‘a double colonization.’ The concept of a double colonization refers to the fact that women are doubly colonized -- by colonialist realities and representations and by patriarchal ones too. To clarify the idea further, John Meleod, by quoting Kirsten Holst Petersen and Anna Rutherford, argues that:

. . . colonialism celebrates male achievement in a series of male-oriented myth such as ‘mateship, the mounties, explorers, freedom fighters, bushrangers, missionaries,’ while women are subject to representation in colonial discourses in ways which colludes with patriarchal values. (175)

Now most of the postcolonial feminist critics have addressed the representation of women created by ‘double colonization,’ and they also analyze how both postcolonialism and feminism have endeavoured to depose of it. So, we are for sure that the issues of women and postcolonialism are the same; to understand the one better, the other should be studied simultaneously. It is so because the nature of repression and resistance resemble in much the same. In the same way, power is the

vital force working in both factors. To show how postcolonialism affects the women, John Mcleod, by quoting Hazel Carby, further argues:

. . . British colonialism interrupted indigenous familial and community structures and imposed its own models instead. Colonialism attempted to destroy kinship patterns that were not modelled on nuclear family structures, disrupting, in the process, female organization that were based upon kinship systems which allowed more power and autonomy to women than those of colonizing nation. (177)

Thereby, it puts forward the ideas how the colonialism has a terrible impact upon gender roles in indigenous communities, by dismantling their own established customs.

In the final analysis, most importantly, the concept of ‘a double colonization’ has worked in the novel very much. It is not only that, but sometimes we find out that both postcolonialism and feminism have co-worked towards exploiting women. Therefore, only the general notion of postcolonialism and feminism could be workable to show the ‘double colonization’ -- women are subordinated by both postcolonialism and patriarchy.

### III. TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

#### INTRODUCTION

The present analysis would employ the modality of postcolonialism and feminism in collaboration to explore the issues of the repression and resistance of women characters in the novel, *Shame*, in the midst of postcolonial context. The research, though, has incorporated the methodology of both postcolonialism and feminism, yet, it would, in fact, use feminism in particular and postcolonialism in general as a backdrop so as to depict the women's poor condition more vividly. To put it in another way, though the research would entirely focus upon the exploitations or the implicit sufferings of women characters, yet it would also observe how the environment of postcolonialism has even more aggravated the condition. It is quite clear that the ultimate purpose of the research would be to analyze how the women have been victimized by both patriarchy and postcolonialism, that is, women are twice colonized by male-domination, and by colonialist realities and representations respectively. Thus, postcolonialism will be used to make clearer the aggravating condition of women in feminist condition.

After all, it is already mentioned that both postcolonialism and feminism share so many issues in common. Moreover, the politics of repression and resistance, the male figures in the centre in terms of oppression and female figures in the margin in terms of repression, and the emphases of both upon reinstating the marginalized in the face of the dominant are all the common issues inherent in both the movements. So, in both the terms the women are positioned in the dominated side. That is why, it behoves us to bring into play the movements of feminism and postcolonialism altogether to explore the conditions of women in the novel. At the top of it, the notion of 'a double colonialization' emerges from patriarchy and coloniality.

Likewise, the focus upon women characters has been especially preferred for the analysis. It is so because the direct impact of colonialism and patriarchy has worked upon women. In the novel, most of the women characters have suffered in one way or the other. The bringing into play the notion of feminism is quite apt in the sense that the stories of women characters have overtaken the novel in much space. In the same way, the modality of postcolonialism is also justifiable because the contents of the novel have taken place in the postcolonial setting and they surface up the issues of marginalization as well. The setting of the novel is after the Partition time in Pakistan. It is the time when colonialism has just ended in Pakistan. Therefore, the effects of colonialism can be pervasively found in the novel.

As to the system of analysis, the research detects the suffering women characters and looks into how it is occasioned by both patriarchy and colonialism altogether. Obviously, the sufferings of women are due to either patriarchy or the power politics -- colonialism. So, the research would take ahead the findings of both colonialism and patriarchy together. The female characters that would be brought under investigation are the three daughters of Mr. Old Shakil, Bilquis Hyder, Sufia Zinobia Hyder, Naveed Hyder, Rani Harappa, Arjumand Harappa, etc. Besides, the research would poke at some postcolonial traces in order to lend credence to the thesis.

