Tribhuvan University

Celebrating Multiculturalism: Politics of Inclusion in *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*

A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, Kathmandu, in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in English

by

Laxman Pande

2007

Tribhuvan University

This thesis entitled, **"Celebrating Multiculturalism: Politics of Inclusion in *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*"** submitted to the Department of English, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, by Laxman Pande, has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of Research Committee

_____

(Hari Adhikari)

Supervisor

_____

_____

External Examiner

_____

_____

(Hriseekesh Upadhyay)

_____

Head,

Department of English

_____

Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus

Kathmandu, Nepal

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I am intensely grateful to my respected teacher and supervisor Mr. Hari Adhikari, Lecturer at the Department of English, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, for his cordial and scholarly guidance. During the period of the research, he acquainted me with the taste of exploration and findings. I am sincerely indebted to him and will be so for ever.

I am equally thankful to my teacher Mr. Hriseekesh Upadhyay, Head, Department of English, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, for his support and encouragement. I am really grateful to him.

Thanks to my colleagues Shankar Gaire, Shankar Bashyal, Binod, Bhuvan and Deepak for their continuous support and encouragement. I would like to express my sincere thanks to Deepak and Narayan Basnet of Resunga Computer Service, Kirtipur for their help in technical support.

Finally, I would be always indebted to my grand parents Mr. Jagat Prasad Pande and Mrs. Rewata Pande; parents Mr. Krishna Prasad Pande and Mrs. Laxmi Pande. I am equally indebted to my maternal uncle Mr. Bishnu Prasad Bhandari for his regular support and encouragement. I am also thankful to my brothers Bibek and Bishal.

Laxman Pande

2007

Abstract

This research work is a study of *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* of Salman Rushdie which has a reference of two different nations–Chupland and Gupland. First kind of nation is fundamentalist that censors people's rights to free speech and narrative and the later one is performative nation that respects people's rights to free speech and narratives Rushdie prefers later type of nation i.e. performative nation but does not isolate the first one. His main concern is to construct a single multicultural nation. In the novel, fundamentalist Chupland and performative Gupland are merged and a Utopia named Chupland formed. The newly formed nation is the dream model of Rushdie where every citizen is treated in equal footing. People tell their respective cultural narratives that lead them to state of negotiation. After the negotiation, the nation gets changed. So, Rushdie's nation is multicultural, that serves mini-narratives and is constructed and reconstructed in course of time.

Contents

Acknowledgements

I. Multiculturalism: A Characteristics of Postcolonial Polity 1

Rushdie as a Postcolonial Writer 15

II. Nation and Nationhood: A Postcolonial Perspective 20

Postcoloniality: A Background 20

The Idea of Postcolonial Nation 23

Pluralistic Nationhood: A Rejection of Grand-Narratives 33

III. Respect for Micro-Narratives: Rushdie's Dream of Multicultural Nation 37

Freedom of Speech: Basis of Pluralistic Nationhood 44

Free Narrative: A Postcolonial Emphasis 48

Chupland: A Model of Multiculutral Nation 53

IV. Advocacy of Multicultural Nation 61

Works Cited 65

I. Multiculturalism: A Characteristic of Postcolonial Polity

Multiculturalism refers to the form of a society or a nation where different cultures are accepted and respected. Different scholars give their opinions regarding multiculturalism. According to Nathan Glazer, "multiculturalism refers to the fact that people may come from different cultures and create many sub-cultures while living in a common society or nation" (253). In the same way, Brian Barry in his book *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism* argues that multiculturalism can divide people when they need to unite in order to fight for the social justice. It is a situation where two or more than two cultures merge. It is also a public policy approach for managing cultural diversity in a multiethnic society, officially stressing mutual respect and tolerance for cultural differences within a country's boarder. As a policy multiculture emphasizes the unique characteristics of different cultures especially as they relate to one another in receiving nations.

Multiculturalism can encompass folk songs, dance, food festival, arts and crafts, museums, heritage languages, ethnic studies, ethnic processes, race relations, culture sharing and human rights. It also aims at something more moderate than radical multicultural theory calls for, and that is respect for and acknowledgement of a range of sub-cultures and changing it in various decrease whether this means a wholesale rejection of assimilation is really not clear. Multiculturalism advocates do not devote any great effort to projecting a picture of how culture and life will in time evolve. It is a response by minority and other groups to their current sense of deprivation and to what they feel is insufficient recognition and respect as well. Multicultural nation is something like the chain of negotiation which always getting

through happy ending where minority discourses can respectfully be incorporated in the national discourses.

Every human being has desire for the full articulation of his/her inherent potentiality. Only that nation can preserve all the rights of the people where multiculturality is prevalent. So, people want to create such a nation where all the voices of the people treated equally. Rushdie, in his novel *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*, does comparative study between two oppositive types of nations. In the text, there is a reference of two models of nation – Gupland which is perfomrative that permits people's rights of free speech and free narrative and also shows friendly and cooperative and second one Chupland which is fundamentalist that censors people to express their ideas freely Rushdie as a writer, prefers the first kind of nation but he does not isolate from the second. His concern is to construct a single multicultural nation. Performative nation 'Gupland' and fundamentalist nation 'Chupland' are blended with each other and form a Utopia, i.e., Chupland. The newly constructed Chupland is the perfect model as desired by Rushdie. He contrasts two nations and gives preference to the one which is friendly and cooperative with complete freedom to its people. Why does Rushdie prefer the state with freedom and cooperation?

Through this novel, Salman Rushdie wants to warn the fundamentalist nations by demanding free speech and free narratives and also offers a model of being what should be an ideal model of nation which allows interaction and cultural interests of the people. Since, Rushdie's concept of ideal state where multicultural voices are accepted resembles with Gupland he prefers it to Chupland.

In the text, there is a demand for the freedom of stories which can be associated to the idea of nation, because nation is the sum total of different narratives with which it is related to. Fundamentalist nation always seeks to grant narratives

officially therefore for fundamentalist supporter nation is what a holistic entity. It could never be changed. Salman Rushdie, one of the significant diaspora writers goes beyond this holistic tradition of nation and narratives and visions a nation as instable entity that changes its form in course of time. By developing this idea, Rushdie provides us a model of a nation that permits free speech and free narratives. The nation is therefore the essence of the interaction that takes place among its people. It doesn’t exist in metaphysical truth but exists as an entity that is passing through the different negotiations among different cultural interests. Multicultural nation is something like the chain of negotiations. Every negotiation imparts happiness among individuals. Therefore there will not be trace of sadness.

Salman Rushdie, in his novel *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* explores an idea of nation by making comparative study between two oppositive types of nation. As in the final part of the novel, he provides us a model of an ideal concept of nationhood which allows limitless interaction among people having different cultural interests. Rushdie, by developing his idea about nation views that nation is not a concrete entity within certain geographical boundaries rather it is an imaginary construction. Nation is created and governed by different narratives that may be changed time and again. therefore, the concept of nation also could be reconstructed in course of time. Its existence depends on different cultural fictions and it is continuously constructed and reconstructed in the course of its history. In this sense, we undoubtly find narration at the center of nation. Stories of national origin, myths of founding fathers etc. are categorized under national narratives in common sense but here Rushdie's concern is different. He accepts the idea of narratives, though those narratives do not remain the same forever, and are constructed and reconstructed in course of time. Reconstruction of narratives is significantly important to change the definition of nation and

nationhood. Such idea of a nation can be taken as a milestone to reach the diasporic movement in the height.

Diapsoric movement is in the center of discussion in current postcolonial world. It does its best to bring subaltern voice into the mainstream culture especially of those who are migrated and compelled to live in another culture. The extension of colony itself was followed by diasporic movement because colonial extension caused the settlement of millions of Europeans over the whole world. The widespread effects of these migrants continued on a global scale. The global perception of diasporic movement helped to bring awareness against direct and indirect colonial domination among structured mind of intellectuals. That awareness, later on, became milestone to neutralize the malpractices of the slavery and other such practices which used to be categorized as 'inferior'. The development of diasporic culture necessarily questions essentialist models of nation interrogating the ideology of a unified and natural nationalistic norm. Diasporic culture adopts multicultural practices in nature. Therefore, "the diasporic space is the site where the native as much a diasporic is a native" (Barker 209). Diasporic identity is at once local and global. Salman Rushdie as a diaspora brings several diasporic issues in the novel which will be studied in this dissertation in considerable length, relating to them with the idea of postcolonial nation.

The novel has been, appreciated and interpreted by different critics across the world with different perspectives. Those approaches, no matter whether they are context oriented, another oriented, reader oriented or language oriented have tried to reformulate the meaning of the text, interpret it on their own way. However, the approach of the present study of the novel is cultural. Particularly, here, it is to relate cultural interests with the idea of nation. At this point, it is necessary to define some

specific terms: 'Nation', 'Narration/Narrative', 'Culture', 'Postcolonial studies', 'Diaspora' and 'Hybridity' that are used with specific meaning in the present study.

It is difficult to make a universal consensus about what nation is. Arising in late eighteenth century and particularly in the French revolution, the political theory of nation was developed by Diderot and Condorcet. James Shead quoting their definition writes, a nation is "a union of individual governed by one law and represented by the same law giving assembly" (231). A nation is a collection of individuals united in supporting a perceived interest. The existing system of a nation is based on divergent laws made by different power holders. If single law can govern the entire world, the national consciousness will no more be required among the people. In course of history, human being had made it and it may end at any time. It is not something eternal. "A nation would be lost if the world had only one law and only one master." Rennan views that a nation is not something that it is constant in its form, but it goes on changing in course of history. He says, 'it is a historical result brought about by a series of convergent facts" (11-12). History is taken as the mixture of facts and fiction. Facts are brought about by situational social interactions so that national form is what determined by different negotiations made with multicultural interests. Brennan states the idea in the same vain; he quotes Fanon's statement, "it is at the heart of national consciousness that international consciousness lives and grows" (63). Today's world is getting through the condition of cultural hybridity. Knowingly and unknowingly multicultural elements are mingled with each other.

One of the most important terms among others that will be used time and again in this research work is *Narrative*. It is known as spoken or written account of events or stories. But when a postcolonial critic Edward Said points out "narratives themselves are nation," it seems important to search this term in further depth

(Culture xiii). The above quotation ruptures the idea of nation as a geographical concept. The nation is sum total of different narratives like political, religions etc. and the important national issues are determined by them. Said adds for more clarification.

> The main battle in imperialism is over land, of course, but when it came to who owned the land, who had right to settle and work on it, who kept it going, who won it back and who now plans its future these issues were reflected in context, and even for a time decided in narrative form forming and emerging, is very important. (xiii)

In this scenario, we can draw the conclusion that national form is changeable. How long the preceding narratives are preserved, it remains the same in its earlier position. While the perspective of "nation as narration" establishes the boundaries of a nation these boundaries are erased, translated and crossed in the process of cultural production. Change in narratives is the reason for change in respective cultures and finally in nationality. Therefore, an imperialist can claim authority upon land but not in the narratives since these are distinctly subjective phenomena.

