

I. Critique of the Western Concept of Terrorism

This research “Critique of the Western Concept of Terrorism in Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown*” examines Rushdie’s critique of the western concept of terrorism through the character Shalimar. In Rushdie’s treatment, Shalimar is not a terrorist rather an avenger and terrorism defined by the west is an ideological construct. Rushdie shows that terrorism neither is a Muslim specialty and nor Shalimar is a terrorist as such but a Clown is tagged as a terrorist by western hegemonic power.

The main action of *Shalimar the Clown* involves a love triangle and an extended pursuit of personal revenge by one of its aggrieved parties. Max Ophuls, married US ambassador to India, falls in love with Boonyi Kaul Noman, a beautiful dancer who also is married with Shalimar. With the help of embassy aide, Max entices Boonyi to New Delhi. There she hopes to advance her carrier; but Max makes her his mistress, seduces, enjoys with her and then leaves her pregnant. Before the arrival of Max Ophuls Boonyi, a Hindu girl had married with a Muslim boy, Shalimar. This union between Hindu and Muslim is a part of social and religious harmony of Kashmiri society. But this secularity is ravaged with the presence of westerners like Max Ophuls who seduces an innocent Kashmiri girl. Max’s wife, Peggy, outraged by his habitual womanizing, leaves him but adopts Boonyi’s baby, Kashmira, whom Peggy renames India. About Max and Peggy, Rushdie writes, “Her success in raising funds in America and Europe to improve conditions at orphanages all over India increased the couple’s popularity”. Moreover, “Perhaps we should regard Peggy- Mata as the real US ambassador”, one news paper editorial suggested, “And Mr. Ophuls as her charming and personable consort” (186).

As a representative of so called civilized west, Max Ophuls exposes his inner animosity of brutality. Being a scapegoat of Max, Boonyi returns in disgrace to her Kashmir village, Pachagim, where she is declared mritak (one of the living death), and compelled to spend the rest of her life alone in an abandoned mountain hut. As a result, boonyi's former husband Noman Sher Noman, also known as Shalimar the Clown, vows deadly revenge against brutal Max, Boonyi and the baby. To do so, he takes a circuitous route through several terrorist organizations, spends years in trainings, killing professionally and whetting his knife for the upcoming big events. As an opportunist, he involves in terrorist campaign to take the revenge against brutality, to escape from the humiliation, and to remove the evils such as abduction, seduction from Kashmir.

References to the Nazi atrocities on the Jews during and before the world war second, terrorist onsets on western metropolises, and the more- than- a- half- century- long Indo- Pak conflict in Kashmir make the novel an engaging reading of the plight of the present day world in its personal, political and cultural dimensions. Terrorists typically attempt to justify their use of violence by arguing that they have been excluded from the accepted processes of bringing about political change.

Commenting on this political nature of terrorism Bruce Fuller writes:

They maintain that terrorism is not the only option available to them, although their choice is a reluctant- even a regrettable one. Whether some one agrees with this argument or not often depends on whether the person sympathizes with the terrorists' cause or with the victims of the terrorist attack. The aphorism "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter" underscores how use of the label terrorism can be highly subjective depending upon one's sympathies. (130)

Salman Rushdie stands apart as a vehement critic of such power imposed western concept of terrorism in his novel *Shalimar the Clown*. His protagonist Shalimar is a case study of what goes into making him a terrorist. His sense of being personally wronged and humiliated, solidified by vows of revenge, enthralls him into the terrorist groups. The cultural practice of the Kashmir, especially the declarations of mirtak and shunning of women who have been sexually besmirched, also helps to explain the extreme reactions of Bonnyi and Salimar. Concurrently he experiences the break down of supportive Kashmiri traditional culture.

Originally Shalimar the Clown is part of his village's traditional band Pather Troup, whose livelihood for generations has been performing old legends and clown stories too much acclaimed. But with the entrance of westerners like Max, the western culture enters. Finally traditional culture is largely replaced by a culture of violence that sucks young men into its factions and consumes and destroys both harmonious and peaceful Shalimar's village and family. Eventually, shy and romantic young Kashmiri boy, Shalimar the Clown has nothing to live for except the pleasure of killing for the sake of his cultural root. That is why western concept of terrorism as having a political purpose has nothing to do with Shalimar. All of his activities are personal.

Today most of the people are of the opinion that it is the west, particularly America, which is giving birth to terrorism around the world. America has listed seven nations responsible for spreading State Sponsored Terrorism around the world. According to Hoffman:

The US Department of State has designated seven countries as State Sponsors of terrorism; Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Cuba, North Korea, and Sudan. In the year 2000, it named Iran as the most active supporter of

terrorism for aid to groups such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and Palestine Islamic Jihad. Although the former Taliban government in Afghanistan sponsored al- Qaeda, the radical group led by Saudi exile Osama bin Ladan, the United States did not recognize the Taliban as a legitimate government and thus did not list it as a State Sponsor of terrorism. (72)

The listing of the seven nations as terrorism sponsor has further widened the gap between the east and west. In Rushdie's novel *Shalimar the Clown*, Max Ophuls, the representative of America, former American ambassador to India and now the head of counterterrorism Department, behaves as a counterterrorist. All the political interventions in India by an ambassador are taken as an act of counterterrorism handled by the west, particularly by America. But on the other hand, Rushdie tries to show that only the American ambassador Max Ophuls is responsible for the picking up the gun by Shalimar. Describing the hidden purpose of Max, Rushdie writes, "Max Ophuls tried to buy what could not be bought" (199). By seducing innocent Kashmiri women, Boonyi, Max Ophuls shows his brutality and animalistic behavior. A beautiful dancer becomes a subject of hatred. About the condition of Boonyi, Rushdie says, "but Boonyi was no longer Anarkali; she has lost her beauty and could no longer dance, and the ambassador was nobody's son but the man of power himself" (205). Such loss of his wife compels Shalimar to pick up a gun and involve in terrorist groups for the personal revenge. But such terrorist groups themselves are the product of western hegemony. And, however, the role of America in claming the 'War on Terrorism' to is not free of biasness.

Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* presents the critique towards terrorism as the construction of that the eastern world, especially America casts upon Islam as a thirsty, barbaric may not barbaric may not be true. Given the prevalence of bloody

borders Islam has with the west is compelled to wonder whether the charge is totally biased. Salman Rushdie in this novel stands as a critic of such cultural biasness towards Islam and so much objected to by the west. In *Shalimar the Clown* Rushdie once again turns to Islam and its fabled bigotry as exemplified in the character of Shalimar who knives Maximillan Ophuls, former American ambassador to India and now the head of US Antiterrorist Department. Rushdie writes “Shalimar the Clown left pachigam the next morning carrying nothing but the clothes he stood up in and the knife in his waistband and was not seen again in the village for fifteen years”(251).

The Clown who used to entertain people is forced to commit the crime of murder not at all on political or religious ground but totally on very personal and emotional reasons. The desire of the west, of America particularly, to play with the destiny and sentiments of eastern people, especially of Muslims, is responsible in many instances for carrying the gun by Muslims. The hatred shown by westerners like Max Ophuls takes a particularly violent turn in *Shalimar the Clown*, which shows not only American power to damage abroad but also to arouse animosity. The centerpiece of *Shalimar the Clown* is a case of personal revenge. So Rushdie’s point in this novel is that terrorism has a personal face.

The novel has a wide ranging historical perspective and sense. Nazi atrocities, as Ophuls argues in conversation with the historian Gaston Zeller, demanded the creation of a new world order. The foreign minister’s words to the ambassador that, “I can see that with as our guide the new India will become more Pro-west than ever before” shows the vested interest of the west in India (183). Simultaneously however, the novel also asserts the need to recognize that those initially honorable intensions have gone sour. It has been kidnapped and corrupted by forces. Hence, Max Ophuls, hero of the wartime resistance, finds himself as an agent of western counterterrorism.