#### POSTCOLONIALISM AND FEMINISM IN *SHAME*

The novel, from the very outset, is full of male dominations. All the male characters, especially chief male characters, have occupied the central position. Male characters like Raza Hyder, Iskander Harappa, etc., have acted and are dynamic in their role. They are dynamic and active in the sense that they are involved in many actions, and have manipulated and caused many events. They are in the centre when

we are described any events or actions in the novel. We find that male characters have caused lots of problems to women everywhere. Their stories are related to the male. Or we can say that we cannot talk anything about women in the novel without the reference to the male involvement. For instance, we cannot talk about Bilquis Hyder without the reference to Raza Hyder, Rani Harappa without the mention of Iskander Harappa, and Naveed Hyder without Talvar Ulhaq. Women in the novel are sidelined and assigned to the secondary roles because, firstly, they do not speak, they are spoken and, secondly, they do not act, rather they are acted. They all look very passive, and maybe, they are made passive. The narrator himself says that he does not want to include them in the story, but they have themselves intruded into the story. The narrator himself opines:

. . . what I had on my hands was an almost excessively masculine tale . . . . But the women seem to have taken over; they marched in from the peripheries of the story to demand the inclusion of their own tragedies, histories and comedies, obliging me . . . to see my male plot refracted . . . through the prisms of its reverse and 'female' side. (173)

Particularly, three types of characters such as the politicians -- represented by Iskander Harappa and Raza Hyder -- the military, and the religious leader control the fate of the women in particular and the fate of Pakistan in general. They promulgate decisive and coercive steps on the masses and take things into their own hand. For instance, Bilquis Hyder, Raza's wife is forced to migrate from India during Partition time when her father's cinema empire was set ablaze. She was so conditioned by her father's will that she is left with nothing save her shame.

Similarly, the research dwells upon the nature and role of postcolonialism in the story of women. The after-effects of colonialism are very pervasive in the novel

from the beginning to the end. It is so because the present context or condition in the novel is that of the period which has remained after the coloniality has freed Pakistan. Pakistan after 1947 was a free country, without the direct influence of colonialism. The unpleasant consequences can be still seen in the system of ruling at the very moment. Raza Hyder, Iskander Harappa, and Talvar Ulhaq are in the government to run the country, but they fail to perform their duty. The pervasion of chaos is seen after the Angrezs have left because the good system and governance was begun and sustained by them till they were there; but after they left, it all collapses. We see the government as a place for the people like Raza Hyder to go to power for retaliation, not for the good purpose of serving the people. Raza Hyder and Iskander Harappa are the characters to represent the contemporary government of General Gia Ul Haq and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto respectively in Pakistan.

The helm of the country is in the hands of these people who are not able to maintain themselves, let alone the country. These three characters have maltreated their own women. These three political characters -- Raza Hyder, Iskander Harappa, and Talvar Ulhoq -- are helpless. They are trying to rule over the country in the best possible way. But, unlike the Angrezs, they have no inborn legacy to drive the state. After Angrezs have left the colonized countries, the state of chaos and confusions prevails over there. It is one of the key issues raised in the study of postcolonialism. The state of chaos and confusion has touched upon the many aspects of Pakistan and, as a result, has led to the tension in every sphere. We find the nation in the novel running through transitional period in that things have just begun to settle in the right places. In fact, the novel depicts the postcolonial turmoil of Pakistan, but, at the same time, the repressed stories of women also appear on the front, as women are also one element of marginalized factors. In another way, it is a postcolonial picture, but the

marginalized factors happen to become women the most. It is so because all the male characters are the victims of coloniality and it has affected their women family members.

In addition, the concept of centre and margin which has worked in the postcolonialism, has equally gained in the currency in feminist issues as well. After all, it is the women who become doubly victimized. In both cases, men are in the centre. That is why, the novel has shown its more preference for women who are dynamic and aggressive, and rejects the passive roles that women are reduced to playing and, sometimes, under the pervasive influence of patriarchal values, even will this subjection upon themselves. Accordingly, almost all the normal women in *Shame* are shown as passive or complicit with patriarchal values, and are consequently rejected and shown in the most negative light. For instance, Arjumand Harappa, who is so blinded by her father that she refuses to see even his most glaring omissions, is condemned, like her mother, to a life without love. Similarly, the author's contempt for Naveed Hyder and her propensity towards 'sitting on her hair' is evident when he summarily dismisses the story of her rebellion as not worthy of comparison with Anna Muhammad. Bilquis's disappointment in her own inability to produce a son marks her as complicit with patriarchal values. Even Bariamma, engrossed in the fixity of her gossipy tales, is subjected to the author's contempt and ridicule. It is only Rani Harappa and Omar Khayyam's three mothers, apart from sufia Zinobia, who receive sympathy and understanding from the author. Thus, we see that the author himself, while delineating the repressed stories of women, has ignored the more passive women in the novel.

The research now moves to the analysis of the particular characters in terms of repression and resistance, and how it is made more possible by colonialism to some



extent. At the very beginning of novel, we are presented three women characters: Chhunni, Munnee and Bunny. These three characters are the daughters of Old Mr. Shakil who is already widowed. It is strange that though the old man is rich and lives in a big mansion, he does not allow his three daughters to visit out. They have been imprisoned in that house since their birth. These daughters have never been out and do not know what the outside world is. They are of the marriageable age and, therefore, need to know a lot of things. But, they are oblivious to it. On the other hand, these daughters always pray for the early death of their father so that they can, on the one hand, enjoy the great wealth of their father, and, on the other hand, they can live very free and independent lives of their own. They hate their father for his cruel behavior.