Homi K. Bhabha says, the national narratives are "incomplete signification" (4) because it is rewritten in course of time. Every attempt to rewrite the narrative always demands newness and hybridity. However, modern European societies go on serving the grand narratives as essential. They ignore small practices, local events categorizing them as "others". The "others" in these societies, are taken as the means to create "disorder."

The term *Culture*, one of the most complicated words in the English language, is defined differently by different scholars. A postcolonial critic, Edward Said points out it as "a sort of theatre where various political and ideological causes engage one another" (xiv).

Another critic Frederic Jameson defines it as the "ensemble of stigmata one group bears in the eyes of the other group and vice versa" (271). It gives one's identity before another group or people to create their self out of the culture they belong to. To sum, culture is customs, arts, and social institutions etc. of a particular group of people. Culture is continuously recreated by conscious or unconscious efforts of individuals because human begins are meant for contextuality. Rushdie gives important space to culture by which people create their own nationality.

Postcolonial studies is a discipline which rejects the Eurocentric colonial scholarship and describes the representation chiefly as orientalist and its historical, political and social tenets. It is an umbrella term that covers all Latin America, Caribbean, African and third world studies. Deconstructing the European practice of 'we' and 'other', it importantly tries to establish an easy approach in understanding the problems inherent in orientalist discourse. As for resisting the western imperialism, postcolonial studies takes a text as a complex network of social, cultural, political and economic relations to rupture the hierarchy of 'we' and 'other' by defining ourselves culturally: Who are we? And where do we belong to?

Despite this reality, Western canonical disciplines do neglect these minority discourses categorising as exotic and foreign even after the colonized country is officially liberated.

The basic assumption of this term is that former colonies share certain qualities and experiences. There is both continuity and change in the nature of the government and structure of power from colonial to postcolonial societies. The western government and the official renouncement of colony are obviously different from the colonial regimes, but the freedom and self rule for which the colonized fought bitterly proved to be illusive. Westerners define nation in the name of their

culture. Such essentialist practice naturally isolates the issue of migrants. At this point, it is said that a new forms of domination and dependence pervaded in the so-called independent nations. Therefore, postcolonial studies directs its critique against the cultural hegemony of European knowledge in an attempt to reassert the epistemological value and agency of non-European world. Likewise, it becomes an important discipline to raise question upon the present claim of nation and national entity.

The term, *Diaspora* is frequently repeated in every discourse of post-colonial studies. Diaspora is the movement of people to any nation or group away from their own country. Therefore, the nation where a diaspora lives cannot serve his/her cultural interests in separation. He/she feels lack of nationlessness. To fill this void, he/she creates a nation of his/her own out of his/her written texts. During the late twentieth century, the word diaspora came to be applied to many groups outside their homelands. Thus, people now speak of African diaspora, Indian diaspora, South Asian diaspora, American diaspora etc. For example, we can take Salman Rushdie's third person narrator of his book, *Imaginary Homelands*, Saleem Sinai. He is an Indian diaspora bears a similar fate with Rushdie. What his condition? To answer this question, Rushdie quotes, "a very appropriate source" from "the film Mr. 420" that is "Mera Joota Hai Japani" (*Imaginary* 11). It means a diaspora has hybrid identity. He is related to hybrid culture. Past and present cultures are blended in a diasporic identity.

The last term of the list is *Hybridity* that refers to the thing that made by combining two different elements, in simple meaning. But in postcolonial discourse, hybridity has frequently used to mean cross-cultural exchange or state of cultural fusion. For the cultural exchanges" imperialist importations are superimposed on

indigenous traditions; it also includes a number of postcolonial counter texts to the hegemonic text that presents a European version of colonial history" (Abrahms 237). In the present research hybridity is used to refer to the blending of different cultural influences in which cultural purity is almost impossible. This condition can be perceived in the text of any diapsora writer.

The specific terms that require definition for the purpose of the present study have been defined so far. Now in the subsequent paragraphs, every brief outline of the propositons of the study will be presented.

The present dissertation has be divided into four chapters. The first chapter presents an introductory outline of the present study. It tries briefly to discuss on Rushdie as a postcolonial writer with diasporic identity. For this purpose, some of his own texts and the texts of different critics regarding on the study of Rushdie, will be taken as supporting materials to justify the point that he is hostile to present form of nations because they secure their identity in totalities by excluding "others".

The second chapter of this study will be concentrated on discussion of the theoretical modality that is going to be applied in this research. It shortly explains the intellectual background of the postcolonial theory and practice, ideas of nation that are germinated in postcolonial literary scenario then postcolonial ideas of nation as a rejection of grand-narratives or modernity.

Being based on the theoretical modality, the text will be analyzed at a considerable length in third chapter. This chapter will serve as the core of the present study. Some extracts from the text will be taken out as evidence to prove the hypothesis of the study. Rushdie not only attempts to warn the fundamentalist nation demanding free speech and free narratives, but also offers a model of an ideal concept

of nationhood that permits unlimited interaction and exchange between cultural interests.

As the conclusion of this research, it puts forward some explanations and arguments based on textual analysis and shows how the present forms of national narratives serve the platonic tradition and why Rushdie attempts to imagine a model of a nation that resists the essential modern European tradition.

The present work touches a contemporary issue, the issue of nation especially in the case of diaspora who are socially, culturally and linguistically uprooted. The present concept of nation is depended on totalities. This totalized concept of nation is used to suppress the differences to serve the fundamentalist rulers. Therefore, people residing in multicultural location are marginalized by the so-called people of superior culture. To erase the hierarchy of superior and inferior, people like diaspora carryout the abstract ideas of nation into concrete form out of their text where the people are treated equally with complete freedom of speech and narratives.

Rushdie as a Postcolonial Writer

Rushdie was born June 19, 1947, in Bombay, India. As a member of a middle-class Muslim family, he attended the Cathedral Boys' High School. In 1964 the family moved to Pakistan, but by then Rushdie had been sent to Rugby school in England for the study. He entered king's college, Cambridge, where he received M.A. with honor in 1968. After graduation, he acted for one year at on experimental theatre. Rushdie published his first novel *Grimus* in 1975. With the publication of the first novel, he formally entered into the literary life. After the six years of the publication of first novel, he produced *Midnight's Children* in 1981 which received the Booker Mc Connel prize. It accelerated his literary carrier, and became the professional writer. He produced *Shame* in 1983, *The Jaguar Smile* in 1987, *The Satanic Verses* in 1988, *The*

Moor's Last Sign in 1995. Then people began to study his works, paying great attention.

In Rushdie's works, various genres – fantasy, mythology religion and tradition are merged into a single text. This narrative technique has connected his book to magic realism – a narrative style in which the realistic details are merged with the fantastic style of magic realism. It makes him easy to combine the elements of dream, fairy tales or mythology with the everyday world. But these fairy tales and mythologies are strangely shaped with his own several themes are repeated in his writing, the theme of emigration and the migrant self are of his favourite themes. By examining the life of a migrant, he explores the universal mystery of being born and puzzled of who one is. Quest for identity, divided selves, double identity, and conflict between good and evil are the most recurring themes in his books.

By examining Rushdie's life, one can understand his quest for identity. He has gained a unique perspective from his own unique life situation. Born in India, studied in England, forced by parents to move to Pakistan and family exiled back to Britain, Rushdie has never been truely accepted in any of his "homes". Using the advantage of "double perspectives" (*Imaginary* 19) of a migrant writer, he fuses his Indian childhood with his Cambridge education. He believes that "We cannot simply use the language the way British did, it needs remaking for our own purposes" (17). So, he recreates English language by combining it with Indian colloquial Urdu and Hindi words Rushdie, an Anglo-Indian novelist, stands as among the major postcolonial writers. According to the *Oxford Companion to English Literature*, his bicultural upbringings informs all his works, where he fuses the allegorical and fable making tradition of east with west. Rushdie is now respected as representative figure of contemporary British literature for his supreme irony and poetic justice. He is always

concerned with giving a voice to the voiceless, with giving the power of description to the disenfranchised. He is also renowned for his brilliantly vicious political satire. However, in deeper level, his texts transcend the relevance of political satire that will be for short period and deal with the theme of migration. Though several themes are repeated in his writing, in *Encyclopedia of Postcolonial Literatures in English* his themes are described as "the themes of emigration and migrant self are his favourite ones (Rushdie)." It does not claim emigration and migrant self as his essential but claims as important one to examine the life of migrant. He explores the universal mystery of being born and puzzled of the individual's real identity.

Writers like Salman Rushdie, proclaim their identity with a country whose artificiality and exclusiveness have driven them into a kind of exile. A person is exile meets a simultaneous reorganization of nationalhood and an alienation form it. His present is divided into mood of rejection and mood of celebration. Celebration comes with the nationhood, but no sooner than later, the nation upon essential nationalistic idea and favours a recent and particularized history in order to expose the political dogma of imperialism. Timothy Brennan describing Rushdie and his text writes:

> In the case of Salman Rushdie, for instance, the examples of India and Pakistan are, above all, an opportunity to explore postcolonial responsibility. [. . .] in fact, the central irony of his novel is that independence has damaged Indian spirit by proving that 'India' can act as abominably as the British did. In a kind of meta fictional extravaganza, he treats the heroism of nationalism bitterly and comically because it always seems to him to evolve into the nationalist demagogy of a caste of domestic sellouts and power brokers. (63-64)

Through these above lines, it seems that Rushdie writes by blending two or more than two cultures into one and pays attention to British imperialism by shaking the imposed spirits of colonized people ironically. The important issue, in his texts is of nation and nationalism. He satires those nations, which are being evolved through popular feelings and prejudices excluding "others."

One significant resistance, we can be found in Rushdie's texts, is about history. In his view, official historical discourse is not the absolute and the final version of history. It is merely based on the biases and prejudices. Moreover, it is an ideological construction which functions in favour of state ideology. So history, like literature, needs to be interpreted with different perspectives. History is like fiction so that one is relied to another, and thus they are complementary.

Most critics described his texts as extremely complex because they are filled with symbolism, element of magic realism, and layer upon layer of meanings. However, these elements are merged into his many texts to make a text valuable as well as resist cautiously against the Fatwa. To same extent, his texts can be analyzed in terms of resistance. Some of his texts resist against Hinduism, some resist against Muslim tradition, some against colonial domination by seeking freedom of an individual. For example his *The SatanicVerses* has been taken as a text which has offended Muslim. So that Rushdie had been charged with blasphemy and ordered for sentence to death. It forced him to loss some years of underground life. The underground life has accelerated his literary life with added subject matters. Free speech and free narratives have been applied frequently as dominant subject matters in his texts taking human dignity into consideration.