Ambassador Max ophuls, the narrator observes dryly “these days were supporting terror activities while calling himself an ambassador for counterterrorism” (272).

West gives the definition of terrorism and designates some groups as the terrorist according to their willfulness. Charles Tilly in “Theories of Terrorism” presents US president George W.Bush’s declaration about terrorism after the devastating attacks of September 11 2001 as “our war on terror begins with al-Quida, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found stopped defected” (5). But Rushdie in this novel is arguing that the US lacks the malignant and programmatic intent of the terrorist. It nevertheless, in the name of self- interest allows, even encourages them. It also tends the look the other way, to willfully forget what it does with its power. It finds the rest of the world treating it in the way victims treat an oppressor. In the novel the transformation of Max Ophuls from a liberator with unquestionable moral justification into an agent of a new imperial power which in its turn, presides over the same kind of moral atrocity that he once fought against, is registered most comfortably, when he finds himself suddenly playing the same kind of role once played by those he despised. He undergoes a conflict in himself: “But I’m not a Nazi, he thought. I’m the American ambassador, the guy in the white hat. I’m for Gods sake one of the Jews who lived” (141). Here, Rushdie implies that the stance is clearly a hallow one, because the US whether it likes it or not, is now sitting in the seat of power.

In this tale of love and revenge, a murder looks at first like a political assassination, but turns out to be passionately personal. As depicted in the novel, the desire of the west to flirt with the conviction of the Muslim people on the one hand, and the tendency of the Muslims to take deadly offence and action at the slightest provocation on the other, has caused much trouble in the present day world. As is the

case, in the novel the political conflicts with which Rushdie is primarily concerned are played out in the life of his central character, Shalimar. In this instance, western interest in Kashmir is chiphered by the Jewish- American ambassador to Kashmir, Max Ophuls, who has become a secret negotiator for American interests around the globe. His involvement in Kashmir is registered through his impact upon the life of Boonyi whom he seduces and abandons, and Shalimar, her husband, embittered by the loss of his wife, involves in guerrilla conflict. Having trained in Afghanistan, using weapons that Ophuls has himself provided, when the US was covertly arming Islamic terrorists after the Russian invasion in 1979.

Rushdie tries to make the point that US gives the birth to terrorist. Having US provided weapons; Shalimar becomes an assassin in the US and finally murders Ophuls. The murder has its roots in Ophuls' seduction and abandoning of Boonyi. Rushdie implies that America's power seduces, its affections imprison, its commodities corrupt, and it abandons once it has taken what its want. Boonyi is thus a product of America's love for the world, and when she speaks, she speaks in the voice of Kashmir. "I am your handiwork made flesh" (3), she tells Ophuls:

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

Rushdie removes the moral high- from Boonyi by having her revert to "another older line of attack": "I should have known better than to lie with a Jew", she further says, "the Jews are enemy and I should have known" (205). Even this, however, is part of Rushdie's argument that westerners like Max Ophuls- the Jew themselves are became

the subject of religious hatred and enemy by whom they hate and call terrorist- the Islam.

Despite these explanations, the main characters of the novel fell to generate enough identification with their feelings. Little is revealed about the complex emotions Shalimar must go through to get from clown to killer. The development of the main characters shows Shalimar weakness. May be they command little identification or empathy because they are shallow, do not show much forethought or conscience, and bring their problems on themselves. Max Ophuls, an official person shows his weaknesses. Rather than to be a dutiful, he involves in corruptions. For example, both Max and Boonyi get what they want, then reverse themselves and do not want it. In contrast to Max's complexities, Shalimar's single- minded, fanatical pursuit of revenge never lets up. Max with the thought of superiority passionately flirts and hurts the sentiments of the Kashmiri people as if they are inferior to him.

In *Shalimar the Clown*, Rushdie dramatizes the problematic relationship between India, its minorities and peripheral territories and the west, especially the America. While he debates the wider political dimensions of the terrorism, he is more concerned with the cause and effects of terrorism and engaged on the activities of individual characters. For Rushdie, what was worth celebrating about Kashmir- its secularity, tolerant multi- faith ethos- is now irretrievable lost. In this novel, he challenges the reader's assumptions with different representations and definitions of terrorism. Ginny Dougary in his essay "The Incredible Lightness of Salman" defends the novel as an art work that is also a lamentation on the loss of harmonious and peaceful world. He writes:

Shalimar the Clown is not a novel about terrorism. Rather, it is a story of trampled love and innocence, a central personal murder and

institutionalized murder on a wider scale, which takes us from modern-day California, to war time France, dropping off in England and always circling back- in some of the most direct and moving passages Rushdie has ever written- to the willful destruction of the Eden which was Kashmir. (5)

For Rushdie, America brings such destruction in Kashmir. To make this argument clear, he presents character like Max Ophuls, the American ambassador who destroys the harmonious like of Shalimar and Boonyi and Kashmir village. Rushdie writes, “A Kashmiri girl ruined and destroyed by a powerful American” (206).

The west, particularly America has belief that east needs and likes their presence. “We need you to go right away”, Rusk said. “Those Indian gentleman needs a good old American spanking and it’s our belief you are just the man to hand it to them” (178). But, Rushdie makes his point that this is a false belief. Indians do not need and like American interventions in their country. American unpopularity is increasing rapidly and America has false belief about their popularity. Max Opluls tries to intervene into the national politics of India. Rushdie writes, “He began to object, in private session and public speeches, to the militarization of the Kashmir valley and when the word oppressors passed his lips for the first time the bubble of his popularity finally burst” (197). So, America is digging his own grave. Rushdie, here, implies that America’s belief of superpower all around the world is a false belief. Now a days America is criticized everywhere. In the name of counterterrorism, America has overthrown the legitimate governments and oppressed them. Rushdie writes:

The Vietnam War was at it height and so was American on popularity in Asia. Draft cards were burned in central park and Martin Luther

King led a protest march to the United Nations and in India the goddam American ambassador was apparently fucking the local peasantry. So war- torn America turned on Max as well, his alleged oppression of Boonyi becoming a sort of allegory of Vietnam. (206)

The cause of all terrorist activities of Shalimar is not other than Max Ophuls- a representative of American superpower- a Jew, one from the race which has been a perennial adversary of the rest- the Muslims as terrorist. America has belief that terrorist's main target is not other than American people and property. As Charles Tilly writes:

Unsurprisingly, the State Department's summaries of international terrorist incidents give special attention to attacks on American interests- American citizens, American service personnel attacked outside of their normal military activity, property owned by Americans or by the U.S. government and US territory itself. (8)

Rushdie also presents Max Ophuls as a representative of such American belief. He is an aristocratic guided by power. Rushdie writes:

For the first time in his life Max Ophuls exercised the power of the United States of America". "The nature of overwhelming might", he would later write in *The Man of Power*, "is such that the powerful man does not need to allude to his power. The fact of it is present in everyone's consciousness. Thus power does its work by stealth, and the powerful can subsequently deny that their strength was ever used at all. (179)

Rushdie in this novel *Shalimar the Clown*, by presenting his character Shalimar as a so- called terrorist, implies that terrorism and terrorists are not what

western countries, particularly America, has defined as such. But most of the terrorists are like Shalimar the Clown to whom, in a sense, America has given the badge of terrorism and forced him to be a terrorist. This analysis seeks to account for all the Shalimar's mere terrorist activities as the product of western hegemonic power. In a real sense, he is not a terrorist, but tagged as a terrorist. The badge of so-called terrorist is given to him by the so-called superpower America. Rather than a terrorist he is an avenger and all his activities are personal rather than political. Readers' sympathy goes not to Max Ophuls but to Shalimar. In a sense, Shalimar is a kind terrorist who gets more sympathy from the reader and Max Ophuls, who in the name of counterterrorism acts as a terrorist, appears as a breeder of terrorism in the east.