But, we know that, if we look beneath the lines, the father is very much aware of the immoral harm that the Angrezs might do to his daughters. It might be justifiable for the father to imprison his daughters for sometime, but imprisoning them for long time in the name of possible harm by foreigners is very, very unjustifiable. In this regard, we can certainly say that the father has misbehaved his daughters. In other words, he has even deprived them of their human rights. Women are exploited sometimes as mothers, sometimes as daughters and, sometimes as wives. In every way and in every form, they fall prey to male violation. Here, they have been exploited as daughters. They are not even given the privileges that they deserve naturally. They have “been kept inside that labyrinthine mansion until his dying day; virtually uneducated, they were imprisoned in the zenana wing” (13). It is quite traditional and oppressive on the part of Old Mr. Shakil to keep them away from education, and other basic privileges.

The three sisters have been even going through the identity crisis. In the novel, only their first name is being used and, thus, they are deprived of their surname. Indeed, Old Mr. Shakil has great contempt for them to the extent that he does not like to link their names with his family line. What the narrator observes about their name is:

Their names . . . but their real names were never used, like the best household China which was locked away after the night of their joint tragedy in a cupboard whose location was eventually forgotten . . . they almost ceased to believe . . . the three sisters . . . bore the family name of Shakil . . . (1)

Thus, the three daughters are never assigned their family name and, thereby, their fragmented identity is practiced whenever in need. Likewise, they have been compared with the household objects that are to be kept for show in a room but not to be touched for real purpose. Or the daughters are shown to bear resemblance to the broken household objects that are thrown and forgotten. So, we can easily speculate from these lines how women have been depicted in the novel. In fact, the conditions of the daughters are the same because they stay in their big mansion and do nothing. They are not important in the father's eyes. It is what the narrator has described and it is what comes true in the ensuing events.

The images of 'the best household China' and 'their joint tragedy in a cupboard' are very powerful, for it has intensified their painful state in a vivid manner. It also hints at how women were traditionally confined in a cupboard- like-room. It is their subordinated limitation created by the males.

We have not been given much information about the girls. If any, that is only the negative picture of them. Because of the sequestration that the father has imposed upon them, they have been misled morally. They have grown very obscene habits in unison which is a moral fall in their characters and which results from the father's cause. To reveal their obscene habits, the narrator mentions:

. . . they amused each other by inventing private languages and fantasizing about what a man might look like when undressed, imagining . . . bizarre genitalia such as holes in the chest into which their own nipples might snugly fit. (13)

They are so helpless that they cannot make any strong efforts to resist their father. But they have resisted in subtle forms. They have always cursed and called for their father's death for their freedom. They "would weave occult spells to hasten the moment of their father's demise" (13). The father has put them under "iron morality" (13). But they have disobeyed it by growing an illegitimate child inside their womb. Unaware of the father's notice, they have done it and, thereby, have challenged their father. The father puts them inside the building -- either for domination or for protection from evil forces in the society -- but they have fallen prey to it. It is really going against the will of their father. They have at least developed a sense of disobedience or revolt against their father. It is the beginning germination of resistance against the father in particular and male society as a whole.

In all these, we cannot avoid the impacts of colonialism. It seems that the father may have imprisoned them inside the building to save from the Angrez's evil eyes. It is so because women at the time of colonialism were not safe. As Angrezs were in power, they could do anything to the women to spoil their beauty and morality. To this end, the hints have already been scattered as well. The child Omar

Khayyam is born to these three sisters -- to the three sisters because the three of them each claim themselves to be the mother of the child and, on the other hand, no one, including their close woman servants, knows who has given birth to the child and when. All of them show the same symptoms of pregnancy. It is quite clear that the child is of the British decent. The Angrez officers must have impregnated her (them). After the birth of the child, they have been morally questioned and undergo the consequent sufferings. Additionally, when the three sisters organize the party to celebrate their ruin, they give preference to the invitations of the foreigners in comparison to the indigenous people. It seems that they had already been attached to the foreigners more. The sisters had also become very rude in times of invitation by:

. . . scorning the doormats of the indigenous worthies, had found their way into the Angrtez Cantonment, and into the ballroom of the dancing sahibs. The long-forbidden household remained barred to all but a few locals . . . the sisters were visited by a uninformed and ball- gowned crowd of foreigners. The Imperialist! . . . (16)

So, it looks they were already more affected by Angrezs. Furthermore, their gestures in the party were similar to the foreigners. They “ordered the musicians to start playing Western-style dance music . . .” (16). Thus, we find that these three daughters have suffered not only because of the father's patriarchal morality, but also because of the colonialism's interference in the locals. And, they have somehow attempted to resist against it helplessly.