Upto this point, locating Salman Rushdie's position as a diasporic writer, his biography and some of his celebrated books have been observed with reference to his

literary features. Next chapter will be concentrated to discuss over some of the major postcolonial ideas of nation and nationality and Lyotard's idea of "grand narrative" and mininarraitve" that will be used in this research as critical tools to analyze Rushdie's novel, *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*.

II. Nation and Nationhood: A Postcolonial Perspective

Postcoloniality: A Background

Orientalism is highly celebrated text of Edward Said which was published in 1978. After its publication postcolonialism has formally been occupied its place among other theories as feminism, poststructuralism, psychoanalysis. This school of thought critically analyses the history, culture, literature and other discourses that are specific to the former colonies of England, Spain, France and other European imperial power. As it is indicated in Said's *Culture and Imperialism*, postcolonialism tries on the one hand, to reveal European colonial dominance upon the colonized people that has not been seemingly underwritten in the major canon of the western intellectual disciplines, and on the other hand, it resists upon that dominance. This kind of reading on the European texts in Said's term is 'contrapuntal reading' (*Culture* 66).

Postcolonial school of thought lacks its originary moment or coherent methodology as it seems in Marxism and Deconstruction. It is the outcome of Marxism and Deconstruction. So, it is methodologically and conceptually indebted to these schools of thought. Leela Gandhi says "Intellectual history of postcolonial theory is marked by a dialectic between Marxism on the one hand, and poststructuralism/postmodernim on the other" (Preface). Unlike Marxism, postcolonialism accounts for the consequences of colonial encounter, and unlike postmodernism it rejects the emphasis on the textual criticism.

Marxism has become unable to accommodate the specific political needs of the colonized world. So, it has failed to exert potential appeal to postcolonial thought. Marxism's blindness to the violence of colonialism is still reflected in Marx own words. Said writes, "Whatever ways have been the crimes of England [. . .] she was the unconscious tool of history, which raised, India in this instance from its semi-

barbaric state into the improved condition of modernity" (153) in his book *Orientalism*. Thus, Marx clearly justifies British colonialism ignoring colonial crime against colonized people.

Post-structuralism, too, isolates the issue of colonialism. It seems silence against political domination of colonialism. In *The Postcolonial Reader*, it says, "postmodernism-the deconstruction of the centralized, logocentric master narratives of European culture, is very similar to the postcolonioal project of dismantaling the center/margin binarism of imperial discourse" (61). Poststructuralism and postcolonialism, as we have in above quoted lines, are similar in their insistence on rupturing the center/margin hierarchy but the latter's emphasis goes on to resist European imperialistic tendency and subverts the European construction of "we" and "other" to bring minority voice into center. It rejects the whole European platonic tradition of theories:

> The main thing is that the written text of the sort we care about is generally the result of some immediate contact between author and medium. Thereafter it can be reproduced for the benefits of the world; however much the author demurs at the publicity he or she receives once the text goes more than one copy the author's work is in the world and beyond authorial control. (*The World* 1211)

The above instence, worldliness of text, postulates that postcolonialism is related to social, cultural, and economic surrounding of writing. However these aspects are analysed in the text for the revelation of colonialoism as an exploitative relationship between the west and the east.

To analyse colonial exploitation of west, Edward Said takes significant assistance of Foucaultian idea of 'knowledge' and 'power'. As he argues in

Orientalism, westners unknowingly impose "authority over the orient" (i) by means of their different discourses. At this point, all the major cannons of European literature are "discourses" out of which "knowledge" is imparted to create "power". As the resistance against monolithic western system, postcolonialism itself can be taken as a "discourse." Thus postcolonialism is highly practical school and within a distinctly postmodernist climate dominated by Derrida and Foucault. Rightist Derridian view-a text is linguistic game, has been made revolutionary going beyond text to politics for the sake of all indigenous group of people who are culturally categorized as "subaltern."

Postcolonialism articulates emergence of newly formulated idea of national and individual identities rejecting the western essential tradition. Although it studies the ideological and cultural impact of western colonialism and in particular its aftermath and accommodates itself to hybridity, syncretism, diaspora, migracy etc. to bring the minority voice into the center, many people claim of the continuation of western colonization in different forms. For example Leela Gandhi claims:

> Postcolonialism can be seen as a theoretical resistance to the mystifying amnesia of the colonial aftermath. It is a disciplinary project devoted to the academic task of revisiting, remembering and, crucially interrogating the colonial past. The process of returning to the colonial scene discloses a relationship of reciprocal antagonism and desire between colonizers and colonized. (4)

The political experiences and practices of the colonial past are theorized from the enlightened perspective of the present. It helps to know "Cultural and political identities of colonized subjects" (Gandhi 5). This awareness leads postcolonial people

to create their individual as well as national identity as it is done by Salman Rushdie, Michel Ondaatje and other such writers.

To conclude, postcolonialism has poststruturalist and Marxist parentage to "diagnose the material effect and implication of colonialism" (Gandhi 26). As poststructuralism, it insists to break the hierarchy of 'center' and 'marin' of European construction and it is to bring "subaltern" voice into center as Marxism does for proletariat. In the above section, the background to postcolonial theory is figured out, in the subsequent sections, the theoretical presumptions of the present study will be forwarded.

The Idea of Postcolonial Nation

The idea about nation wasn't something that had come abruptly into existence; it is the result of intellectual and political consequences which were being developed in course of history. In fifth century BC, when Plato, one of the systematic philosophers of the western tradition, had relegated the idea of ideal state, there was not systematic idea about nation-state. According to his idea of city-state, there would be three classes: rulers, soldiers and workers. They would have been in hierarchical order. Plato had claimed that virtue would be found in the proper functioning of these classes. Plato's above mentioned idea refers that it is his condition of mind, his subjectivity and his spirituality which would have enforced him to create a Utopia. It is his argument, his love or his nationality to create better society.

It was Aristotle who couldn't see any essence beyond this world (unlike Plato), points out that there are good and bad forms of government. According to him, if a government is constitutional i.e. good. For the best, he recommends a constitution favoring the middle class. To sum up, the entire Greek history had been passed through such different ideas related to nation. They took nation as an objective entity.

Later on, upto the fifth century AD, the Europe was ruled in the name of divine force. People used to punished, classified according to divine rule. The whole rein was in the claws of church. Church was in the center and religious texts like the Bible were the prime source to rule upon the people.

In the fourth quarter of the 20th century, with the relegation of Benedict Anderson's idea of nation, one terrible question mark fell upon the established ideas of nation. Anderson views, the new nations are made imaginable due to the interactions among the system of production and productive relation, technology of communication, and controlled human linguistic diversity. Mainly, it is the result of interaction between capitalism and print-capitalism. Print-capitalism, Anderson claims, creates "unified field and exchange" or communication which makes people aware of how "power of language" is created to dominate dialects (*Ashcroft* 82). The native speakers were forced to create a distinct linguistic community. So that an alternative thought could be emerged in every conscious man's mind. Intellectuals began to question upon the monolithic claim of a national language in particular and culture religion etc. in general. Partha Chattergy points out:

> Ten years ago, it was such area specialist who managed to raise once more the question of the origin and spread of nationalism in the framework of a universal history. Benedict Anderson demonstrated with much subtly and originality that nations were not the determinate products of given sociological conditions such as language, or religion; they had been, in Europe and everywhere else in the world, imagined into existence. He also described some of the major institutional forms through which this imagined community come to acquire concrete shape especially the institutions of [. . .] 'print capitalism'. (4)

With the help of 'print capitalism, it became easy to spread the common experience of people, their condition and interests. Chattergy further talks about Anderson's three models of western Europe, America and Russia. People out of their imagination have to choose the model which can accommodate their interests. The question comes of three kinds of models were already available, now one could imagine the some? Whatever he argued regarding the idea of nation, the arguments paved the way for the idea of postcolonial nation.

One of the significant ideas for resistance to imperial control in colonial society has been the idea of nation. It is the concept of shared community "which has enabled postcolonial societies to invent a self image through which they could act to liberate themselves from imperialist oppression" (*Ashcroft* 75). Nation in this sense, is self-construction. People themselves have created it out of there collective thought to describe, justify, and praise their actions. This kind of collective efforts of people make them feel dignified, and at that time redeem them from the state of lack of nationhood. The postcolonial people who are entangled into the condition of lack of national identity can practice this idea to escape from this situation. The imperialist nations always exploit these postcolonial people. Their national machineries are activated to preserve the ideologies of people who are related to so-called superior culture. Therefore these imperial nations are no longer the nations for minority group of people like migrants, blacks etc. Rushdie claims:

> This is not the England of fair play, tolerance decency and equality may be that place never existed anyway, except in fairy-tales. In the streets of the new empire, black women are abused and black children are beaten upon their way to home from school. In the run down housing estates of the new empire, black families have their windows

> broken, they are afraid to go out after dark, and human and animal excrement arrives through their letter boxes. (*Imaginary* 134)

The condition of emigrants is also not different from that of blacks. Rushdie in the same book postulates the British persuades immigrants and emigrants to come there by attractive advertisements, later expel them after completion of their project. These British opportunist activities torture the people who are culturally uprooted. So, these postcolonial people, to escape from their painful situation, go beyond the present form the fundamentalist tradition of nation and imagine the nation of their own that is a performative nation which can do just for all types of cultural people. It is ideal and disseminated in nature and it imposes a great threat to the European model of grand cultures.

However, the rise of postcolonial theory and criticism about nations has led to a certain problem of the concept 'nation'. This is because of the term 'nation' is sometimes approximated to state, at other times other terms and concepts like people or even culture. In the discipline of political science the terms, nation and state are different, nation is related to subjectivity and state with objectivity. A single individual is likely to be a member of one state, but membership of nation or culture may in each case disputable or multiple, since the idea of nation goes beyond its concrete form. Chattergy views, there is spiritual nation i.e. "inner domain" of people bearing the essential marks of cultural identity. This domain had fundamental features of anti-colonial nationalism in Asian and African people during the colonial period. This spirituality was the precondition to achieve the political victory upon the monolithic colonial power.

Many European powerful nations are defined in terms of their superior race. In England white people are regarded as the superior and England as nation is defined in

terms of that race. Ernest Rennan says that every country has mixed blood race. No pure race is in existence throughout the world therefore European ethnographic principle which is substituted for a national one is great error. Rennan writes, "Ethnographic considerations have played no part in the institution of modern nations. France is (at once) Celtic, Iberic and Germanic. German is Germanic, Celtic and Slav. Italy is the country where the ethnographic argument is most confounded" (14). In this sense, race cannot be a national identity. Such practice is selfish and disincentive.