II. Terrorism as the Western Construct in Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*

Terrorism, at least for the west, is designed to have psychological effects that reach far beyond its impact on the immediate victims of object of an attack. West itself has introduced the term terrorism. For, west violence or the threat of violence, especially, bombing, kidnapping, and assassination carried out for political purpose is terrorism. It is an act forced upon innocent people through the use of power.

According to Daniel Benjamin, terrorism was “first used in France to describe a new system of government adopted during the French Revolution” (123). From that time on, the term terrorism has had a decidedly negative connotation. Oleg Zinam illustrates: “[Terrorism] is the use or threat of violence by individuals or to obtain some economic, political, socio-psychological, ideological, or other objective” (244/245). Terrorists attempt not only to sow panic but also to undermine confidence in the target country.

Salman Rushdie, in his novel *Shalimar the Clown*, stands as a critique of such very western concept of terrorism and terrorist by presenting his character Shalimar as a so-called terrorist. For the west, terrorism is by nature political because it involves the acquisition and use of power for the purpose of forcing others to submit, or agree, to terrorist demand. But Rushdie's Shalimar involves in terrorist activities and becomes an assassin not for any political purpose but for personal revenge. No one persuades him to involve in such terrorist groups but he himself is compelled to involve in such groups by American Ambassador to India, Max Ophuls, to take revenge against him who has seduced his wife Boonyi and destroyed the harmonious life of Kashmiri people by misusing his so-called power. So instead of political, economic or ideological, Shalimar's only one goal to be a terrorist is personal. Focusing in this personal purpose, Rushdie writes:

At night in his appointed city garret, or on a straw bed in a stinking country barn, or abroad a lurching boat wedged in between sales of grain, Shalimar the Clown went looking for Boonyi in his mind, he prowled through the night and found her, and at once the fires of his rage flared up and kept him warm. He nursed his heat, the hot coals of his fury, as if in a Kangri next to his skin, and even when the fight for freedom was at its lowest ebb this dark flam kept his will strong, because own goals where personal as well as national, and would not be denied. (258)

Actually his all activities are the product of humiliation and hatred created by the inhuman and barbaric activities of Max who is a representative of so-called superpower America. The west does the animalistic activities and gives the badge of barbarian to the others or non-west. Rushdie tries to make his point that westerners show their animalistic nature in the name of civilization but the non-westerners whom the west called uncivilized can die to save their culture. In the novel Rushdie's character Anees Noman talking to his brother Shalimar shows his strong determination and says: "We will die as men of culture, not barbarians" (254).

Western countries categorize terrorist as the main threat and one of the major enemy to them but these countries do not have a sense that the terrorism is the very product of their biased superimposed power. To evade their so-called enemy of thread, they have started an action of counterterrorism. For their counter-action, such so-called powerful western countries are lingering upon the root causes behind terrorism. For them its causes can be historical, cultural, political, social, psychological, ideological, economic, and religious or any combination of these. Office of the coordinator of Counterterrorism defines terrorism as "premeditated,

politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by supranational groups of clandestine agents by intended to influence an audience” (VI). Rushdie, in this novel tries to undercut such accusation of terrorist and for him; America’s action of counterterrorism is itself an act of terrorism. To defeat terrorist groups, America supports some groups and provides the weapons in the name of counterterrorism. In the novel, one member of the terrorist group Zahir reveals it to Shalimar and says: “The Americans bring us weapons to kill the Russians” (272). Being supported by the Americans such terrorist groups get chance to increase their activities. Rushdie’s character, Max Ophuls, a former American Ambassador to India and now a head of counterterrorism conceals him and acts as terrorist supporting terror activities of one particular terrorist group to defeat another. Dealing with Max’s biased activities, Rushdie writes: “Ambassador Max Ophuls, who these days was supporting terror activities while calling himself an ambassador for counterterrorism, had been in charge of liaison, with Talib the Afghan’s branch of the Muj” (272). Providing the weapons to terrorist groups, America itself is returning that very guns towards its own head. When Shalimar gets more information about the nature of his main targeted person, the Ambassador Max, “a tiger leapt at up inside” and says “may be the gun I’m holding was brought to this region by you. May be one day, it will point at you and fire” (273/273).

Hence, Max Ophuls “one of the great romantic heroes if the Resistance: the Flying Jew”, defending the American so-called superiority covertly engages in strategic arms deals with the Taliban and al-Qaeda (158). Actually, America has given birth to terrorism, provided the weapons and now it itself is declaring war against terrorism. Addressing to congress nine days after the devastating attacks of September 11, 2001, U.S. president George W. Bush declared that “our war on terror begins with

al-Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated” (I). Presenting the character Max as a representative of American vested interest against non-west, Rushdie evokes the secret plan of America to hold the power upon India. After the murder of Galbraith, Lyndon Johnson talking with Dean Rusk says, “So go ahead and send them another liberal professor, don’t let this one go native on us” (177). Rusk deciding to send Max as a new ambassador to India says, “We need you to go right away. Those Indian gentlemen need a good old American spanking and it’s our belief, you’re just the man to hand it to em” (178). At the same time, India is facing great problem of economic crisis. America wants to support and show his superiority. About the condition of India, Rushdie write: “This was the period in which the devaluation of the Indian rupee and the national food crisis had put India into the humiliating position of being dependent on American supplies” (178). America, showing the superiority stops its supplies and Rushdie digs out the hidden secret after stopping the supplies is that: “India was receiving arms from the soviet union”, which is the major enemy of America (178). Instead of Indian interest, America wants to impose its own biased interest forcefully. Rushdie says, “Rusk meanwhile was openly hostile to Indian interest” (178). Before leaving for New Delhi as an ambassador, Max finds Rusk “himself on the receiving end of an extended anti-Indian triad, in which Rusk not only opposed the Indian line on Kashmiri but also criticized the annexations of Hyderabad and Goa, and the vocal support of several Indian leaders of the government of North Vietnam” (178). At the meeting with Max, Rusk says, “professor Ophuls, we are at war with that gentleman, Ho Chi Minh, an you will be so good to make plain to the Indian authorities that our enemies friend can only be our foe” (178/179). Rushdie

evokes the vested interest of America towards India when Max says: “If I dance to Rusk’s tune, they will start throwing things as soon as enough” (179).

Here, Max represents the west, particularly America that acted on the eastern world; west always treats non-west as uncivilized, barbaric and as the birth place of terrorism. So, guided by the power, America has announced the war against terrorism. Secretary of state Colin L. Powell in May 2002 announces:

In this global campaign against terrorism, no country has the luxury of remaining on the sidelines; there are no sidelines. Terrorists respect no limits, geographic or moral. The frontlines are everywhere and the stakes are high. Terrorism not only kills people. It also threatens democratic institutions, undermines economics and destabilizes regions. (iii)

Internalizing the biased power of America, Max starts his power-imposed ambassadorial activities. War time Resistant hero begins to lose his former reputation being cocooned in the American power. His personality is destroyed in the palm of American power. Showing Max’s degraded personality, Rushdie writes:

For a long moment Max slipped loose of all his different selves, the brilliant young economist, lawyer and student of international relations, the , master forger of the Resistance, the ace pilot, the Jewish survivor, the genius of Bretton Woods, the bestselling author, and the American ambassador cocooned in the house of power. (179)

Max only worships the power which causes his own downfall. Rushdie, here, tries to make his point that the downfall of Max is the downfall of America and its so-called superpower in itself.

