

## Chapter I: Introduction

### *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* and Freedom of Expression

This research entitled “Advocacy for Free Speech in Salman Rushdie’s *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*” examines the elements of magic realism and the allegorical core of the novel to show their implication to advocate free speech. Rushdie’s Guppees, Haroun and Rashid allegorically represent moral and peace loving people who celebrate the imagination and power of language and advocate for freedom of expression. In the same manner, Rushdie too loves freedom of expression and imagination but a Fatwa was placed on him to limit his language and expression. Khattam-Shud, on the other hand, collectively represents rude and immoral rulers in general and those who imposed censorship upon Rushdie in particular. Rushdie identifies himself with Haroun, Rashid and Guppees’s side, who show honour, courage and dignity in risking their life for the liberation of Kahani, the source of story. Their love for freedom and cooperation are enduring and noteworthy. These qualities are sadly lacking in human beings of our time. By allegorizing the narrative Rushdie is turning spotlight on the evil qualities of rulers and is strongly resisting censorship.

The allegorical core of the narrative points to the fundamental tension between those who celebrate the imagination and those who feel threatened by its power is certainly significant in the *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*. This research draws on the theory of allegory and magic realism aiming at dramatizing the conflict between dictators and liberals, speech lovers and speech controller etc. to show the inevitable defeat of the dictators, tyranny and censorships.

An allegory is a narrative, in which agents or actions or settings contribute to make coherent sense on the literal or primary level of signification and at the same time to communicate a second, correlated order of signification. Paul de Man defines allegory as “a sign that refers to one specific meaning and thus exhausts its suggestive potentialities once it has been deciphered” (188). For him allegory appears “as dryly rational and dogmatic in its references to a meaning that it does not itself constitute” (189).

Magic Realism is extensively used in the novel to raise voice for the freedom of expression. Magic Realism goes beyond realism that pretends to reveal the world as it is. Magical Realism however uses myth, oral tradition, fantasy, imagination and other supernatural elements along with everyday issues to depict the magic hidden behind the everyday reality. In this novel Rushdie uses magic realism to reveal the bitter reality of censorship on speech and expression. By so doing he is strongly resisting this constraint upon the free speech. As per Ross Murfin and Supriya M Ray magic realism “refers to works characterized by a mixture of credible and utterly fantastic elements. Realistic details, esoteric knowledge, fairy tales, myths, and dream are intertwined in a complex, even tangled plot that often involves abrupt chronological shifts” (252).

The idea of censorship is a sustained motif in the novel. This is largely a reflection on Rushdie’s own experience of censorship when the Ayatollah placed a fatwa upon him for his depiction of Islam in *The Satanic Verses*. Chupwala and its dictator Khattam-Shud represent this censorship. Khattam-Shud wishes not only to poison the Sea of Stories, but he also wishes to silence the stories completely. Chup, therefore, is not only a land of darkness, but also a land of complete silence and censorship. The Land of Gup, on the other hand, is a land of complete Freedom of

Speech, even to those that would criticize the land's leaders in what might be considered anarchy. On the surface, Rushdie would seem to favor the Guppees' freedom over the strict authoritarian censorship of the Chupwala's, though later passages in the novel blur these lines of distinction. The Censorship can be the best way to suppress others' voice. The worst insidious effect of censorship is that in the end. It can deaden the imagination of people. Freedom of expression is one of the major concerns of this novel. John Stuart Mill opines that the expression of ideas and feelings raise up the the mind of spectator. He says:

The objects in an imaginary landscape cannot be said, like the words of a poem or the notes of a feeling which they harmonize, and which they have a tendency to raise up in the spectator's mind. They must inspire a feeling of grandeur, a loveliness, a cheerfulness, a wildness, a melancholy, a terror. (556)

Rushdie's *Haroun and the Sea of the Stories*, being an allegory has at least two layers of meaning. It is an adventure story at the surface level but the adventure, events and characters have allegorical significance. Rushdie associates the struggle against dictatorship and censorship with the adventure story as a genuine motif in the novel. The Sea of Stories lies upon on the second moon of the Earth named 'Kahani' which has been divided mechanically into two distinct spheres: "the land of Gup is bathed in Endless sunshine, while over in Chup it's always the middle of the night" (80). The Guppees take care of The Sea of Stories with a socialized hand. On the contrary, Chupwalas under the leadership of Khattam-Shud wish to poison the Sea and even remove language, speech and expression completely. Chup reigns in an absolute darkness and silence whereas speech or Gup in light.