Race is something which is made and unmade in the long run of history. The politics based on racial hatred and ethnographic sentiment is in no way a stable thing. The point of national origin "conceived ethnically, linguistically or geographically was of small significance" while there is not a single nation in this world with only one culture" (Ashcroft 83). This pattern of holistic tradition brings half concealed transformation of "the colonial state into the national state" (83). In this scenario, the nation's claim to modernity, as an autonomous form of political rationality, is particularly questionable from the point of view of postcolonial perspective of nation:

> Nationalism [. . .] seeks to represent itself in the image of enlightenment and fails to do so. For enlightenment itself to assert its sovereignty as the universal ideas needs its other; it could ever actualize itself in the real world as the truly universal. It would in fact destroy itself. (Ashcroft 85)

The ideological ambivalence of European modernity itself supports the idea of nation as contingent one. The nation takes its concrete shape out of cultural practices practiced by nationalism. These cultural practices are often arbitrary. They are historical inventions.

History is constructed out of different perspectives. It can be concerned with who has written it with what intention. The intention leads the history ahead excluding others' ideology. How long does it remain in the center, the nationality it bears, functions. The history writing therefore becomes a tool to charge opposite groups, Chattergy says, "the past had been constructed by the early generation of the Bengali intelligentsia as a Hindu past" (73). It excluded Islam and aligns. It could accommodate Islam only as foreign elements. But "there is not a single English book which contains the true history of Bengal" (76) because English people did not support the Hinduism as it is. In the colonial society the colonized were expelled from its "Decisive Zones by a rule of colonial differences" (75).

Now, it becomes clear that the history is the product of power for its own sake. The reasons of power centered history is the outcome of European rationalist movement. This rationalist movement, later on, became able to legitimate the European imperialism. In this respect, the movement of postcolonial nationalism is to resist the ways of "modern institutions" of European imperialism:

> The new subjectivity that was constructed here was premised not on a conception of universal humanity, but rather on particularity and difference, the identity of the 'national community' as against other communities. In this aspect of the political domain, then, the hegemonic movement of nationalism was not to promote but rather, in a quite fundamental sense, to resist the ways of modern institutions of disciplinary power. (75)

The Bengali national community of particularity and difference is akin to our concern of postcolonial nation. The idea of postcolonial nation is subjective, imaginary and

contradicts with the European idea of modernity. European imperial nations are sustained due to the modernist idea of rationality.

Nations are imaginary construction that depend for their existence on an apparatus of cultural fictions in which imaginative literature plays a decisive role. By using national allegories, national narratives are written to provide legitimacy to the idea of nations as an essence. Many of the novels often attempt to assemble the fragments of national life and give them a final shape. They become documents designed to prove national consciousness with extremely large number of components that display an active communal life. Fundamentalist nations define nationality in terms of their national narratives. In such narratives, stories of national origin, myths of founding fathers are reposed necessarily. In contrast to this tendency, writers like Salman Rushdie cross the boundary of the nationality and expose their transactional attitude prescribing a postcolonial nation that allows multicultural narratives equally.

The nations were and are profoundly unstable formation, always likely to collapse back into sub-divisions of clan, tribe, language or religious group. Nations are not natural entities. The instability of the nation is the inevitable consequence of its nature as a social construction. Regarding the issue writer like Timothy Brennan argues, "modern nation state is entirely artificial" (45). The process of globalization requires that the individual be free to act in an economic realm that crosses and nullifies there national boundaries and identities. Since the practice of globalization has been already projected in economic realm, people's economic concern comes first and the question of nationality within the geography of certain boundaries comes later.

Homy K. Bhabha, one of the significant postcolonial critics, who is remarkable in his idea of postcolonial nation, argues that the nations are instable

entities. He says, "nations like narratives, lose their origin in the myths of time and only fully realize their horizons in the mind's eye" (5). In this sense, myths have their multiple meanings at different times in the writing of modern political culture. They are made suitable to sustain the grand narratives of the nation. This myths preserving and rationalizing tendency can't catch the state of people who are in the frontier of culture. So that, their nationality is realized "in the mind's eye." The rationalization of the culture within the crowed of many cultures in the name of national interest comes into being due to European enlightenment idea developed after the mid-nineteenth century. This antagonistic perspective of nation, invents new cultural boundaries of the nation. So the meaning of the exclusive nation is erased itself in the process of cultural production.

Every culture has its own narratives. The national culture "is neither unified nor unitary with its relation to other" (Bhabha 4). When someone says something as national culture, there is always assumption of the "other". Those minorities or the others demand for their freedom of narratives. The freedom of narratives is not simply the freedom of expression; it is also the demand of freedom of individual, of minority cultural groups and of their cultural practices to be a part of the nation with which they are affiliated. It is also their appeal not to be excluded from a nation simply because they do not agree with a unified nationalist ideal. The idea, High Culture is a national identity, is something like what Derrida calls "irreducible excess of syntactic over semantic" (Bhabha 4) because the limitations of High Culture are unclear and meaningless. It is meaningless idea of superior and inferior culture is the product of latest European mind which extremely obssessed with the idea of Marxist internationalism. On the contrary, the postcolonial intellectuals like Bhabha see the international dimension within the margins of the nation space. There is no single

nation with absolute culture; it has a crowd of people with different identities. The fundamentalist claim of totality is akin to effort of an individual to make shadow upon entire earth by expanding the hands.

The emergence of later phase of modern nation from the mid-nineteenth century onward became the cause of mass migration within the west and colonial expansion in east, Bhabha views the situation of migration brought a cause of cultural uprootedness among these migrants. They had not their nationality where they were migrated. Therefore, they felt akin of loss. To fill that void, these migrants "loss into the language of metaphor" (Bhabha 29). He further says:

> The nation fills the void left in the uprooting of communities, and turns that loss into the language of metaphor. Metaphor, as the etymology of the work suggest and transfers the meaning of home and belonging across the middle passage or the central European steppes, across those distances and cultural differences, that span the imagined community of the nation people. (291)

They find the difficulty of belonging. They even seek the relation to the source culture and thereby try to establish their identity. This doesn't apply only in the case of diasporic writers; it is equally applied to diaspora characters. If the writers concretize the model of their ideal concept of nationhood in their texts, they are documents for this concept.

Every new narrative, or every new fresh formulation of an old narrative, is not a simple addition to the body of narratives that already exist; it also antagonizes the narratives. Therefore there are not certain numbers of model narratives. The narratives are infinite in numbers and they are meaningless in relation to others. They have meaning in itself. Bhabha has called, "the insurmountable extremes of story telling

(where) we encounter the question of cultural difference as the perplexity of living and writing the nation" (*The Culture* 161). The question of cultural difference with the distribution of practice, exist beside each other in a form of juxtaposition to resist the teleology of testing truth by logic. In evasing the harmonious totalities of culture, cultural difference articulates the difference between representations of social life and judgements that are produced within the process of transactional cultural negotiation. The analytic of cultural differences disturb the rationale of discriminations. Thus the aim of cultural differences is to rearticulate the sum of knowledge from the perspective "signifying singularity" of the "other" that resists totalization.

The nations which praise their totalized ideologies are to interrupt the individual's selfhood, freedom of expression. They try to maintain this act of interruption in the name of religions, myths, race etc. But their hidden purpose is political; therefore framework of its reasoning is entirely secular Chattergy regarding the case brings Indian context and says:

> The idea that "Indian nationalism" is synonymous with "Hindu nationalism" is not the vestige of some pre-modern religious conception. It is entirely modern nationalist and historicist idea. Like other modern ideologies, it allows for a central role of the state in the modernization of society and strongly defends the state's unity and sovereignty. (110)

The state lords take religious and racial practices as absolute to create "order" in the society. They take these practices into grant, claiming them as the only reality. But these things have been originated only after the mid-nineteenth century when the modernity came into existence. Therefore the mythic proportion of any practices is not anything more than the mere object that serves the interest of some selected

people. And the idea which brings religion into the level of national identity is a political idea. It throws society into the maze of exclusive European modernity to which the postcolonial intellectuals categorize fundamentalist.

Pluralistic Nationhood: A Rejection of Grand-Narratives

Modernity is fundamentally about order, rationality and rationalization. It believes that societies are going towards decay therefore there is an urgent need to create order out of chaos. The assumption is that creating more rationality is conducive to create more order, and that the more ordered a society is the better it will function. Therefore, the modernity is about the pursuit of ever-increasing levels of order. Modern societies constantly are on guard against anything and everything labeled as "disorder." While modernity pursues order and guards disorder, it is assumed, modern societies go on continually establishing a binary opposition between "order" and "disorder", so that they can assert the superiority of "order". Thus modern societies continually have to construct "disorder." In modern societies continually have to construct "disorder." In western culture, this disorder becomes "the other" – defined in relation to others binary oppositions. Thus, anything non-white, non-rational, etc. becomes part of "disorder", and has to be eliminated from the ordered, rational modern society.

The way that modern societies go about creating categories labeled as "order" or "disorder" has to do with the effort to achieve stability. Francois Lyotard equates that stability with the idea of "totality" or totalized system. Totality, and stability, and order, Lyotard argues, are maintained in modern societies through the means of grand narratives, which are stories of a culture tell themselves about its practices and beliefs. Jim Powell points out grand narratives as "big stories of mythic proportions that claims to be able to account for, explain and subordinate all lesser, little, local

narratives" (29). In this respect, philosophies of Marxism or narratives of Christian salvation can be the examples of grand narratives. A grand narrative in American culture might be the story that democracy is the most enlightened form of government and that democracy can and will lead to universal human happiness. Every belief system has its grand narratives, for Marxism, the grand narrative is the idea that capitalism will collapse in itself and a utopian socialist world will evolve.

Lyotard argues that all aspects of modern societies, including science as the primary form of knowledge, depend on these grand narratives. What then science does? Powell question:

> According to Lyotard – is that since World War II, people no longer believe in these two grand metanarratives. After all, applying science and reason to the construction of gas chambers and efficient railroad schedules, the Nazis exterminated millions of human beings. Did these people experience freedom and liberation? And did science fulfill Hegel's narrative of increasing knowledge? (30)

Postmodernism then is the critique of grand narratives, the awareness that such narratives serve to mask the contradictions and instabilities that are inherent in any social organization or practice. In other word, every attempt to create "order" always demands the creation of an equal amount of "disorder."

But a grand narrative masks the constructedness of these categories by explaining that "disorder" really is chaotic and bad, and that "order" is really rational and good. Postmodernism rejects grand narratives and favours mini narratives – stories that explain small practice, local events, rather than large scale universal or global concepts. Postmodern mini narratives are always situational, provisional, contingent and temporary, making no claim to universal truth, reason, or stability. In

postmodern nation, many mini narratives are stuck together. The crowd of narratives," replaces the monolithic presence of one meta-narrative" (Powell 32). Thus, the idea of mini narratives rejects the universal system meaning.

Mini narratives unlike science, don't seek to be legitimized themselves with reference to a grand narratives. Each story, while it is being told, is its own proof, and the proof of all the others. It is legitimized simply by doing what it does. And not one of these little stories can dominate or explain the rest. These mini narratives offer many alternatives ,and focus on thinking of any and all action as necessarily local but nonetheless effective. By discarding grand narratives, and focusing on specific local events, the idea of postcolonial nation offers way to theorize local situation as fluid, unpredictable. Then any claim to grand scheme or master plan can be regarded as the means which only are useful in modern but not in postmodern societies.