For a long time, America has tried to impose its power upon India and stop its rapid economic growth to claim and being superpower around the world forever. Some of the American national security advisers provide back-force to Max to fulfill their hidden mission. Talking with Johnson, one adviser McGroge Bundy exposes American interest upon India. Bundy advices, “India, the largest and potentially most powerful non-communist Asian nation was the biggest prize in Asia” (180). In former days, America had been providing military aid to Pakistan but now a day its evil eyes are going towards India. To expose the growing interest of America upon India, Rushdie writes, “the United States handing seven hundred million dollars in military aid to Pakistan, that prize was in danger of being lost; the tail was wagging the dog” (180). Rushdie also exposes the American interest through the mouth of Max’s successor, Walt Whitman Rostow, when he says, “India is more important than Pakistan” (180). America tries to break up the Russian arms supplies and wants to be a supplier as soon as possible. Rushdie, presenting the American adviser Bowles’s argument, “America’s unwillingness to arm India had pushed the late Jawaharlal Nehru, and now Lal Bahadur Shastri, into the Russians’ arms”, makes clear that America wants to impose its power to the other nations (180). It becomes more clear when Bowles says, “Only when it become clear that we were not prepared to give India this assistance, did India turn to the Soviet Union as its major source of military equipment” (180).

Dancing with the tune of power, Max Ophuls arrives to New Delhi carrying the political mission on his back as an ambassador but consequently, he has to leave the host country in shame and disgrace. Instead of holding political activities, he shows overmuch interest in non-worthy things and engages into the sinful activities which eventually, at last, invite his own assassin. His all political missions vanish

when he sees beautiful Kashmiri dancing girl, Boonyi Kaul Noman. Max once in Paris “had established a reputation as a dandy and a lady-killer” (139). About Max’s success as a sex-expert at the time of Resistance, Rushdie writes: “The greatest contribution Max Ophuls made to the Resistance was sexual; although in order to pull off the feat he had to create yet another phoney self and inhabit it fully and, also, somewhat painfully; he was the man who seduced the Panther, Ursula Brandt” (163). The same kind of his lustful ego increases when Boonyi begins to dance for him. Rushdie again exposes Max’s lusty nature at the dance party:

When Boonyi Norman danced for him in the Dachigam hunting lodge in Kashmir he thought of those feathered dead-eyed show girls wreathed in Nazi Cigar smoke, flaunting their gartered thighs. The clothes were different but he recognizes the same hard hunger in her stare, the readiness of the survivor to suspend moral judgment in the presence of imagined opportunity. But I'm not a Nazi, he thought. I'm the American ambassador the guy in the white hat. I'm for God's sake one of the Jews who lived. She swung her hips for him and he thought, and I'm also a married man. She swung her hips again and he ceased to think. (141)

Max forgets his ambassadorship and he is bewildered by the beauty of this Kashmiri girl. His burning lust overlaps his responsibility. When Rushdie writes, “Boonyi Kaul Noman came out to dance and Max realized that his Indian destiny would have little to do with politics, diplomacy or arms sales and everything to do with the far more ancient imperatives of desire”, it becomes clear that Max as an American himself is a barbaric, not the Indians to whom America has accused as such (181).

In the name of so-called civilization, west always tries to increase its activities in the non-western worlds which are for them, uncivilized and it is their burden to teach them. But instead of teaching, they want to impose their power upon non-west. So, following the American power, Max destroys the life of harmonious family by seducing a beautiful dancing girl, Boonyi which, in turn, ultimately causes his own downfall and assassin. Dancing for Max, Boonyi sees her beautiful future as a perfect dancer and feels, “her dance was changing her life, that was being born in the eyes of the moonstruck American ambassador was nothing less than her own future”, and, “she wasn’t leaving the stage but making an entrance on the greatest stage she had ever been allowed to walk upon, that her performance was not ending but beginning” (181). Boonyi feels that her career will develop with Max and “left Pachigam without her husband” (190). Being hopeful, Boonyi says to Max:

I want to be a great dancer; so I want a great teacher. Also I want please to be educated to high standard. And I want a good place to live – please – so that I am not ashamed to receive you there. Finally [...] because I will give up much for this, please, sir, I want to hear form your own lips that you will keep me safe. (192)

Being ready to give up everything for her dancing career, she declares, “In that case I will do anything you want whenever you want it [...] my body will be yours to command and it will be my joy to obey” (192). But, things goes reverse when Max lustful evil eyes glittered by the power flashes darkness upon her. When Rushdie writes, “thus all Max’s significant requirements were in place”, but, “the clown of a husband was a problem”, he implies Max’s brutality against Kashmiri people (192/193). Boonyi becomes hindrance in the political mission of Max. Regarding her influence in Max’s mission, Rushdie reveals: “And that was how it came about that a

faithless wife from the village of the bhand pather began to influence, to complicate and even to shape, American diplomatic activity regarding the vexed matter of Kashmir” (194). Max’s deception of Boonyi puts all her future dreams only in illusion and such deception ultimately deceived him and took his own life by the hands of her husband, Shalimar with which Max seems ignorant.

Boonyi deserts her husband and village in pursuit of some great achievement. But she has ended of as a mere concubine to the ambassador. Now she reveals “her former imprisonment had been freedom, while this so-called liberation was no more than a gilded cage” (195). Now, she becomes no more than a doll in the dirty hands of power. When Rushdie writes: “She was an American’s toy, and he despised her for that; somewhat he despised himself for talking the Yankee dollars and becoming party to the arrangement and this, too he held against her”, he clarifies how the American power and money destroys the life of the Indian people (199). For Max, money can buy everything. Rushdie clarifies money-minded nature of Max as: “Max Ophuls tried to buy what could not be brought” (199). Max is not totally unaware of the possible problems that the seduction might bring to him. Therefore, as a precaution he has Boonyi to take some contraceptive pills everyday in the presence of Edgar Wood his assistance. But, Boonyi outwits them. Actually, “she had tongued the pills to one side concealing them beneath those ever- present wads of chewing tobacco” (204). As result, she gets pregnant and vehemently pours out her dissatisfaction for her destroyed beauty and accuses him as:

Look at me, [...]. I am your handiwork made flesh. You took beauty and created hideousness, and out of this monstrosity your child will be born. Look at me. I am the meaning of your deeds. I am the meaning of your so-called love, your destructive, selfish, wanton love. Look at me.

Your love looks just like hatred. I never spoke of love [...]. I was honest and you have turned me into your lie. This is not me. This is not me. This is you. (205)

Max is accused for his betrayal. Boonyi realizes for the first time that Max is a real enemy to her family and village. Hating his lie, she confesses, “I should have known better than to lie with a Jew. The Jews are our enemy and I should have known” (205). She also makes it clear that though he has destroyed her life; her heart is not tormented by his wanton love for her. She does not trust his seduction as love and says, “Does a rat love the snake that gobbles it up” (205). When she claims, “my heart is still my own”, she seems to be sure about her pure heart as a Kashmiri girl (205).

America always claims its popularity around the world. Being proud of power, America tries to impose the power and happens to engage in non-worthy and sinful activity which causes its own downfall and unpopularity. Max Ophuls’s seduction of Boonyi proves costly for his political and diplomatic career. He himself bears his own unpopularity among the Indian people. His assault on the native girl is seen as an assault on the honor and the sovereignty of the nation. Consequently, Ophuls loses his ambassadorship and becomes an object of hate which causes America’s unpopularity in India. Regarding Max’s failure in India, Rushdie writes: “American ambassador was being withdrawn in disgrace” (207), Max’s true nature is revealed as: “he was no longer the well beloved lover of India, but her heartless ravisher” (206). Max’s seduction is equated with the American invasion on Vietnam as:

The Vietnam War was at its height and so was American unpopularity in Asia. Draft cards were burned in Central Park and Martin Luther King led a protest march to the United Nations and in India the goddamn American ambassador was apparently fucking the local

peasantry. So war-torn America turned on Max as well, his alleged oppression of Boonyi becoming a sort of allegory of Vietnam. (206)

Everywhere America is criticized for the misuse of so-called power. Misusing his power, Max involves in sin which becomes the cause of hatred. Moreover, Max is known as a “sexual predator who was fit for nothing but gelding” (207).