Likewise, we have another suffering character: Bilquis Hyder, the wife of Raza Hyder. Even as being the wife of the General and daughter of a great businessman, she cannot lead a very happy and satisfactory life. In the novel, her character is not given a justifiable touch. She is motherless at first, but her father also

commits suicide later because of the terrible collapse in the business. She has suffered itself as not having mother from her childhood. After her father commits suicide, she is left alone and uncared. It was what happened in India and, as a result, she was compelled to migrate from India during Partition time. She is so conditioned by her father's will that she is left with nothing except her shame and a "dupatta of modesty" (63). The narrator describes her pathetic condition as:

O Bilquis. Naked and eyebrowless beneath the golden knight, wrapped in the delirium of the firewind, she saw her youth flying past her, borne away on the wings of the explosion which were still beating in her ears. . . . it is the fate of migrants to be stripped of history, to stand naked amidst the scorn of strangers . . . (63)

Hence, Bilquis is left naked and bankrupt. And as she becomes the migrant, she even loses her past history. She is in a new place with a new history beginning. She would live there rootless. She finds her life flying away in the explosion of the fire that has destroyed her father's business. It is not her choice but what her father imposes upon her in particular and by the society in general.

Father does not think about the already orphaned daughter and takes the hasty action of death. She has been imposed the orphanage upon her turn by turn. As a result, she even has to go to 'the dormitory house' -- a house where so many poor women sleeps -- and live with an obscene life. She is very ashamed of giving birth to a female child, Sufia Zinobia. She always feels unhappy about this matter. Indeed, her husband wants a son. She is mocked at everywhere for having given birth only to the daughter. Even then, her first child is mentally and physically retarded. The daughter is called 'shame' even by her own mother. It shows how shameful she feels to have borne a female child. As a matter of fact, she was not to feel the shame for

this, but it was the society -- the patriarchal one -- that always expects healthy son and beautiful daughter. But, the first daughter does not fall in any categories. So, the parents, especially the mother, are ashamed of it. In the similar manner, her husband is killed at the end. Raza Hyder is killed due to his own interest in the power play. He is killed as a response to the vengeance for his long-ago murder of Omar's brother. But, the ultimate victim would be his wife, Bilquis Hyder because she has lost her husband and become a widow. Hence, the compulsion of migration, the shame of bearing a retarded child, and the state of being widow are all ups and downs she has to go through under the circumstances in the society.

She has not committed any such mistakes to the extent of undergoing such difficulties. It is the system of society wherein she has fallen. It is not only due to the patriarchal factors that have contributed to her troubles, but also the partial impacts of colonialism equally add up. In any society, women in particular and men in general suffer if the governance is not good. It keeps people safe and relieved. The state of chaos and orthodoxy still exists in the society, even after the end of colonialism. After colonialism was lifted, the colonialists took the system with them. People are left to care about them on their own. So it is the transitional period and in this period, usually, many problems can surface in the society. It seems, to some extent, Bilquis Hyder has also fallen prey to it. So the novel is, in many ways, directed to show the pathetic conditions of women in the state of patriarchal domination and postcolonialism. The impacts of colonialism are not seen here directly but the context, in which she suffers, is created by colonialism in partial way.

Furthermore, Bilques's daughters: Sufia Zinobia Hyder and Naveed Hyder also go through the oppressions of the society in patriarchy. Both these daughters are married and, know a lot about the society. They are the daughters of the future

president, Raza Hyder. They have not done any such cruel acts to deserve the sufferings. However, they have suffered. They are played in the hands of male characters. Both of them want to lead simple lives, but their innocence has been exploited. Naveed has been forced to bear children in large number; her husband does not heed what it might lead to the health of his wife. Similarly, Sufia Zinobia becomes the part of ridicule and shame in every place. It is not what she has opted for her but it has naturally happened. But she has been punished for it and it has even led her to the madness.

Sufia is the daughter of General Raza Hyder and wife of Omar Shakil. She is born retarded and mentally sick. Sufia symbolizes purity and innocence. She is a saintly figure who absorbs the shame of those around her who commits brutal acts. From the time of her birth, she assumes the social stigma of being a daughter, and is referred to as “the wrong miracle” (89). Her blush at birth is transfigured into the sign for the collective shame of the community. As being a female child, she was called by different derogatory expression like “My Sufia Zinobia grew out of the corpse of that murdered girl who is murdered by her father for having brought shame upon the family” (116). In the process of treatment, Omar Khayyam begins to love her and marries. His marriage is not consummated, though. Her husband is the embodiment of shamelessness and is counterpoised against Sufia, who is the epitome of shame, both in name and personality.

The novel’s title is *Shame* and the embodiment of shame can be traced down in the character of Sufia in the sense that she becomes a source of shame to herself and to her parents. They are humiliated for having borne just a female child. She suffers the price for their humiliation just because she is a daughter borne while the opposite was in the expectation. The state of shame, that her parents are feeling, has

been addressed as “The plague of shame” (141). Sufia is thought to be “her parent’s burden, her mother’s shame, remained as dry as the desert. Groans, insults, even the wild blows of exasperation rained on her . . . . Her spirit parched for lack of affection . . .” (121).