Postmodern societies are getting through the condition of fragmentation, provisionally, performance, and instability. There are various judgements about whether the postmodern society and its practices are good or bad. The desire to return to pre-postmodern era tends to get associated with conservative political religious and philosophical grounds. Such desire is the out come of traditional societies which are under the spell of one dominant narrative. It is most obvious in Muslim fundamentalism in the Middle East, which bans postmodern books like Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses* etc. Because they deconstruct such grand narratives by jolting multicultural sources. The carnival of narratives challenges the monolithic presence of one meta-narrative.

Now, the theoretical modality intended to apply in the novel, *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* has been developed. Through the help of this modality, attention will be focused to prove the hypothesis of the present research in the third chapter – the

nation in postcolonial scenario is something like narratives which are produced in multicultural societies out of unlimited interaction and exchange between cultural interests. The arguments will be put forward through the means of textual application to show the model of an ideal nation that has not its own concrete form.

III. Respect for Micro-Narratives: Rushdie's Dream of Multicultural Nation

Nation was not something that came suddenly into existence. As Charles Van Doren says "none has been able to define the world 'nation' exactly, but it had and still has something to do with a commonality of things like language and traditions, and an ability to defend itself against all enemies" (156). The concept of nation has been changed throughout the history of human civilization as the result of intellectual and political development. Westerners defined nation in the name of their culture, as the essence of intention of the ruling class people. Mostly nation is defined in terms of superior race or class. Anyway, nation is a collection of individuals united to fulfill common interest. But all forms of nation – empire, nation, state, kingdom communes have collapsed in course of time when they are unable to address the voices and interests of its people. As Abraham Lincoln says, "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time. But you cannot fool all of the people all of the time" (qtd. in Doren 304), no ruler, king or any tyrant has been able to reign the people for long time ignoring them. Inclusive and democratic stage is the demand of people. And the similar state, where all the people get freedom and opportunity is imagined by Rushdie as 'Chupland' on his novel.

Rushdie views that a nation is not something constant in its form but it goes on changing in course of history. The instability of the nation is the inevitable consequence of its nature as a social construction. Chattergy views "Nations are imaginary constructs that depend for their existence on an apparatus of cultural fictions in which imaginative literature plays a decisive role" (78). By using national allegories national narratives were and are written to provide legitimacy to the idea of nations as an essence. Many of the novels often attempt to assemble the fragments of national life and give them final shape. They become documents designed to prove

national consciousness with extremely large number of components that display an active communal life.

Fundamentalist nations define nationality in terms of their national narratives. In such narratives, stories of national origin, myths of founding fathers are reposed necessarily. In contrast to this tendency, writers like Salman Rushdie cross the boundary of the nationality and expose their transnational attitude prescribing a postcolonial nation that allows multicultural narratives equally. According to Rushdie nation is narration and it gets changed its form with the changing in narrations. He brings the reference of two ideal nations, Gupland and Chupland to support this idea. Between them, Gupland can accommodate all kinds of people where there is freedom to speech and everyone is free to tell stories. But Chupland is essentialist in nature which restricts people to speech and people to tell stories of all sorts that praises the unified, holistic vision. There is a ruler Khattam-Shud, the prince of silence and the foe of speech. He secretly sets out to pollute the sea of stories.

Rashid's wife works as the source of storytelling power for him. But when Khattam-Shud takes his wife away Rashid loses his storytelling power. Rashid, after his wife's elopement, loses his power of storytelling. "No story comes out: only a horrid barking sound" (Cover page). Hero of the novel, Haroun, doesn't entertain his father's condition therefore determines to rescue his father and return his special gift of storytelling power. At this point, Haroun's whole campaign of resuming his father's storytelling power can be categorized as the struggle for freedom to speech. The characters who help Haroun on his way are the supporters of free speech and free narratives. They are Guppees who have their 'self' as well as their activities in balance. They do everything with great care. On the contrary, there is another campaign to block the people's right to speech and right to free narratives. This

campaign is being headed by Khattam-Shud, the Chupland ruler. He is afraid of stories. He believes, 'the world is for controlling" (161). The story world is very much hostile to him. It can not be ruled upon absolutely according to his wish. There is always possibility of construction of new meanings and new ideas. The construction of new ideas disturbs in the constructed mind of the autocratic ruler like Khattam-Shud.

Power intoxicated Khattam-Shud hates stories very much. In his argument, story worlds are funny. It becomes his subject of tension. The world is not for fun rather it is for controlling for him. There two opposite campaigns do their best to serve the respective interests of related people. On the way of their own, war between these two groups has been penetrated. The war can be observed as the war between wisdom and weapon. The writer remarks from Guppees side that "now there is not a second to lose ! Assemble the armed forces-all the pages, every chapter, and every volume ! To war, to war ! (105). The weapons of Guppes are not swords, guns, etc. but the ideas every written text has, which become the cause of the great threat among the nations like Chupland that believes in totalities. In the text, Chupland is always afraid of 'stories' of books or of ideas. To suppress peoples' free narratives, free ideas, Chupland ruler, Khattam-Shud orders his armed force full of ultra modern weapons to clash with Guppees. The narrator of the novel indicates this by providing an image of Chupland army personnel who plays with a sword:

> There was a small clearing up ahead, and in this leafless glade was a man who looked almost like a shadow, and who held a sword whose blade was dark as night. The man was alone, but turned and leapt and kicked and slashed his sword constantly, as though battling an invisible

> opponent. Then, as they drew nearer, Haroun saw that the man was fighting against his own shadow. (123)

The man described here is ordered to fight with his own shadow because the people of fundamentalist nation always remain in the condition of restriction. They have to do different form what they actually wish people's rights are curtailed in Chupland but they cannot resist publicly. Every human being likes to enjoy his/her freedom to do anything with complete dignity. Therefore kicking of sword is symbolically an individual's resistance against Khattam-Shud, against authoritarian rules of the world.

Rushdie writes by describing Guppees that they have "magical golden liquid" i.e. called "wish water" (170). The person with wish water can be benefited every time with its magical power. Guppes' wish as well as work is always in balance, contrary to Chupwalas. Their balance state helps them defeat Chupwalas. By conveying this comparative message of these two lands, Rushdie writes:

> Gup is bright and Chup is dark, Gup is warm and Chup is freezing cold. Gup is all chattening and noise, whereas Chup is silent as a shadow. Guppees love the Ocean, Chupwalas try to poison it. Guppees love stories and speech; Chupwalas, it seems, hate these things just as strongly. It was a war between love (of the Ocean, or the Princess) and Death (which was what Cultmaster Khattam-Shud had in mind for the ocean, and for the Princess, too. (125)

Through these above lines, it is clear that there are some Guppees among Chupwalas too. Many Chupland dwellers forcefully are compelled to hate the stories so that the writer explains the Chupwalas activities as surfacial. It is cleared by the phrase "it seems."

The whole story of the novel is developed around a thirteen year old child Haroun. He is in journey to find out the secret of poisoning the 'ocean of notion' especially of his father. For this purpose, he reaches into the deep with his companion, Iff the water Genie riding on the bird, Butt the Hoopoe. In that deep region, there is a large dark ship with various tenderils and Khattam-Shud with his Chupland armies. The armies attack Hoopoes head. The Guppees are plunged into the frightened gothic situation. This situation doesn't disturb Haroun and his group rather they go head wish more vigor being careful of every situation. Their presence in dark land is "replaced by the dim twilight" (159). In that dim twilight, they see a "darkship" i.e. driven by Chupwala drivers" assembling the largest and most efficient plug ever constructed" (162). The plug is constructed to switch off the "source of stories". Khattam-Shud vows before Guppees, "when it is plugged ! Ah, then the ocean will lose its power to resist my anti-stories" (162). Therefore, Guppees have to break the darkship for the restoration of stories. The Guppees slowly go on slowly the darkship so that they can resume the ocean i.e. poisoned by Khattam-Shud. In the twilight, floating Gardener, Mali" leapt into air, disassembling his body as he did so, and flung roots and tendrils all over the generator, setting into every nook and cranny of the machine" (164). Every action of the ship is stopped abruptly when the entire power supply is cut off at once. Chupwala guards attack Mali in large numbers with axes and swords but instead of Mali, the ship its is ruined beyond the hope of repair. After this victory, Mali converses with Khattam-Shud and reveals, one could do everything out of his power, but he/she 'cannot chop' a person. Every person has his distinct self though the westerners used to take their culture as absolute. This western holistic tradition of culture is ruined when the case goes with every single individual. However, the system takes people into grant, to gain absolute power. The westerners define their

nation and nationalities by keeping all subaltern voices a side. The ruin of large 'darkship' is symbolically a challenge to that entire tradition if we take Khattam-Shud and his Chupland as the representation of western essentialist tradition.

Haroun and his fellow beings enter into the depth of Chuplanad after the destruction of the ship. Haroun skillfully attacks Chupland and reveals that everything and everyone, is "a shadow made solid" (166). His effort is for making everything, liquid. He made that and goes rather deeper into the ocean and finds less filthy the stories are in the very depth of ocean. Chupwala driver is there to switch off the big plug. Haroun catches the sight of the source of stories. The source of stories is a hole "through that hole [. . .] the glowing flow of pure, unpolluted stories came bubbling up form the very heart of Kahani" (167). The stories that we find around our surrounding are no more true. When they pass through person to person, they change their shape themselves.

The existing stories about nation and nationalities are only myths and in course of time they are reconstructed if there will be no restrictions upon them. A fundamentalist ruler keeps them going on, the way he wishes. He believes in 'grand narratives' which have been assumed true to maintain order in the modern societies. The wish to turn "Moon Kahani" of Haroun has been fulfilled with the shedding of light throughout Chupland" the sun rose, at high speed, and zoomed up into the sky" (152). The more the sun beams its light, the better the "moon" gives its light. In the time defeated Khattam-Shud orders his supporters to possess a power beyond imagination. He is still hungry of power. For the first time people of Gup city can remember and speak with open-mouthed while talking with Haroun and Hoopoe, Haroun asks to "move the whole Moon by will power" and Hoopoe accepts it by replying "no problem" (172).

The nation like Chupland and the ruler like Khattam-Shud remain no longer in power. As Michael Foucault says, power is in cycle so is the case in Chupland and Khattam-Shud. The previous regime of Khattam-Shud has been destroyed, constructing united Chupland with multicultural system. The throwing of Chupland ruler Khattam-Shud in the novel is followed by describing the idea: why Chupwalas have had to bear defeat in the war. Rushdie gives reason and says that they "have mechanical brains" (174) which can be repaired and replaced by "service station" in Gup city. The service station is nothing but free speech and free narratives that are guaranteed for every people in performative nations like Gupland. In the nations like Gupland, every idea can freely play in its territory. In spite of this idea, use of Hoopoe, a bird with mechanical brain indicates that science is the product of human idea. Ultramodern equipments should always be used to regain people's freedom not to control them. Any effort to control people's right to express ideas finally turns into defeat. Science is necessary but has to be under human control. We see the proper balance of science and spirituality in Gupland so that it has got victory over Chupland.