America wants to enter into the national politics of India and tries to settle down the Kashmiri problems feeling as if it is the duty of being powerful country. To do so, America is supporting “Indian armed forces”; when Max reveals to Boonyi that, “these would be actions of the Indian armed forces”, she internalizes that “the term ‘Indian armed forces’ would secretly refer to the ambassador himself, she would use the Indian presence in the valley as a surrogate for the American occupation of her body”, and she warns him, “the ‘Indian armed forces’ rapping and pillaging. How can you not know it? How can you not comprehend the humiliation of it, the shame of having your boots march all over my private fields?” (197). Max’s bad smell of power alienates him from the Indian people. Being so-called superior west is oppressing the non-west as inferior. Max as an agent of American oppressive policy, tries to oppress the Indian people. By doing so, he himself destroys his personality and Indian government gets more chance to rule the nation freely after his disgrace. His unpopularity begins “when the word oppressors passed his lips”. Max’s lust foreshadows his political mission to India. Max’s disgrace and misfortune has become Indian grace and fortune. Max’s inhuman action provides Indian government an opportunity to be free from the American guidance as:

A Kashmiri girl ruined and destroyed by a powerful American gave the Indian government an opportunity to look like it would stand up and defend Kashmiris against marauders of all types-to defend the honor of

Kashmiri as stoutly as it would defend that of any other integral part of India. Nothing less than Max's head on a plate would do. (206)

India is the second paradise which he has lost; whenever Paris "was the first paradise he lost" (141). Max's failure and downfall in India rhetorically shows the failure of American oppressive power in the non-west India.

Boonyi has dreamt beautiful future in New Delhi with Max Ophuls. But "things in Delhi had not gone as Boonyi Kaul Noman would have wished" (199). She has imagined more comfortable and prosperous life in the city than in her village, Kashmir. From the harmonious and peaceful village life, she moves to the crowd, noisy and dirty city-life about which she seems ignorant at first and lives in illusion. She is totally destroyed in the city when "the excess of Delhi deranged her, its surfeit of muchness, its fecal odours, its hellish noise, its anonymity, its uncaring crowd of the desperate fighting to survive" (201). Before coming to New Delhi with Max, she has been living a beautiful and healthy life. But when she comes with the contact of American Jew, she learns to take drugs which destroy her former healthy life. Living with so-called civilized man Max "she became addicted to chewing tobacco", and, "her narcotic of choice turned out to be food" (201). About her pathetic condition in Delhi with Max, Rushdie writes:

Inevitably her beauty dimmed. Her hair lost its lustre, her skin coarsened, her teeth rotted her, body odour soured, and her bulk- ah! Her bulk-increased steadily, week by week, day by day, almost hour by hour, her head rattled with pills, her lungs were full of poppies. Soon the pretence of lessons was dropped. The general education she had requested as a part of her deal with ambassador has ceased long ago. (203)

Instead of good education, Boonyi only learns about how to chew tobacco and other drugs and receives humiliation and hatred by taking American seed in her womb. When she gives birth to the child, her claim of ownership as mother is broken by Max's wife Peggy who does not like the name of the baby as "Kashmira" given by her mother and Peggy names the baby as "India Ophuls" to claim the superiority of Max, white American father (210/211).

West defines terrorism and categories terrorist groups according to the interests and needs of the western countries. Mainly, America has categorized terrorist groups as religious, political and so on to get success in its counterterrorism and takes some groups in the hands and designates the fighting between two groups. In the immediate aftermath of the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, US president George W. Bush declared 'war on terrorism' and said "the United State will hunt down and punish those responsible" (4). United State has conveyed the message 'elimination of terrorism' to other nations. In Lawrence Sherman's opinion, America's counteraction is "a proud and shameless reaction" (459). According to Yassir Arafat, "the difference between the revolutionary and the terrorist lies in the reason for which each fights. For whoever, stands by a just cause and fights for the freedom and liberation of his land from the invaders, the settlers and the colonialists, cannot possibly be called a terrorist" (26). But, there is an aphorism that 'one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter'. So, Arafat's freedom fighters can be the terrorists for America.

In the novel, *Shalimar the Clown*, Rushdie's character Shalimar is neither a freedom fighter nor a terrorist. Behind his violent actions there is a very personal goal that is to take revenge against American ambassador Max who, by using his so-called power, has seduced his wife and destroyed the peace of his village Kashmir. Shalimar

is not fighting for the liberation for any nation, group or tribe but he is, here, fighting for his own liberation from the humiliation created by the sinful act of so-called powerful man Max. He just wants to kill Max only to provide peace to his heart.

Shalimar says, “One of these days I want the American ambassador at my mercy” (252). Shalimar strongly determines and, “decided he had to murder the American ambassador at some point not long after the end of the Bangladesh war” (243).

Shalimar wants to join in terrorist groups for the gateway to reach to Max. Before leaving his house, he tells about his main target to his mother, Firdaus Noman as:

Because once we stop being asleep we can see that there are only enemies for us in this world the enemies pretending to defend us who stand before us made of guns and Khaki and greed and death, and behind them the enemies pretending to rescue us in the name of our own God except that they’re made of death and greed as well, and behind them the enemies who live among us bearing ungodly names, who seduce us and then betray us, enemies for whom death is too lenient a punishment, and behind them the enemies we never see, the ones who pull the strings of our lives. That last enemy, the invisible enemy in the invisible room in the foreign country far away: That’s the one I want to face, and if I have to work my way through all the others to get to him then that is what I will do. (248/249)

Actually Shalimar’s involvement into the terrorist groups is the channel for him to reach to his enemy Max. Max is now living far from him and to find him is not easy task for Shalimar. So, he joins in many terrorist groups, gets trainings and makes his all preparation for his ultimate personal goal. Dealing with Shalimar’s preparations for Max’s murder Rushdie writes:

He became a person of value and consequence, as assassins are. Also, his secret purpose was achieved. He had passports in five names and had learned good Arabic, ordinary French and bad English, and had opened routes for himself, routes in the real world, the invisible world that would take him where he needed to go when the time for the ambassador came. (275)

From these lines it also becomes clear that Rushdie's Shalimar is not a terrorist but an avenger. He involves in religious fighting groups not for the sake of religion but for his own desire to kill Max.

Shalimar involves in the holy war led by the iron mullah known as Fc-22 from which he gets more trainings about bombing, murder and kidnapping. He rejects "the use of fidayeen suicides" (318). Acting with that group, he tries to get the experience about using "knife against the man's skin" because he wants to chop the ambassador's head using his own sword (274). More than a holy warrior, Shalimar is a warrior of his own self. Presenting his character Shalimar as a fighter for personal matters, Rushdie writes:

He was, he wanted to be, a part of the holy war, but he also has private matters to attend to, personal oaths to fulfill. At night his wife's face filled his thoughts, her face and behind hers the face of the American. To let go of himself would be to let go of them as well; and he found that he could not order his heart to set his body free. (267)

Like Shalimar, some other members of Fc-22 have also their personal matters after involving into such terrorist groups. America tries to defeat terrorist groups and for that it involves in the weapon business. America provides the weapons to some groups to fight against other groups. But now these terrorist groups are fighting

against America using the weapons provided by America itself. Rushdie here, make his point that the America which is fighting against terrorism in the name of counterterrorism itself is a weapon provider to the terrorist. So counterterrorism is not other than terrorism itself. Rushdie clarifies the point about America as a major weapon provider to the terrorist groups through the following lines:

Shalimar the Clown at forward camp²² befriended the luminous little man who had fought with Afghans and al-Qaeda against the Soviet Union, who had accepted U.S. arms and backing but loathed the United States because America soldiers had historically backed the settlement of catholic in Mindanao against the wishers of the local Muslims. (269)

The terrorist groups accept American weapons not to provide support but to fight against America. America by supporting some terrorist groups is giving strength to its own old enemy. In many years ago “The Christians controlled the economy and the Muslims were kept poor” (269).