The war between speech and silence, however, is fought in different fronts: between democracy and dictatorship, between freedom of expression and censorship, between good and evil and between freedom and repression. “Gup is warm and Chup is freezing cold. Guppees love the ocean, Chupwalas try to poison it. Guppees love stories and speech: Chupwala, it seems, hate these things just strongly” (125). Chup is the sad city-inhabited by men like Khattam-Shud-“black smoke poured out of the chimneys of the sadness factories and hung over the city like bad news” (15). The Chupwalas are infecting the living ocean with anti-stories virus manufactured in artificial darkness and poison factories to torture the well spring and original source of the stories.

Rashid Khalifa, the storyteller, loses his wonderful ability to make up and tell stories when his wife Sorya leaves him for the snivel Mr Sengupta, a man who has always complained to Haroun and his mother about the uselessness of storytelling. Haroun, the only child of the Khalifas, blames himself for the breakup of his parents’ marriage and his father’s disability. Restoring storytelling power is analogous to regaining freedom of expression. Haroun manages to trap the water genie Iff, who has come to cancel Rashid’s story water supply and finally with the help of genie and his friends, restores his father’s storytelling powers and reunites his parents. Rushdie, the real-life storyteller is currently suffering from a similar kind of disability, imposed by real-life followers of Khattam-Shud, the archenemy of stories in the land of Kahani. The story of Haroun and Rashid Khalifa, written by Rushdie in his forced exile deals with the theme of writers’ freedom to make up stories and to make free speech. Rushdie’s current predicament is the latest replay of the age-old battle between the proponents of free speech and their enemies. The ultimate victory of free speech is unavoidable.

Beyond the fabulation and the political implication there is a personal story. Eva Koing, a professor at University of Zurich in her article, “Between Cultural Imperialism and Fatwa”, talks about the personal allegorization in *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*. Rushdie’s son Zafar and the relationship between Haroun and Rashid in the novel is quite comparable. Both fathers- Rushdie and Rashid- real and fictive – have suffered the loss of their voice. So far as the biography remains in the public domain; the situation can be allegorized. Both of the fathers suffer from a loss of the gift of the expression but they do not give up. They fight against the barbaric domination to regain the lost gift and freedom. Rushdie’s extensive use of the elements of magic realism is significant in the novel. He gives the details and dream narrative in order to fulfill the politics behind using magic realism in the novel: the politics is none other than to resist censorship and to advocate freedom of expression. Answering the question ‘what are the effects of total censorship?’ in his essay titled “Censorship”, Rushdie says “Obviously, the absence of information and the presence of lies” (39). Rushdie, here in this novel wants to reverse this situation to secure the presence of information and the absence of lies.

*Haroun and the Sea of Stories* explores instances or situation where people or characters are restricted to express their feelings and ideas. As it uses myths, scientific discourse, fabulation, magic realism turns out to be a pastiche. Pastiche is related to postmodern inter-textuality, pastiche means to combine or ‘paste’ together multiple elements. In postmodernist literature this can be homage to or a parody. Rushdie’s sole purpose in the novel is to protest any kind of constraints on the way of freedom of expression. The elements of dream are highly used in this novel. Most of the journey undertaken by Haroun and Rashid is in dream. This blending of incredible dream with daily realities is the characteristic of magic realism.

The Chupwalas apparently seem one dimensional but fight among themselves during the final battle and “many Chupwalas threw in their lot with the Guppees” (185). Many of them do not want to be the part of Khattam-Shud’s plans. During the development of the plot many of the Chupwalas revolted against Khattam- Shud. This is analogous to the revoltees who revolt against dictators in politics and brings the downfall of the dictators and freedom simultaneously.

Since theoretical support plays a major role in the accomplishment of a research, this study draws on the theory of allegory as theorized by Paul de Man and Walter Benjamin and Magic Realism theorized by Jorge Louise Borges. In this research the allegorical implication of the narrative act is analyzed to show Rushdie’s resistance against censorship and the defeat of dictators and the victory of free speech. Besides the extensive analysis of the primary source this research is based on the use of secondary materials, library consultation, websites and instructions from the university scholars.