Rushdie tells what really had happened in the old zone while Haroun was away to fight with Khattam-Shud at the concluding part of the novel. He writes, there is Princess, Batcheat Chattergy being held in "the topmost room of the topmost power of the citadel of Chup" (179). To free her from that prison, Guppees came in Chupcity and war took place. Blabber mouth, one of Guppee ladies resisted against prince Bolo. Later on they came in agreement and fight collectively against Chup. They defeated Chupcity and called themselves, they are "liberator of Chup" (185). They saved Batcheat and previous Chupland and Gupland were merged each other into one regime and named Chupland itself. The new government was formed under the

chairmanship of Mudra. He announced its desire for long and lasting peace in which "night and day speech and silence, would no longer be separated into zones by Twlight strips and walls of force" (191). Blabbermouth Princess Batcheat invited to stay with Mudra so that she could act as go-between for the Gup and Chup. Haroun reunited with his father and Blabbermouth, and then everyone set off for Gupcity to enjoy marriage ceremony between prince Bolo and princess Batcheat.

Freedom of Speech: Basis of Pluralistic Nationhood

Free speech is that in which nobody is restricted by anyone while expressing anything. It does not mean that whatever a person wants to say, he/she can say. By keeping himself/herself within the socio-linguistic boundary, he/she can express anything. If anyone restricts him/her, will meet disaster later because the persons whose right of speech is suppressed, they are united and fight against to those who restrict them. The same case is found in Rushdie's present text. The freedom of free speech is shown in the present text in this way. The exploration of the value of fiction in *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* is initiated with the question which poses Mr. Sengupta to Haroun's mother, Soraya : "What's the use of stories that aren't even true?" (20). It is a kind of objection to story telling to Haroun's father, Rashid Khalifa which recalls the platonic stance about story and poetry.

Plato maintains in Republic that story and poetry have no claim to truth and therefore, no value. Since story has no claim to truth, the artist is acting upon irrational impulse and thus cannot proceed rational means, philosophic understanding of reality. These arguments are reflected throughout the story, but especially in Mr. Sengupta's condemnation of Rashid Khalifa a professional storyteller. The same fact is revealed in the note that Harounns mother, Soraya, leaves her husband Rashid: "You are only interested in pleasure, but a proper man would know that life is serious

business. Your brain is full of make believe, so there is no room for facts" (22). The novel, in the course of the narrative offers several responses to these arguments. Writer Rushdie reformulates the response to these arguments. Rashid Khalifa's intention is not to relay facts or to tell truth, so one can hardly accuse him as the person with an intention to mislead. When someone never bothers to tell the true, he neither communicates true nor false. Therefore, the stories Rashid tells are also neither true nor false. "Nobody ever believed anything, [. . .] but everyone had complete faith in Rashid because he always admitted that everything he told them was completely untrue and made up out of his own head" (20). A more important defense of storytelling offered in the novel arises from Rushdie's implication that the ambiguities of storytelling can do more justice to offer facts. His preference to fiction make him believable because he is not attempting to reduce for his personal sake as it is done by a rationalist.

Storytelling tells us a kind of truth that we cannot set in another way. Rushdie's Arabian Night's kinds of stories are carrying a kind of truth, a much richer truth than we can get by collecting the day to day facts. We have many possible realities but the later types of facts that are carried by the stories are the facts of their own realities. In this sense, storytelling is antithesis to information for Rushdie. Information comes with limitation while storytelling is characterized by expansibility and ambiguities while a story goes round, it comes ahead with a new explanation or with new form, this means that storytelling, when disseminated, becomes the antithesis of totalitarian thinking. Because it resists the essentialist drive to control society by limiting definitions and controlling interpretations. It is very clear in the present novel that Rashid Khalifa tells many stories to the people. Khattam-Shud is representative of totalizing tradition. For him, storytelling is one of the greatest threat

of his power. Power of storytelling undermines the lust for ruling people as long as possible. Story's nature of ambiguity and expansibility challenge the rational definition of nation and its ruler. For example, we cantake Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses* which halted Khomeini's rule in Iran and Rushdie was ordered to sentence to death. Khattam-Shud is obsessed with the desire to establish a univocal interpretation of culture by policing, who may and who may not speak. It is his excretion others. In the present novel when Haroun asks why he hates stories so much, Khattam-Shud replies:

> The world, however, is not for fun [. . .]. The word is for controlling. "Which world?" Haroun himself ask. Your world, my world, all words, came the reply. They all are there to be Ruled. And inside [. . .] that I cannot rule at all. (161)

The novel tries to reveal how the wild pursuit of totalitarian rule results in a society with full of jealousy, suspicion, and mutual mistrust. And contrary to the logic of authoritarian rule, it shows how freedom of speech and freedom of thought will ultimately create a stronger community.

Free narration is a form of free speech which is good for society. It is only through the free exchange of ideas and words that members of a community can achieve their full potential. This "Free" society is represented in *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* by Gupees who defend the Story Sea. Story Sea reflects the diversity of their own community, a multicultural utopia where mechanical Hoopoes consort with many mouthed fishes. In this society "power of speech" is regarded as the greatest power of all and is exercised to the full (119). 'All is free to speech equally" is likely the political principle that leads Haroun and Rashid to be ready for, disorder and

Chaos. Out of war or chaos, they are able to resume "power of speech" overrunning Chupwalas.

> The pages of Gup, now that they had talked through everything so fully, fought hard, remained united, supported each other when required to do so, and in general looked like a force with a common purpose. All those arguments and debates, all that openness, had created powerful bonds of fellowship between them. The Chupwalas, on the other hand, turned out to be a disunited rabble [. . .] their vows of silence and their habits of secrecy had made them suspicious and distrustful of one another. (185)

In the above passage, Gup is free land for people. Guppees are untied and fight collectively. But in the Chup people, Chupwalas seemed united but are disunited, suspicious with each other. A free society in which there are no limits to be said. Rushdie is suggesting what will always be proved stronger then a society i.e. superficially bound by imposed government policy and enforced ideology.

Long explanation of significance of absolute free speech, however, does raise some problems that Rushide has faced to confront in the novel. Freedom of expression leads toward a more tolerant society in which different ideas can co-exist side by side in theory but in practice it is usually the case that, even in societies in which there is no direct censorship, indirect censorship is based on various social and economic factors. The ideas of the wealthy and powerful will have greater access in every step of the society. By arguing the principle, free speech is sufficient to guarantee a free society, Rushdie is ignoring the impact of social and economic inequality that disturbs an individual to speak freely. In the democratic societies as well people are still disabled to speak what they wish who are underprivileged and

indigenous group for these reasons the novel can criticized for Rushdie's one sided explanation of simplification of political issues.

Rushdie doesn't create a work of art with very forced arguments, therefore it is said to read his art is not as a serious piece of political thought. He himself clarified that he has written the texts by "sometime jolting things down, sometime sifting things through on the paper" (Salon *Interview 2*). There is no seriousness and no conceptuality in any works of art created by him. They are the product of chance. The same is also true of the present novel. The ideas are not arranged in too tidy order, and there is not clear end with certain morale. But in many respects, the present novel can be observed as a novel in favour of freedom of speech and the free exchange of ideas. The battle waged by the Guppees against Khattam-Shud is, not just a battle for freedom to say what you want, when you want, it is also a battle between competing ideas of nationhood.

To assess the ideological position in the novel more fully, we should not limit our discussion of the significance of storytelling to its implications for free speech. We should also consider the use of storytelling in relation to issues of national and cultural identity. In order to this, I like to begin the section by exploring the cultural significance of storytelling tradition and narrative queries that Rushdie is drawing upon. The discussion will then be proceeded to show how his subjective use of narrative tradition reflects and reinforces an argument i.e. being made about national identity.

Free Narrative: A Postcolonial Emphasis

Haroun and the Sea of Stories can be described as a short literary fantasy which combines traditional elements of fairy tale with the author's own creative imaginings. It is a story that features a young boy, Haroun, traveling to distant land in

search of happy ending which he is able to achieve later. From this short observation, we have not got Rushdie's uniqueness of story writing. Almost all of the European stories too end either in happy or in tragic situation. In this sense, the style and the structure of the novel is not so different from that entire European essential tradition of story writing. However, the significant thing with this novel is that it has traditional references merged into one unlike other European novels. European novels bring sense out of holistic western tradition. The myths, legend and archetypes used in western stories are taken only from English culture. The present novel adopts Hindi, Arabian, English and Persian tradition one at a time. Therefore Rushdie's *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* itself is a resistance to the traditional exclusive nature of European narrative forms. The content and structure of the novel are not inclusively from a single culture. The phrase, "Ocean of streams of story" itself which frequently used in the novel is originated from Hindustani phrase", Katha-Sarit Sagar" and the name 'Haroun' is from Arabian Night. A disaspora writer, always creates a hybrid contents. They have equal value and are necessary to create rich meaning in the text written. There were not positive representations of orientalist elements in European stories. European story writers isolated these elements categorizing them as foreign and exotic, it is said in *Orientalism* by Edward Said. Rushdie aims to rupture that tradition by transforming new genre with the equal footing of western as well as eastern narrative tradition showing how the two are interdependent and intertwined.

Rushdie's attempt to demonstrate the consistency of tales from different culture is apparent in the episode in which Haroun takes" the golden cup" (72) drinks from the Story Sea. Haourn is miserable having failed to resume his father's storytelling ability, so Iff the Water Genei extracts a story from the water. Haroun drinks the story water and finds himself transported to virtual landscapes in which the

story is being played. First he has to kill several monsters which he does easily; then he finds himself at a white stone tower:

> At the top of tower was (what else but) a single window, out of which there gazed (who else but) a captive princess. What Haroun was experiencing, though he didn't know it, was Princess Rescue Story Number 5/1001/ZHT/420/41 (r) xi; and because the princess in this particular story had recently had a haircut and therefore had no long tresses to let down (unlike the heroine of Princess Rescue Story G/1001/RIM/777/M (w) i, better known as 'Rapunzel') Haroun as the hero was required to climb up the outside of the tower by clinging to the cracks between the stories with his bare hands and feet. (73)

The above lines clearly show that Rushdie is playful. The passage creates a comic effect by drawing attention to the conventions of fairy tale and then confounding those conventions by introducing the extravagant device of a princess with a haricut. The same title, Princess Rescue Story has different notations to make us alert about the changing form of narratives. Changing takes place when it goes person to person. Another significant thing, we have in the above paragraph is that Rushdie makes different story out of the story of Rapunzel i.e. most popular among English people. It is itself his disagreement with European exclusive tradition since the story of Rapunzel is not taken inclusively. Every story has it '1001' versions when it is merged with different cultural variants. In this sense, the tales of different cultures are not separated from one another by rigid cultural divisions and "walls of force" but can share a number of significant features.