So, she has remained as the burden and the shame for her parents simply because she is not a male child. It is not just a shame but also a plague that spreads so fast and impinges on so many others in the near vicinity.

She not only absorbs the shame and remains passive but also transforms it into a form of revolutionary hysteria. When we read the narrative about her, the escalating violence of her can be easily unearthed from a feminist perspective. Sufia’s style of beheading off the heads of her victims and of showing her presence everywhere is suggestive of the elements of the destructive dimension of Kali, the goddess, who had killed the male demon, the symbol of oppression. The (male) human targets of her attack reveal an agglomeration of female revenge. The ‘Beauty’ and ‘Beast’ metaphors revolve around her characterization. The traditional associations of passivity incorporated within the ‘Beauty’ myth is shunned and replaced instead by the bestial fighter who initially destroys animals and fields. After her marriage, when Sufia finds that “Her husband does not come to her at night” (215) but has sexual intercourse with the servant; she questions the state of her life and marriage and responds with a consequential rise in violence. She has shown very destructive violence against men. It seems that her sense of revolt has found an outlet through the dream. She has been ignored and maltreated in the society so much so that she finishes off the things that come to her. As to the four men, the narrator describes that, “The heads had been wrenched off their necks by some colossal force: literally torn from their shoulders. . . . They were found in a rubbish dump near



a slum” (216). The transformation from ‘Beauty’ to ‘Beast’ is indicative of the extent to which women can awake to revolt against the injustices done to them. Women can be beautiful, and can be bestial as well to save their beauty.

Hysteria is another residing factor in the character of Sufia. It is explained that hysteria emanates from sexual frustration. Hysteria can be considered within patriarchal society as the expression of unsatisfied and thwarted aspects of women’s lives, intellectual frustrations, lack of mobility and the need for control or autonomy. Therefore, at one level, Sufia’s hysterical violence may be seen to encode undertones of the sexually frustrated woman. Even if she is not able to grasp the more intricate repressive systems defining her reality, the extremes of gender socialization are entrenched in her psyche so that her revenge is directed at all man-kind. Her actions destabilize and demand the attention of the male establishment and open up possibilities of agency that are insidiously foreclosed by positions that take identity categories as foundational and fixed, for instance, mother, daughter or wife. Hence, the forms of repression and resistance are equally moving ahead and, thereby, Rushdie directs our attentions towards the pitiable conditions of women and, the concomitant violence in partiality, though.

The extent of repression works in the novel in oblique forms. At most stages, it damagingly works upon the women characters. But, in most cases, they have been unknowingly affected by it. Commenting on the nature of repression and resistance, the narrator holds:

Repression is a seamless garment; a society which is authoritarian in its social and sexual codes which crushes its women beneath the intolerable burdens of honour and propriety, breeds repressions of other kinds as well. (173)

The repressions lead to sexual and psychological frustration, the effects of which are visible later and impinge on subsequent relationships. The marital relationships which run tenuous, again lead to another generation of women who are equally incapacitated by male repressions. Each one negotiates her familial and social tensions differently, but whatever methods they choose -- resistance or resignation -- they are compelled to be content with cultural expectations which include marriage and the capacity to produce male children since a female child is a 'sign of personal and familial ignominy.'

As to Naveed Hyder, she works to meet the cultural demands of her husband and the society. She is also seen as the embodiment of good news at the beginning. Being the daughter of future president and wife of chief political police, she is unaware of female role in the family. She is unknowingly used as the machine for producing babies. She performs the role of the ideal woman by producing an endless stream of children. However, as her reproductive capacity increases, her name becomes an ironic signification of her fecundity. She holds the responsibility of mothering in that she functions solely as a baby-machine. Her husband is oblivious to her physical and psychological condition, resulting from it. He only wants her to give him children. He only expects and assures this in her. But, when she realizes, at the end, after bearing twenty seven children, that she can no longer maintain her social values, her reproductive capacity becomes the mere subject of irony and gets down to the level of grotesque; it, thus, assumes the form of shame. She is just used as an object as a source to serve the needs of her husband, whereas her husband does not care about her any longer. We see her servility to her husband at the beginning but it turns into the opposite at the end when she commits suicide in order to escape the oppressions. It suggests that she has the awareness of domination done upon her but

she cannot show it out. Naveed's pathetic condition can be grasped vividly in these lines:

Begum Naveed Talvar . . . proved utterly incapable of coping with the endless stream of humanity flowing out between her thighs. But her husband was relentless, insatiable, his dream of children had expanded to fill up the place in his life . . . and owing to his clairvoyant talents he always knew which nights were best for conception. He came to her once a year and ordered her to get ready, because it was time to plant the seed, until she felt like a vegetable patch whose naturally fertile soil was being worn out by an over-zealous gardener, and understood that there was no hope for women in the world, because whether you were respectable or not the men got you anyway, no matter how hard you tried to be the most proper of ladies the men would come and stuff you full of alien unwanted life. Her old personality was getting squashed by the pressure of the children who were so numerous that she forgot their names, she hired an army of ayahs and abandoned her offspring to their fate, and then she gave up trying. . . . the absolute determination to be beautiful which had entranced first Haroun Harappa and then Captain Talvar faded from her features . . . (207)