Like Shalimar, the Filipino revolutionary Abdurajak, has involved in the same terrorist groups for his own personal matters. He hates both the Filipino government and American ambassador Max for giving weapons to defeat the revolutionary group. Talking with Shalimar, he exposes his hatred for American involvement into the national politics: “In seventies big wars one hun’red thou, hun’red twenty thou die. Then peace deal, then MNLFF split, MNLFF-MILFF, then fight again. Hate Filipino government. Hate also U.S.A. U.S. secret ambassador comes to the Base to give weapons and support. I hold my fire but in my heart I want to kill this man” (269). This Filipino man also involves in the religious fighting groups not for the sake of any religion but to take action against American weapon support to defeat the

revolutionary group. America has founded Muslims and al-Qaeda as the main enemy. In the war against al-Qaeda and its leader Laden, America also announces war against Afghanistan accusing it as a supporter to al-Qaeda. To defeat Afghan government, America provides weapons to the freedom fighters as the Muj. But, Rushdie declares that both the mujahid and jihadi refers to holy warrior. Both the Muj and Jihad are fighting for the religious sake. But, America imposing its biased power supports one religious group to defeat another. Rushdie shows the biased nature of American power and its terror activities in the name of counterterrorism as:

The Afghans had freedom fighters of their own, and the United States decided to support these fighters against its own great enemy, which had occupied their country. U.S. operatives in the field- CIA, Counter-Terrorism and Special Units personnel- took to referring to these fighters as the Muj, which sounded mysterious and exciting and concealed the fact that the word mujahid meant the same thing as the word jihadi, "holy warrior". Weapons, blankets and cash poured into northern Pakistan, and some of these aids reach the Muj. Much of it ended up in the arms bazaars of the wild frontier zone and a percentage of it reached Azad Kashmir. After a while the fighters gathering in Pakistani-controlled Kashmir started calling themselves the Kashmiri Muj. The ISI provided them with powerful long-range missiles which had been intended for the Afghan front, but had unfortunately been diverted along the way. Other high-quality arms also began to appear at Fc-22. (270/271)

American action of attacking upon a democratic nation and overthrowing the legal and legitimate government is the result of power. America supports illegal groups to

overthrow the legal government. America is the main arms bazaar for the terrorist groups. In the Kashmir also holding the guns provided by America many religious fighters for the sake of Muslims culture are fighting. But America is fighting against Muslims. For America Muslims are more dangerous terrorist. To defeat Muslims groups, America supports Pakistani fighter groups which ultimately cause the destruction of religious harmony between Hindu and Muslims in Kashmir.

Before the separation of Pakistan from India, life of Kashmiri Hindu and Muslim people seems peaceful. Rushdie shows the harmony between Hindus and Muslims, when he writes: “The words Hindu and Muslim had no place in their story, [...]. In the valley these words were merely descriptions, not divisions. The frontiers between the words, their hard edges, had grown smudged and blurred. This was how things had to be. This was Kashmir” (57). In Pachigam there is not cultural division but a multicultural hint comes with the marriage between Muslim boy Shalimar and Hindu girl Boonyi. Rushdie shows the connection between two cultures as:

Noman called the pandit Sweetie Uncle, though they were not connected by blood or faith. Kashmiris were connected by deeper ties than those. Boonyi was the pandit’s only child, and as she and Noman approached their fourteenth birthday they both discovered that they had been in love for their whole lives and it was time to do something about it, even though that was the most dangerous decision in the world. (47)

Peace and harmony are the parts of life for Kashmiri people. Rushdie writes: “before Shalimar the Clown and Boonyi were born there had been the villages of the actors and the villages of the cooks” (61). So the “Pachigam was a village of gastronomes”

(48). Critiquing the biased vision of the west to the non west as uncivilized and uncultured, Rushdie writes, “Kashmiris were fond of saints of all types” (115).

Rushdie actually in this novel *Shalimar the Clown* presents the total friendship and exchange of culture among the Kashmiri people. Kashmir is a paradise as one of the unnamed man says, “here, in our unparalleled paradise on earth! - which, so as not to sound too boastful to the ears of outsiders, we choose to call Kashmir” (76).

Describing the cultural exchange between the Hindus and Muslim, Pandit Pyarelal Kaul says:

Today our Muslim village, in the service of our Hindu Maharaja, will cook and act in a Mughal – that is to say Muslim- garden, to celebrate the anniversary of the day on which Ram marched against Ravan to rescue Sita. What is more, two plays are to be performed: our traditional *Ram Leela*, and also *Budshah*, the tale of a Muslim sultan. Who tonight are the Hindus? Who are the Muslims? Here in Kashmir, our stories sit happily side by side on the same double bill, we eat from the same dishes, we laugh at the same jokes. We will joyfully celebrate the reign of the good king Zain-ul-abidin, and as for our Muslim brothers and sisters, no problem! They all like to see Sita rescued from the demon-king and besides, there will be fireworks. (71)

To undercut the western belief to the non- west as barbaric and low- cultured, Rushdie shows cultured life-style of Kashmiri people. West always accuses non-west as the place for religious war and cultural hatred. But before the presence of the west to the non-west there seems no any cultural hatred among the religious groups. Rushdie talks about distinct quality of cultural activities of Kashmiri people among other cultural societies when he writes:

The pandits of Kashmir, unlike Brahmins anywhere else in India, happily ate meat. Kashmiri Muslims, perhaps envying the pandits their choice of Gods, blurred their faith's austere monotheism by worshipping at the shrines of the valley's many local saints, its pirs. To be a Kashmiri, to have received so incomparable a divine gift, was to value what was shared far more highly than what divided. (83)

People of both religions participate in one another's festivals and cultural activities. In the festival of one religion both Muslims and Hindus customs can be found. Rushdie presents Kashmiri people as "all brothers and sisters" (110). Accepting the love affair between Muslims boy Shalimar and Hindu girl Boonyi, Abdullah Noman, father of Shalimar says, "There is no Hindu- Muslim issue. Two Kashmir- two Pachigami- youngsters wish to marry, that's all. A love match is acceptable to both families and so a marriage there will be; both Hindu and Muslim customs will be observed, and with which Pyarelal father of Boonyi responses, "To defend their love is to defend what is finest in ourselves" (110).

Rushdie depicts his character Max Ophuls as a representative of American power. America sends him to India as an ambassador by giving all its so-called power upon him. Before coming into America, Max seems as a man of great personality. His old personality, such as a bestselling author, a 'Flying Jew' and a Resistance hero are destroyed by the American power. He is chosen by America not to regard for his personality, but to use him to fulfill America's vested interest upon India. He becomes a handiwork of American power. America gives him a false identity about which Rushdie writes: "Max acquired a second false identity" (162). Max comes to America with the hope of the New World. Describing Max's quest for the New World and his movement to America, Rushdie writes:

After all, by the end of the war [...] Max Ophuls was a living flying ace and giant of the Resistance, a man of movies star good looks and polymathic accomplishment, and in addition he had moved to the United States, choosing the burnished attractions of the New World over the damaged gentility of the old. (161)

But, his dream of the New World vanishes when he is used by America. He enters into the house of power, not in the New World. His personal matters and personalities are disregarded and he is “cocooned in the house of power” (179). America does not give him a chance to flourish his personalities, rather gives him a burden of America’s biased interest upon non-west, India, which destroys his own life. Only American so-called power is responsible for his destruction.