Stories may seem to be stable if they are fixed artificially by cannon of official narratives or by the direct censorship . Genealogy of story reveals that the boundaries

we have around the stories of different people and nations are permeable. Haroun observes in the novel that the story water are" made up of a thousand and one different currents, each one a different colour, waving in and out of one another like a liquid tapestry of breath taking complexity" (72). Our serious assessment of any narrative too, can meet this condition. The content of stories does not get beyond process of cultural interactions so that the stories are valuable, meaningful and intellectual. They even establish the elegant life situation among multicultural people. It is in this respect that Story Sea as an image of Rushdie's hybrid sources comes to reflect the argument against the idea that the single culture establishes strict and impermeable boundaries between different cultures. The category of superiority for single culture, gives the false impression of purity, and it deprives people to have the idea that their respective cultural narratives too are able to provide as much of a basis for dialogue and communication against segregation.

In the present text, fundamentalist ruler, Khattam-Shud makes announcement to censor on others' narratives. The censorship is resulted separating the "Moon of Kahani" into two halves, Chupland and Gupland. His efforts to establish 'Grand Culture' cannot be entertained by a group of people including Haroun, so that instead of strict culture, opposite culture is created in equal force. No matter, Haroun himself encounters many troubles in clash, he does not entertain imposition. Then, these two different cultural halves exist side by side with their distinct identity. Between them one serves grand narratives and restricts people's right to free narratives and another serves mini narratives and let people free to float in every stream of stories. The comparison between these two nations can be read in the following lines:

> Gup is bright and Chup is dark. Gup is warm and Chup is freezing cold. Gup is all chattering and noise, whereas Chup is silent as a

> shadow. Guppees love the Ocean, Chupwalas try to poison it. Guppees love stories, and speech; Chupwalas, it seems hate these things just as strongly. (125)

We see that there is a light side populated by the talkative, noisy Gupees, 'gossip' in Hindustani it can also mean 'nonsense or fib' (218) on which the sun shines and a dark side populated by the silent Chupwalas 'quit fellows' in Hindustani (217). The division is maintained by 'Chattergy's wall' (103) made by the Gupees to keep the Chupwalas out. The wall is not a concrete to physically block but it is responsible to create tensions in Chupwalas' mind.

Totality, stability and order are maintained in essentialist societies through the means of 'grand-narrative' bond of stories of a culture. These stories tell about its practices and beliefs. While the stories of that single culture are categorized as the means to maintain order, others are labeled as inferior as Leotard argues. Therefore in 'totalized' societies opposites are created and suppressed continually. In the present text, Khattam-Shud's reign suppresses Guppees to tell the stories. 'Her cherry lips must be sewed from the cult master's needle" (136) because princess Batcheat is held in prison in the top most room of "topmost tower of Citadel of Chup" (179). For Chupwalas, Gupees are enemies of their reign so that they are other. They are treated like things as it is done upon imprisoned princess, Batcheat. This suppression refers to the Khattam-Shud's indifference to Guppees and their personal dignity. This labeling produces the vigor in opposites to involve in war against the tyranny of Khattam-Shud. At last Guppees seem to have justice on their side. The justice depends on their ability to rupture that binary opposition created by Chup. Rushdie does justice on non-European cultures by conveying ideas against European totalized system which advocates its grand narratives as superior. He also ruptures the hierarchy of European

and non-European of European construction and comes with multicultural elements in this novel.

Thus, Rusdie has created in *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* a complex allegory that emphasizes the importance of exchange between different cultural groupings. He has shown how Guppees and Chupwalas are able to create a better society when the separation between them not to be enforced. At the symbolic level, he has given us an image of the Story Sea that seems healthy when stories from different places are permitted to intertwin. Most importantly his own text is a Story Sea where diverse narrative traditions are allowed to intermingle.

Chupland: A Model of Multiculutral Nation

The demand for freedom of stories in the novel can be associated to the idea of nation since a nation is the sum total of different narratives with which the nation is related to. Fundamentalist nation always seeks to grand narratives officially therefore for the supporter of fundamentalism nation is a holistic entity. It could never be changed. Salman Rushdie, one of the diaspora writers goes beyond this holistic concept of nation and narratives and gives an idea of nation as instable entity that changes its form in course of time. By this idea, European modernist idea of grand narratives is criticized and Rushdie comes up with the Lyotardian postmodern idea of mini-narratives. He says that the sea of stories are set to follow with diverse narratives that are incorporated and assimilated from the multicultural sources and come up with new forms. In the novel, the same is true with reference to Plentimaw Fishes, who are hungry to sallow stories:

> The Plentimaw fishes were what he called 'hunger artists'. Because when they are hungry they sallow stories through every month, and in their innards miracles occur, a little bit of story joins on to an idea from

> another, and hey prepto, when they spew the stories out they are not old tales but new ones. (86)

The 'Plentimaw Fishes' are free to float in the ocean of stories and sallow. The stories held their fluid form, retained the ability to change so that they are new. However, the nation where people are restricted to free narratives would no more be able to develop and to express the newly invented stories. No one ever tries to make stories new.

Khattam-Shud, in the novel, is the representative of fundamentalist nation so he must suppress differences to maintain the illusion of its toality. Rushdie as a resistant merges Khattam-Shud's dynasty, Chupland into Gupland and form a single nation in which Khattam-Shud himself could entertain his rights in equal footing with Guppees. There is no restriction to free speech and free narratives. Everybody can interact each other freely. In this sense, Rushdie, out of this novel aims to imagine a form for the nation. His nation is understood not as a holistic entity defined by the exclusion of "others" but as a fluid provisional entity defined by its capacity to incorporate differences.

From this explanation, we can take the conflict between Chupwalas and Guppees as the conflict between fundamentalist and performative nationhood. Khattam-Shud represents fundamentalist campaign that serves an essenitalized entity independent of any opposite ideas and defined itself by excluding others. The Story Sea by contrast, represents the idea of a nation that defined and redefined each and every moment. It would not to be irritated to incorporate new stories into national narrative. It could accommodate every cultural narrative and beliefs on making new narratives merging different cultural stands into one. Allegorically Rushdie's Chupland and Gupland resemble with fundamentalist and perfomrative nationhood respectively. Making comparative study between these two lands Rushdie makes

statement that "Guppees love stories, and speeches, Chupwalas hate this thing just as strongly" (125). Khattam-Shud tries to control nation according to some pre-established notion. But enlightened Guppees can not tolerate his activities. To respect themselves, to respect the ideas of their rights and dignity, they have waged war against the tyranny of Khattam-Shud. They are the supporters of Story Sea. For them, there will never be the question of complete and incompleteness of nation. Chupwalas themselves can be accommodated in Guppees' nation i.e. multicultural nation. It has been observed at the final part of the present text, *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* that the defeated Chupwalas could entertain their rights in equal footing with Guppees. Thus, Guppees' concern is to recognize cultural differences as an aspect of community. The cultural difference is such dynamic figure of the nation which can easily threat Khattam-Shud or his political claim. From this point, Rushdie raises a question mark against the entire world system which claims its existence on fundamentalist principles. The falling of Khattam-Shud's regime, Chupland is something that symbolically refers to the falling of the present state of monolithic system of nation. In an uneven battle between Guppees and Chupwalas the Guppees have the advantage of possessing multiple voices. "All those arguments and debates, all that openness, has created powerful bonds of friendship between them" (185) while habits of the secrecy has made Chupwalas suspicious and distrustful.

Power is not something that can be activated, created anytime, anywhere by anybody. It is the outcome of certain process. Changing power results into a new form of nationality. Partha Chattergy points out how anticolonial nationalism of colonial India was able to convert itself into political nationalism. He says, anti-colonial "Nationalists divided their culture into material and spiritual domains, and staked an early claim to the spiritual sphere, represented by religion, caste, women and family"

(Cover Page) to have the political victory. The minority groups of people united each other and shape their ideology into national form with this spiritual dimension at the beginning. Later on this spirituality, leads them for the political contests. As Chattergy exemplifies, the Indian anti-colonialist elites began their anti-colonial campaign with the spirituality and finally converted it into "political nationalism" as Indian nationalism. The same is ture in *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* where Guppees can be kept in equal length with Indian elites. A long period of time has been taken to be united all the Guppees; Plentimaw Fishes, Butt the Hoopoe, Iff the water Genie, Rashid Khalifa, Haroun Khalifa, etc. Their common desire is to turn Moon Kahani" so that it's no longer half in light and half in darkness" (171). Guppees' collective efforts have made them able to have the political victory upon the land of Chup. A new government has been formed "under the chairmanship of Mudra" after the victory in Guppees side" (191). The new government activates its policies to accommodate different cultural interest, so that there will be no opposites. Rushdie says, "Guppees authorities act as go between" (191). Thus, the newly formed 'Chupland' is a typical multicultural nation, where the multiple voices contribute a lively state of heteroglossia.

In this type of nation, minority discourses can respectfully be incorporated in the national discourse. It does not intervene the narratives of all types. There will not be official narrative as an organic unity, so that there is no necessary to discover an antistory "to cancel each other out" (160). Khattam-Shud explains "For every story there is an anti-story [. . .] and if you pour this anti-story into the story, to cancel each other out" (160). Consequently, the story which serves his interest can only be continued. Such continuation is believed to maintain order in the society. This kind of definition of ordered society seems opposite of multicultural society. Multiculutral

societies get through chaos. Therefore the fundamentalist claim or order and disorder is very much subjective, one sided or bias. This 'subject centered rationality' of fundamentalist claim could no longer be functioned in Rushdie's nation. To play on this kind of rationality is what Rushdie accepts as an excess of "epistemic privilege over all other local, plural, and often incommensurable knowledge" (Chattergy, Preface). The national stories are completed in themselves, there is not necessarily to shape them with sugarcoated arguments. They are important things to construct a national form so that they are to be the never completed subjects for multicultural utopia.

Cultural difference causes various social contradictions and antagonisms. Chupwalas and Guppees differ in their culture therefore that has resulted in social contradiction and communal antagonism. These antagonisms and contradictions are negotiated into a national form without being prejudicial in a multicultural nation. The difference between opposite sites and representations of opposite social life are articulated without overcoming the meaning that is produced during the process of transcultural negotiations, Bhabha views. The negotiation between Guppees and Chupwalas transcends a national form into another new form having all people happy. Multicultural nation is always getting through happy ending Rushdie writes, "Happy ending must come at the end of something" (202). The end of something is what Rushdie refers to negotiation. Multicultural national form itself is determined through negotiation to negotiation. Therefore it exists in chain of timely negotiations. Infinite negotiations are made among cultural interests in course of time. The number '1001' which is repeatedly used in the novel, is also the notation for that reality. It is not just thousand and one. The number is an indication for thousand negotiations and then one

more negotiation, and then one more negotiation, and then one more negotiation, infinitely.