In the case of Naveed, the form of resistance has surfaced in different forms. Her incessant production of children enforces seclusion on her life because pregnancy, childbirth and aftercare of the infant occur in the domestic space. In the same way as purda is a way of keeping the woman dependent on her husband, constant pregnancy then is also a way of purda which holds up Naveed's dependence on her husband. Naveed can do nothing to do away with this problem. It is the duty

of the women to obey her husband. But she opts out of this trouble of pregnancies by committing suicide. To save herself from further suppression, she destroys herself. Even if she cannot resist directly, she has assumed the roundabout way to save herself from her husband's unwanted imposition on her.

Female oppression is both gendered and classed in case of Naveed. As an upper-class woman she has a set of expectations placed upon her. In addition to the procreative aspect, Naveed's suicide enacts the tensions of wearing the night perfume constantly looking groomed and beautiful and producing babies simultaneously while doing so. The extreme signification of femininity, the perfume and flowers associated with Naveed's death, is a form of parody of both gender and class norms and expectations. We should also understand that suicide as a practice and as a metaphor refers to the refusal to be conscripted. Suicide can be productive in opening up a dialogue about sexual differences. It refers to the tragic level of powerlessness and desperation of women and bears profound witness to the patriarchal authority and general atmosphere of socio-political suffocation. To cut the long story short, suicide is also a *modus operandi* of the protest against the male violence inflicted upon the women. She has preserved herself from more oppression by terribly resorting to the suicide.

In modern feminism, silence is also taken as the grave issue in the study and understanding of women. In the past, silence was meant to be the weakness and, thereby, put behind the screen. It is well-accepted fact that language is male-made and, therefore, cannot give a realistic expression to the women's experiences. It was male strategy that women were compelled to show their sufferings through verbal mediums in which they were not skilled. So they failed to express their womanliness or what they are and what they feel. But, indeed, silence is also the sign of certain

voice that can no longer be heard on the surface level. It is because silence represents what is unsaid, unspoken and unsayable in large scale, but to speak is to say less and to remain silent is to imply much. In the society, men have not allowed women the full access to public language, and are forced into silence and solitude which is one of the major forms of the oppressions of women in the society. But, now feminism lays much emphasis upon the silence which is considered as one of women's languages and which can say what lies beyond the capacity for male language to express.

Rani Harappa has also spoken very silently about what is happening to her. She goes through the husband's subordination quietly and knits shawls, recording the memories of her husband. There are not any clear hints so as to how Rani Harappa suffered, but after we study and dwell upon the eighteen shawls, we know what misbehaviour her husband has done to her. It is the shawls which actually speak about her troubles in life. Each shawl intricately captures the debauchorous, violent and inhuman acts of her husband's career. He has been unfaithful to his wife. He has philandered with many women. In the shawl named, 'the badminton shawl,' we find the details of her husband's unfaithfulness:

. . . the great man lay unclothed, while all about him the pink-skinned concubines cavorted . . . the female figures seemed unable to bear the confinements of white shirts . . . they flung them off, while Isky lounging on his left flank . . . but I knew him, he hid nothing from me, I saw the white girls in the village swell and pop, I knew about the small but regular donations he sent them . . . (191-92)

Rani Harappa is not happy with her daughter, Arjumand Harappa, when she does not believe about what she says against her husband. Her daughter refuses to acknowledge the putative claims of Iskander's corruption. Rather "Arjumand has her

own mother placed under guard” (277). As her daughter does not believe about the wrongs of her father, she addresses the contents of the shawls to her daughter.

Her revelations in the shawls bring out the ‘macho’ images of patriarchy. It is so because Rani Harappa weaved the shawls as a means of protesting against husband’s adultery and negligence in the honour of his wife. She has chosen the silent method in the sense that silence can speak a lot. To show the extent of atrocity of her husband, she has even incorporated violence perpetrated by her husband during the election campaign.

Similarly, we can see the resistant modes in the actions of Rani Harappa, when she writes a title of the shawls ‘The Shamelessness of Iskander the Great.’ She signs under the title by writing her own maiden surname: Rani Humayun. “She would add a surprising signature: Rani Humaayun. Her own name, retrieved from the mothballs of the past” (191). She is sending the gifts to her daughter who is very much supportive of the father. Arjumand blindly adopts the patriarchal images and disavows her own feminine images by saying, “It’s a man’s world. Rise above your gender as you grow” (126). She shows the disapprovals of her husband to his supporting daughter. Actually, Rani wants to break the marital bond with her husband. But she cannot do it publicly. In reverting to her maiden name, she symbolically disassociates herself from her husband. It is a disavowal of a large part of her history. Anyway, Rani Harappa has become aware of the exploitation and, therefore, has, at least, succeeded in germinating the sense of revolt.