America wants to show its superiority around the world imposing its hegemonic power. To impose its power, it uses some individuals of great personality. America is being hated for its bias behavior towards others. The persons to whom it uses to fulfill its own interest also become a subject of hatred and get their own doom. They are responded negatively everywhere. Despite of being a man of great personality, Max is treated negatively for being an American representative. In London, Max is responded negatively for being representative of the so-called house of power, America. The general of London, De Gaulle, treats him badly and says:

Your accomplishments and talents are no doubt remarkable. However the propositions in your theses are for the most part untenable. Some sort of European association, very well. It will be necessary to forget what has happened and make friends with Germany. That, yes.

Everything else you propose is barbaric rubbish which will deliver us,

bound and gagged, into the power of the Americans, which is to say a new captivity following immediately upon an old one. (170)

Max gets hatred and it is the result of American power. Disregarding Max, De Gaulle is throwing his hatred towards America and its so-called power. Max's regarded personalities are transformed into disregard and hatred by American power as heavenly qualities of Kashmir is transformed into the hell by the same western vested interest upon non-west and their so-called power.

Max comes to India as an American ambassador to India carrying a burden of American interest upon it. American power provides him a back-force to fulfill its interest upon India. This same back-force power not only destroys the India, but also destroys America's representative, Max. American power is the main cause for Max's downfall, rather than his own fault. Max, a political diplomat, has to leave India in disgrace and hated. In India, Max is ceased to think about his mission and personality. His reality about the mission is hidden and inside his apparent civilized personality resides the savage and irrational things given by so-called civilized and powerful America. Max comes to India wearing an American so-called civilized coat, but its pockets are full of savagery of American power which gives a burden to Max to spread such rubbish all over India. Clarifying Max's savagery mission concealed inside the apparent civilization of the west, Rushdie writes:

Was he clothing an essentially savage, irrational thing in the garb of civilization, dolling it up in the dress shirt of endurance, the silk trousers of constancy, the frock coat of solicitude and the top hat of selflessness? Like Tarzan the ape man when he came to London or New York: the natural rendered unnatural. But under all the fancy

apparel the untameable, unkind reality still remained, a feral thing
more gorilla-like than human. (200)

Here, western savagery upon non-west is revealed which is covered by the so-called civilization. America gives the clothes of that very so-called civilization to Max and uses him to fulfill its hidden purpose of imposing the power upon India which ultimately destroys the harmony of Indian people and also invites his own downfall. Max's sinful action of seduction is also the product of that same so-called power.

Rushdie draws a picture of Kashmir as a paradise on earth. In America Shalimar is introduced as "a driver from paradise" (11). But now this old paradise has lost its originality. About Kashmir's old time heavenly quality Yuvraj tells Kashmira that "in my childhood it was a heaven inside a heaven" (361). But the old time heaven is totally transformed into a hell. So Yuvraj also informs Kashmira that "but now Kashmir is no longer heavenly and I am not a gardener" (361). The old harmonious story of Kashmiri people is totally lost and transformed into the brutality, seduction, abduction and murder. Lamenting on old history with Kashmira, Yuvraj says, "This place is finished; places get smashed and then they are no longer the places they were" (363). Friendship between Hindus and Muslims is broken. Pyarelal laments about the destruction of their old story with Boonyi and says, "Our story is finished", and, "it is no longer the story of our lives, but the story of a plague year during which we have the misfortune to be around to grow buboes in our armpits and die unclean and stenchy deaths. We are no longer protagonists, only agonists" (295). The joy and peace of Kashmiri people are taken away from them. Hasina Yambarzal informs Kashmira that "once we were proud but now even that has been taken from us" (365).

Rushdie, in this novel *Shalimar the Clown* tries to make a point that only the west, especially America is responsible for the destruction of Kashmir. Religious war

between the Hindus and Muslims is the result of American power which biasly gives supports to one particular group to defeat another. In the novel, Max tries to settle the Kashmir problems imposing his power being an American. In a talk-show in America Max says: “we who live in these luxury limbos, the privileged purgatories of the earth, have set aside thoughts of paradise” (28). Through this line Max reveals his vested interest upon India. It is America’s interest to impose its power upon India and Max tries to practice it. He wants to rule the paradise according to his own interest but fails and for him his fall from the paradise is the fall of paradise itself. Comparing his fall from paradise with the Adam’s fall from Eden, he says in talk-show:

If thoughts of paradise do occur to us, we think of Adam’s fall, of the expulsion from Eden of the parents of humanity. However, I have not come to speak of the fall of man, but the collapse of paradise itself. In Kashmir it is paradise itself that is falling; heaven on earth is being transformed into a living hell (28).

America shows its interest upon the beauty of Kashmir. Imposing the power, Max shows his biased behavior towards the Hindus. When Zainab Azam warns “you were dumb about something”, he realized that “the cause of her anger was his bias towards Hindus” (29).

Max’s interest to India parallels the western interest in non-west. America tries to hold the power upon newly emerging powerful countries. It is horrified by the rapid economic growth of India, China and Brazil tries to stop their growth to remain superpower forever. Max, as an international diplomat of America is disapproved by the economic growth of non-west about which Rushdie writes: “The emerging economics of India, Brazil and a newly opened-up China would be the world’s new powerhouses, the counterweights to the American hegemony of which he had always,

as an internationalist, disapproved” (20). Such American hegemonic power makes him international diplomat and that same power also destroys his personality and takes his life. Describing the double role of power played upon Max, Rushdie exposes that, “three years after the ignominious termination of his New Delhi posting he was deemed to have atoned for his sins, to have been cleansed by the temporary withdrawal of power” (335). But he has to give his own life for his sin which is the outcome of the power itself. He is killed by using his own knife. To whom America calls terrorists are carrying American guns. Shalimar, who involves in terrorist groups for personal revenge to whom America gives the badge of terrorism, also kills his enemy with using enemy’s knife. Dealing with Max’s murder scene, Rushdie writes: “His throat has been slashed so violently that the weapon, one of his own sabatier kitchen knives, which had been dropped beside his corpse, has all but severed his head” (40). Meanwhile, “the murder of Ambassador Maximilian Ophuls was being mourned” in the western countries and they “officially lamented the fall of one of the last surviving heroes of Resistance” (334). American authority arrests and accuses Shalimar as a Muslim born terrorist. Defending at the court William Tillerman argues about Shalimar's accusation as a terrorist for his personal revenge as:

Yes, the accused was a terrorist [...]. Yes, he had been in some remote, scary places where bad people gathered to plot dark deeds. Under a number of work-names he had been involved for many years in the perpetration of such acts. On this occasion, however, [...] the probability was that he had been flying solo, because of the seduction by the victim of the accused’s beloved wife. (384).

It is American power that makes Max its victim rather than his sinful deeds and Shalimar is arrested not only as a murderer but as a terrorist. Finally, Max meets his

own doom. When Tillerman gives his argument that “our invisible foes understood that not everyone could be a suicide bomber, not everyone could be an assassin”, it becomes clear that most of the terrorists are not what west has defined as such but they are, like Shalimar, accused terrorist by the west (382).