At this point, Rushdie's conception of society is seen as a complex and a sum total of competing discourses that are produced frequently in course of time. The ideas, which are drawn out of those competing discourse are negotiated. To understand nation as a transcendental or ideal one is the culture of European modernity. Modernity always creates 'we' and 'others'. But in this novel after the victory of Guppees' side "the red-rose and halo headed Gupees with block snow drops, kissed them, too; and called them liberators of Chup" (185). The one who praises the religion of European modernity confuses with it because one does not embrace its opposite after getting victory in the war, rather gives more troubles.

Here, Rushdie's concern is different. He tries to impart the idea against 'totalized' national cultures which create binary opposition and tries to create multicultural utopia where no binary remain. Guppee's kissing to Chupwalas is significant here to support his idea. Once Guppees include the Chupwalas into their nation, we have an echo of Partha Chattergy's idea of spiritual nation to political one. The previous model of spiritual Gupland has been converted into concrete form and attributed the name, "Land of Chup" (191). The conversion of Rushdie's nation into concrete form is initiated with the restoration of people's censored voice.

> Now the air was full of a great groaning noise. As Bolo, Batcheat, Mudra and the handmaidens fled down, down, through soggy courtyards and own squashy staircases, they looked back; and saw, high above them, at the every apex of the Citadel, the gigantic ice-statue, the colossal ice-idol of tongueless, grinning, many toothed

> Bezaban beginning to totter and shake; and then, drunkenly, it fell. (190)

In the above passage, "the colossal ice-idol of tongueless" is the collective form of silence that has been rampant among people due to strict censorship of the autocrat. The falling of the citadel is something resembles the falling of an autocratic regime.

During the time of the spiritual domain of multicultural nationality used to function, there was not freedom to seemingly speak, and meet each other among Guppees. The "Gesture language, Abhinaya" (191) helped them to recognize and to express their sentiments. Later on it helped them to wage war against Chupland collectively. After the transformation, Mudra was selected as the head of new land. The new land was the land of all parties; in the novel, king Chattergy, one of the Guppees says to the crowd that "it is to the victory over its enemy, but also a victory for the new friendship and openness between Chup and Gup, over our old Hostility and Suspicion" (193). The liberalness of Guppees impressed Chupwalas. They regreated for their past. The enlightened Chupwala, Walrus said "you must forgive us" among the crowed of Guppees (199). He is very happy after experiencing the system of multicultural nation. The essence of the nation proper is to confirm the civil interests into higher law that must reflect innate human dignity. The ruling machinery of multicultural nation is narratives. Those narratives can freely go with new forms merging with each other. The wild imposition of grand narratives could not to be entertained into a multicultural nation. The ruler in authoritarian system serves that imposition officially in direct or indirect way. But he/she can address people with sugarcoated speech to hide his/her crime. Rushdie, being attentive of such vested courtesy, implicates that it is something like "grand hotels sometime leave night time mint chocolates for their guest" (202). In the contrary, democratic rulers leave people

free to interact and rule according to their consent. The different interactions continue with negotiation to negotiation. Once the things negotiated the previous one comes up in new form. The process goes infinitely. The conclusion i.e. drawn out of the people's interaction ultimately is people's dignity and their collective spirit, a nation of their own.

In conclusion, *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* provides us a model of a nation that permits free speech and free narrative. The nation is therefore the essence of the interaction that takes place among its people. It does not exist in metaphycial truth but exists as an entity i.e. passing through different negotiations among different cultural interests. Every negotiation imparts happiness among individuals. Multicultural nation is something like the chain of negotiations.

IV. Advocacy of Multicultural Nation

Salman Rushdie's *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* presents a model of an ideal nation. Multiculturalism lies at the heart of his ideal nation where individuals get equal right, respect and opportunity irrespective of their culture, race, religion and social status. Everybody gets equal footing in every step of national discourse with the freedom of choice and decision. Contrary to multicultural nation, the nation where monolithic culture is rampant, other minority groups are marginalized and their ideas and voices are unheard. Multiculturalism is a situation of in unity. In this sense, multicultural nation is a democratic nation. But in authoritarian nation, there is one major culture, which dominates other minority cultures. The dissatisfaction resulted in the people will lead it towards disintegration. Lack of unity causes lack of peace and harmony in the nation. Therefore, Rushdie prefers a multicultural nation, which allows limitless interactions among the people having different cultural beliefs.

In the colonial world, diaspora status causes individuals to lose their real identity as they have to confront with the colonizer's ethos and become helpless strangers, rootless people. To heal such trauma of rootlessness Rushdie proposes the idea of multicultural nation through his writing. The nation where colonizers impose their authority cannot serve people's interest. Either in manifest or in latent way people's interests are abstracted to maintain the illusion of colonizers' culture. Rushdie has much exposure to the colonizers' literatures which have been written exclusively in such environment. Based on these experiences, he says that neither the previous nor the present nation belongs to him. Actually his ideal nation is multicultural nation which is inclusively democratic that respects individuals' dignity. In such a nation everybody has freedom of speech and freedom of telling stories in any way they like to tell by keeping themselves within a socio-linguistic boundary.

To assess his position, Rushdie brings the reference of two types of nations. The first type is a Fundamentalist Nation, which does not allow people's freedom of speech and narration because it wants to maintain its illusion of grand culture by which people are not able to work out freedom as responsibility. It is defined as a stable entity. It serves a totalized idea and recognizes some selected narratives officially. On the contrary, the next type is a Performative Nation, which does not prescribe any narratives officially. It is taken as an unstable entity, which is constructed and reconstructed in course of time. It is the outcome of different cultural interactions. Out of these interactions, negotiations are made. This process of negotiation goes on infinitely. So it is the chain of different negotiations. In it there is no restriction imposed to suppress people's free expression. Rrather it respects individual's dignity by providing ample space in every national discourse.

Rushdie shows a resistance to the European mode of perception about nation by merging European tradition in Indian storytelling that derives from Persian, Arabic, Indian and English literary sources. It makes his nation multicultural and at the same time it helps to justify his multicultural national stance. His nation should not be understood as a unified and holistic entity defined by exclusion but as a fluid, provisional entity defined by its capacity to incorporate differences and variations.

In the present text, Rushdie makes comparative study between Chupland and Gupland. Chupland is fundamentalist in nature. It tries to suppress different cultural interests as well as different ideas, which do not match with their principles of holistic nature. The fundamentalist ruler Khattam-Shud is always terrified with stories. Therefore he produces anti-stories to overpower these different stories. He believes that the only world which could not be ruled upon is 'world of story'. Gupland is perfomrative nation and it is seen as a collective spirit of Guppees. The Guppees who

are aware of Khattam-Shud's suppression cannot tolerate him therefore organize to fight collectively. Despite many barriers Guppees become able to get victory over Chupland and the previous fundamentalist Chupland is merged into Gupland and they name this new nation Chupland. In the newly formed Chupland, all parties are treated equally. It acts as go-between so that even previous Chupwalas are happy and regret for their past. Walrus himself begs for excuse after experiencing the practices of this multicultural nation. Rashid Khalifa begins to tell stories after resuming his power of storytelling. At this point, all people in newly constructed nation are happy. Thus, the novel itself gets happy ending.

Rushdie uses sea of stories as the symbol of a multicultural nation that he has imagined throughout the present novel. As water in the sea contains no traces of its sources, there should be equal treatment to all people from different communities despite having different cultural beliefs, religion, ethnicity, race, and color of skin. Sea is compared to the nation and the story to the people and their voices. As there is equal space for water from different sources in the formation of the sea, Rushdie wants to assert the access of all people in the formation of the nation and its future through policy-making. No ruler should and could marginalize the minority groups in the national issues through discriminatory state policies.

Thus, throughout the novel Rushdie does not concern himself on defining the variation of nation, their nature of ruling upon. He does not even try to portray the activities of their rulers. He creates a form of social and communal interaction. The demand for the freedom of interaction of stories in the story-sea is linked to the demand for the freedom of individuals, groups, to be a part of a nation with which they are related. He creates an imagine a model of a nation that does not lead to the marginalization or exclusion of the dissenting voices. Rather he seeks solace in that

imaginary Utopia. His model of nation is not for marginalizing fundamentalist voice for the coalition of plural voices.

Works Cited

Abrahams, M.H. *Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed. Singapore: Prism Book, 2004.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin eds. *The Postcolonial Studies Reader.* London: Routledge, 1998.

Barker, Chris. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage, 2000.

Barry, Brian. *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism* <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/multiculturalism>.

Bhabha, Homi K. ed. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. New York: OUP, 1997.

Brennan, Timothy. "Tribes Within Nations: The Ancient Germans and the History of Modern France." *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990. 44-70.

Chattergy, Partha. *The Nations and its Fragments*. New Jersey: Princeton, 1993.

Doren, Charles Van. *A History of Knowledge Past, Present and Future*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1992.

Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Delhi: OUP, 1999.

Glazer, Nathan. "Multiculturalism in Theory and Practice." *Encyclopedia Britannica.* Vol. 3. 15th ed. 1990. 253-61.

Henderson, Lesley et al. eds. *Contemporary Novelists*. 5th ed. Chicago: St. James Press, 1991. 790-91.

Jameson, Frederic. "On Cultural Studies." *Identity in Question*. Ed. John Rajchman. New York: Routledge, 1995. 251-59.

Lyotard, Jean-Francois. *The Postmodern Condition*. Trans. R. Durand. New York: Manchester, 1986.

Mukherjee, Meenakshi. "Haroun and the Sea of Stories: Fantasy or Fable?" *The Perishable Empire: Essays on Indian Writing in English*. New Delhi: Oxford, 2004. 149-63.

- - -. "Nation, Novel, Language." *The Perishable Empire: Essays on Indian Writing in English*.

Powell, Jim. *Postmodernism for Beginners*. Chennai: Orient Longman, 1998.

Rana, Randeep. *Profaning the Sacred : Criticism on Salman Rushdie*. New Delhi: SS, 2000.

Renan, Ernest. "What is a Nation?". *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990. 8-22.

Rushdie, Salman. *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*. New Delhi: Penguin, 1991.

- - -. *Imaginary Homelands*. London: Granta, 1991.

- - -. *Interview Salon Interview*. 20 June, 1992 <http://www.search.epnet.com>.

Said, Edward. "The World, The Text, and the Critic." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York: Harcourt, 1992. 1210-22.

- - -. *Orientalism*. London: Vintage, 1994.

- - -. *Culture and Imperialism*. London; Vintage, 1994.

Tushingham, David. *Interview*. Salman Rushdie in Conversation. 1st Oct., 1998.