We can guess that the shawls are Rani’s legacy to her daughter, whereby she hopes to rid Arjumand’s illusion about her father of her mind. However, Rani fails to convince her daughter. It is quite appropriate that Rani has chosen the shawls as her mouthpiece because the shawls speak a lot as the veiled silence. We know that

silence can imply much more than what the verbal medium does. On the contrary, maybe she is constrained by a wife's unquestioning loyalty to her husband, she must confine herself to what is perceived as an innocuous device, overtly identified with the feminine and the domestic, simultaneously enabling her to transcend patriarchal codes of conduct. Thus, Rani has employed the means of silence as a vibrant force of resistance against her husband.

In addition, Rani's daughter, Arjumand Harappa is very powerful and strict. She has devised her own forms of resistance. We find very contradictory characteristics in her. She is very much psychologically conditioned by her father's saying that women must get above the gender to get the power as men have because it is the men's world. She endeavours to adopt the manly qualities. She hates the women for their feminine traits. She bandages her breasts and strenuously attempts to efface her sexuality and disavows the institutions of marriage and motherhood. “. . . when her breasts begin to swell she will bind them tightly in linen bandages, so fiercely . . .” (126). Her interests to look and act like a man is quite clear. There can be no comparison between mother and daughter in these terms.

In one way, the male group, for instance, her father has psychologically conditioned her. Since she thinks that becoming man is to enjoy the privileged power in the society, she assumes the male gestures. In a sense, it can be a form of psychological exploitation. But, in the other way, her exposure of contempt towards what she regards as the weakness of women and the belief that, in order to acquire power, it is necessary to enlist its patriarchal structure are also forms of protest against the patriarchy. By condemning the weaknesses of female, she says in the roundabout way that they need to overcome it in order to compete with men. Her act 'to feel and look like a man' is a threatening to the male. She is attempting to transgress her

female boundary and enter the male. But her way of protest looks very inappropriate in the society. In the society where the practice of veiling defines a woman's self-worth and identity, Arjumand's repudiation of it and the social institution it represents, seems to cripple her. Thus, though she is not seen as a suffering character, her ways of protest obviously informs that she must have also been the victim of the exploitation. And, hence, she has posed her resistance that way.

Finally, I want to bring into discussion the two girls whose tragic stories are delineated by the narrator. By looking at the cruelty inflicted upon the Pakistani girl and the Asian girl, we know the extent of oppressions in the lives of women. They are not the major focus in the novel but they are mentioned in the process of describing the extent of Sufia's pains. But, their sufferings are very lively in the novel. They have directly suffered but could say nothing against it. the Pakistani girl is killed by her father, for "by making love to a white boy she had brought such dishonour upon her family that only her blood could wash away the stain" (115). Similarly, the Asian girl, who was beaten up on the underground by a gang of white teenaged boys, cannot complain the misbehavior out of shame. She is also afraid that there would stick an immoral stigma to her character if she publicizes it. It is so because character is very precious to girls. Though these two stories are mentioned to elaborate on the characterization of Sufia Zinobia, I have picked up on their oppressive parts. The narrator has described the predicaments of two girls unknowingly caught in situations where the Pakistani girl is the victim of father and other people's shame, and the situation in which the Asian girl is herself mortified by her situation. While reflecting upon the latter's reluctance to talk about her incident, the narrator says:

. . . remembering her beating, she feels not angry but ashamed. She does not want to talk about what happened, she makes no official



complaint, she hopes the story won't get out: it is a typical reaction, and the girl is not one but many. (117)

So, the both girls suffered even if they had not committed any mistakes. Tragedy lies even in their not being able to reveal out the persons who harmed them. Here they are psychologically also tortured in the sense that if they open it up, they are not to be cleared of their so-called immoral stigma and even if they do not open it up, there lies a sense of pain in their mind that always haunts them in some ways. And the torture of mind is more intensifying than that of the physical. Thus, they have been twice victimized. Firstly they were troubled and, the consequences also boomerang on them in the absence of justice.

In the final analysis, we can ascribe all these stories of repression and resistance of women characters to the partial hand of colonialism. The setting of the story takes place immediately after the end of colonialization. I have not, therefore, mentioned the impacts of colonialism upon later characters for it underlies all the events developing, that is, the state of chaos and disorder. So, the postcoloniality is the time of chaos and disorder in all spheres of lives. Its imprints can be seen in all factors. The people in governance are left helpless to bring the things into order in time. There was no good law and order in the country which are one of the causes of women sufferings. Therefore, we can certainly attribute the repressive condition of women to the postcolonialism.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

This research paper has delineated the vivid picture of the suffering women characters in the novel, *Shame*, and their unique resistance against patriarchy in midst of postcolonial context. The inclusion of marginalized women in the centre of the story has striking impact in the sense that they are the peripheral characters and have overtaken the major ones. It, similarly, serves up the double colonized predicaments of women -- one through patriarchy and the other through postcolonialism.