Shalimar is accused as a terrorist not only for his actions but also for his Muslim originality. The general belief of the west is that the Muslims are barbaric and terrorist by birth. This biasness of the west towards Muslim community or religion is the main cause of growing terrorism in the west world. In American mentality, every third world Muslim is viewed as a bearer of terrorism and as another fundamentalist. As, Mohsin Hamid in his latest literary venture *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* writes:

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

Rushdie vehemently criticizes the western belief about Muslim as the terrorist in this novel *Shalimar the Clown*. All the accusation upon non west, particularly upon Muslim, by the west is the product of their so-called power. What west makes truth about non west is born out of the power. Power can conceal one truth and make another. Max tells the nature of power to India as: “the place of power is a labyrinth of interconnecting rooms”, and, “it’s windowless”, in which, “there is no visible door” (16). He also reveals to her that “freedom is not a tea party, India; freedom is war” (17). So, American so-called power conceals its own brutality to the non-west and constructs a truth to them as the terrorists.

Max is a man from the so-called house of power, America, which is windowless and has not any visible door as Max describes to India. So, this windowless house of power cannot see the outside truth and constructs a truth being inside the room of power not witnessing the outside which only becomes truth for its constructor but not for the others. Rushdie, in the novel, stands as a critique of such constructed truth with the help of power by the west to Islam as terrorist and the term terrorism given by such countries, particularly by America. West constructs the notion about terrorism according to its own needs and desire. To construct the truth about their so-called superior power, they construct another truth to others as inferior and powerless. Such constructed bias truth leaves passages to flourish terrorism in the non-west. Defining terrorism, Fyodor Dostoevsky writes:

Each of the active groups, while proselytizing and spreading its side-branches to infinity has as its task, by a systematic and denunciatory propaganda, ceaselessly to undermine the importance of the local powers, to produce bewilderment in communities to engender cynicism and scandal, complete disbelief in anything whatsoever, a yearning for the better, and, finally, acting by means of fires as the popular means par excellence, to plunge the country, the prescribed moment, if need be, even into despair. (547)

But, in the novel Shalimar has no any group agenda when he involves in the terrorist groups. He is not fighting for the sake of any religion, nation, tribe and community but he uses terrorist groups as a channel to get to Max for his personal revenge of the seduction to his beloved wife. He has not any political issues but his terror activities are guided by his personal subject matter. About Shalimar's accusation as a terrorist for his personal subject matter of revenge, Rushdie reveals:

The crime which had at first looked political turned out to be a personal matter, insofar as anything was personal any more. The assassin was a professional, but the consequences of U. S. policy choices in South Asia, and their echoes in the labyrinthine chambers of the paranoiac jihadi mind, these and other related geopolitical variables receded from the analysis, could with a higher percentage probability be eliminated from the equation. (338)

Shalimar's goal does not meet the goals of terrorist defined by the west. His only one enemy is Max who lives in America far from India. A village boy cannot reach there and murder Max without taking help from the terrorist groups. So he has not other choice and compelled to involve in such groups. Actually, Max's sinful deeds compel Shalimar to involve in terror activities. The weapons of the terrorist groups are provided by American Max himself. He, who provides weapons to one particular group to defeat others in the name of counterterrorism, is himself a terrorist. The badge of terrorist given to Shalimar by the America generates sympathy to the readers and as the real culprit of the novel, appears Max Ophuls, rather than Shalimar the Clown.

III. Conclusion

Rushdie's character Shalimar the Clown is not a terrorist. Shy and romantic Kashmiri boy is compelled to involve into the terrorist groups to take revenge against Max Ophuls, a seducer of his beloved wife, Boonyi. Religious harmony among Muslims and Hindus in Kashmir is destroyed by the western interventions. As a representative of American so-called power, Max comes to India to handle his ambassadorial activity but instead of it, he involves in the sinful activities which ultimately take his own life. Shalimar himself involves into the religious fighting groups not for the sake of any religion but to take revenge against his enemy, Max.

Salman Rushdie in this novel *Shalimar the Clown* stands as a vehement critique of the western concept of terrorism by presenting his character Shalimar as an avenger than a terrorist. Rushdie makes his point that Shalimar is not a terrorist but he is an avenger. He is tagged as a terrorist by the western hegemonic power. The west gives the definition of terrorism and categorizes the terrorist groups. It defines terrorism and labels some groups as terrorist internalizing their so-called superiority. The western countries think terrorist as their enemy and want to defeat. Rushdie in the novel conveys his message that the west itself is a bearer of the terrorism and terrorist groups with which the west itself designates counterterrorism. To do so, the west provides weapons to some terrorist groups to defeat others in the name of counterterrorism. So, America's counterterrorism is also terrorism itself. Announcing the so-called 'war on terrorism', America involves in more terrorist activities. For the west, non-west is barbaric, uncivilized and uncultured. But Rushdie undercuts such biased notion of the west towards the non-west through Max as a western representative who involves in sinful and animalistic activities and destroys the harmonious life of Kashmiri people in the name of so-called civilization. The west has

labeled Islam as terrorist. But, Rushdie criticizes such western accusation and makes his point that terrorism is not a Muslim phenomenon. Western biasness towards Muslim religion is the product of their so-called superior power which they want to impose upon non-west internalizing them as inferior, powerless and uneducated and taking it as their burden to teach them. Instead of teaching, the west tries to impose its power and oppresses the non-west in the name of education to claim its so-called superiority and superpower around the world forever.

America sends Max to India as a representative of its power and uses him to impose such power upon the non-west which destroys his reputation and of the west itself. As heavenly quality of Kashmir is transformed into the hell by the American power, Max is also destroyed by the same western hegemonic power. He becomes a handiwork of American power. Rushdie vehemently criticizes the power-imposed western concept of terrorism and makes his point that the destruction of Max is also the failure of American so-called superpower.

To critique the very western concept of terrorism, Rushdie shows his character Shalimar as a terrorist-cum-personal avenger who involves into the terrorist groups and religious fighting groups not for any group agenda, not for the sake of any nation, religion, community and tribe but only for his personal matters that is to take revenge against Max to whom he wants to kill for the seduction of his beloved wife, Boonyi, and he uses such terrorist groups as a channel to fulfill his personal mission. So, he is not a terrorist but tagged as a terrorist. Rather than a terrorist, he is an avenger. Critiquing the western concept of terrorism, Rushdie implies that terrorism and terrorists are not what western countries define as such, but there are many Shalimars to whom the west has given the tag of terrorism.

Works Cited

- Benjamin, Daniel and Steven Simon. *The Age of Sacred Terror*. New York: Random House, 2002.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Demons: A Novel in Three Parts*. New York: Knopf, 1994.
- Dougary, Ginny. "The Incredible Lightness of Salman." *The Times*. New York: Macmillan, 2006. 3-7.
- Fuller, Bruce. "Strong States, Strong Teachers." *The Globalization Teacher*. Ed. 2nd. Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2001. 126- 133.
- Gibbs, Jack P. "Conceptualization of Terrorism." *American Sociological Review*. New York: American Sociological Association, 1998. 329-340.
- Gray, Jacqueline M. and Margaret A. Wilson. "Understanding the 'War on Terrorism': Responses to 11 September 2001." *Journal of Peace Research*. London: Sage Publications, 2006. 23-36.
- Hoffman, Bruce. *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- - -. *Terrorism*. New York: Microsoft Corporation, 2008.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Shalimar the Clown*. London: Vintage Books, 2006.
- Shughart II, William F. "The Political Economy of Terrorism." *Public Choice*. Mississippi: Springer, 2006. 7-39.
- Tilly, Charles. "Theories of Terrorism." *Sociological Theory*. New York: American Sociological Association, 2004. 5-13.
- Zinam, Oleg. "Terrorism and Violence in Light of a Theory of Discontent and Frustration." *International Terrorism in the Contemporary World*. Ed. Marius H. Livingston. Westport: Greenwood, 1978. 240-268.