One of the unavoidable issues quite pervasive in the whole novel is the spirit of shame that runs through the veins of women characters and it is the strong foundation on which they stand to judge themselves. However, the way of resistance is different from general resistance given that the women usually take action silently. And, silence is also used as a means of revolt. I have incorporated the major undercurrent ideas of feminism and postcolonialism -- repression and resistance, and how it has worked in the novel through the means of silence.

Likewise, the novel, *Shame*, published in postcolonial time has reflected upon the after-effects in Pakistan which loomed large on women particularly at that time. Besides, the novel has touched upon the issues of magic realism and history so as to contribute towards the accurate depiction of women. The introduction of the representative characters like Iskander Harappa, Raza Hyder and Talvar Ulhaq are presented in terms of power politics and, thereby, we are simultaneously divulged how it has culminated in the oppression of women. The suffering characters such as Sufia Zinobia, Bilquis Hyder, Iskander Harappa, Noveed Hyder, etc., have all been victimized in the hands of their male relatives. But, we should not forget to ascribe

their pathetic predicaments to the impacts of colonialism. How the society in the postcolonial time has shaped counts much for the existence of women repression.

Furthermore, the employment of methodological means such as feminism and postcolonialism has been assigned the maximum treatment to bring forth the notions about how the culture impinged on by patriarchy in particular and colonialism in general exploits and marginalizes women. Patriarchy is the social form where male sides get the upper hand, and in the same manner, post-colonialism refers to the idea that the rich and powerful people rule over the poor and weak. Both the movements deal with the issues of oppressions and the concomitant resistances. They have it in common. Apart from this, male stands in the centre. Both postcolonialism and feminism lay emphasis on reinstating the marginalized in the face of the dominant. That is why, both terms are employed to tackle the text in terms of, especially the politics of repressions and resistances of the marginalized, and in terms of male in the centre.

The concept of 'a double colonialization' can be used to sum up the gist of the research. To this end, we can take example of the three Shakil sisters. Not only their father as a patriarch dominates them but also the system of colonialization has played vital role in their predicament. Since the father is afraid of the Angrez's harmful influences on his daughters, he has imprisoned them. Illegitimate child Omar Shakil is one example. In the likewise manner, Bilquis Hyder has undergone the forceful migration and the orphanage. Rani Harappa suffers because her husband accompanies with other women and does not care about her. So, these exploitations

are, in one way, the products of the colonial after-effects, for the society remained helpless and disordered in the colonial period.

In a nutshell, the whole analysis is devoted to serve up the ways in which women characters under postcolonial milieu go through the repressions and revolt against it. Thus, it is not only women characters who have been brought under the investigation and through them the author has simply unearthed the nature of the repression and the resistance.

### Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Noida: Harcourt, 2000.
- Adams, Hazard, ed. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. New York: Hartcourt Brace, 1992.
- Ashcrot, Bill and et. al, eds. *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- . . ., *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Bryson, Valerie. *Feminist Political Theory: An Introduction*. New York: Paragon House, 1992.
- Cuddon, J.A. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Theory*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. England: Penguin Books, 1977.
- Djaout, Tahar, "Silence." *Quit: Asian Women Weave*. No. 3. Jan. (1997): 45.
- Drable, Margaret, ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. Rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Fanon, Frantz. "On National Culture." *The Wretched of the Earth*. Trans, Constance Farrington. New York: Grove P. 1967. 206-48.
- Fraser, S. Arvonne. "Becoming Human." *Women, Gender and Human Rights*. Ed. Marjorie Agosin. Jayapur and New Delhi: Rawat Publications, 2003. 15-64.
- Gandhi, Leeta. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Grimkes, Sarah. *Letters on the Equality of Sexes and Conditions of Women*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.

Guerin, L Wilfred and et. al. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Oxford, 1999.

Haddon, Katherine. "Fatwa Fugitives Becomes Sir Salman." *The Kathmadu Post*. Ed. Prateek Pradhan. 17<sup>th</sup> June, 2007. 1.

McLeod, John. "Postcolonialism and Feminism." *Beginning Postcolonialism*. New York: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Mongia, Padmini, ed. *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Peck, John, and Martin Coyle. *Literary Terms and Criticism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London. MacMillian, 1993.

Rushdie, Salman. *Shame*. Britain: Vintage, 1983.

... , *Imaginary Homelands*. London: Penguin Books, 1992.

... , *The Satianic Verses*. Britain: Vintage, 1988.

Sanders, Andrew, ed. *The Short History of English Literature*. Rev. ed. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Seldem, Raman. "Feminist Criticism." *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1981.

Steiner, George. *Language and Silence*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Faber and Faber, 1985.