### **Rushdie and the issue of freedom of expression**

Salman Rushdie has established himself as a dominant diasporic figure in English. In 1975 with the publication of his first novel *Grimus*, he formally stepped into literary life. His next novel *Midnight’s Children* (1981) received the Booker McConnell prize. The novel is an allegory about modern India, which accelerated his literary life and he won the international recognition. *Midnight’s Children* is an allegorical fable that examines historical and philosophical issues by means of surreal characters, brooding humor and an effusive and melodramatic prose style.

Many art critics opine Rushdie’s works contain variety of genres such as fantasy, mythology, religions, tradition, culture and costumes are inter-mingled and merged to form an individual text. His themes make a tie with narrative techniques to

produce meaning and sense. He frequently uses magic realism, a narrative style characterized by a mixture of realistic and fantastic elements. This technique makes him easy to combine the elements of fairy tales, mythology, dreams and imagination with the real everyday world and his experiences.

Rushdie's fourth novel *The Satanic Verses* (1988) encountered a very different reception. Some of the bizarre adventure in this book depicts a character shaped on the prophet Muhammad and portrays both him and his transcription of the Quran in a dubious light. After the publication of this book a fatwa was issued against Rushdie. Despite the standing death threat Rushdie published *Imaginary Homeland*, a collection of essays and criticisms in which he deals with post-colonial, diasporic etc sense. It is about how a writer makes own home when he left his birth place, and how migrants writers create their imaginative home when they search their identity. Rushdie stands 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 and west. Several themes are repeated in his writings. Theme of emigration and the migrant self, quest for identity, divided selves, double identity and conflict between good and evil are some of them. He is also renowned for his brilliantly vicious political satire. He satirizes those nations which are being ruled by the sense of superiority and evolved through popular feelings and prejudices excluding 'Others'. Most of the critics opine that his texts are extremely complex because they are filled with symbolism, elements of magic realism, myths and multiple layers of meanings. To some extent, his texts can be analyzed as the means of resistance. Many of his texts resist Hindu and Muslim dogmatism, colonial and imperial domination and official historical discourse.

Rushdie's novel *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* in particular is an adventure story and a story of Haroun's determination to return his father his special gift of storytelling and liberating Guppees' Kahani. In *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* which shares thematic and narrative affinity with *Grimus*, Rushdie again relies on the mythic mode as a fictive strategy to shape his ideological intentions. In this novel, Rushdie creates an allegorical framework within which he explores issues of individual freedom expression and political authority. Rushdie to some extent identifies himself with Haroun and his father Rashid who loves and celebrates imagination and power of language. Being a writer Rushdie too loves language and imagination. Haroun and the Rashid along with Guppees struggle against Chupwalas in general and Khatam Shut in particular who allegorical represent rude, immoral, unkind ruler and feels threatened by the power of language and imagination.

Since the publication of Rushdie's *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*, the novel has been responded in various ways. Taking about the narrative modes in the novel Meenakshi Mukherjee expresses her distinct view. For Mukherjee, *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* not only focuses on the fantasy and fable but at the same time deals with other various elements such as ecological, political, moral and aesthetic. In her article she wrote:

An attempt has been made here to examine the process or the possibility of this merger, not only of the two narrative modes- fantasy and fable- but of several other concerns- moral, aesthetic, political, ecological, and intertextual- that are allowed to converge in this slender tale meant for children. (165)

Janet Mason Ellerby in his article writes about Rushdie's autobiographical influence in the novel. He is of the view that the narrative has something to do with Rushdie's personal life. He writes:

Because of the danger and isolation of his life, one would think that Salman Rushdie would have followed *The Satanic Verses* with a novel that would prudently avoid the controversy over the censorship of fiction. However, it is the provocative question, "What's the use of stories that aren't even true?" (216)

Timothy Brennan discusses different aspect of the novel. He opines that Rushdie treats heroic nationalism in bitter and comical way in *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*. In his article he opines:

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 providing 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)

R.S. Krishnan in *International Fiction Review* talks about the colonial aspects in the novel He reveals the deconstructive aspect of the narrative act in *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*, which subverts the ideology of "other". He says:

In terms of text, in the context of its origins, Haroun is not only Rushdie's retelling of an oft- told tale, it is also an iteration of the ideology of the "other" which, in deconstructing itself through the

narrative act, privileges the self -of the writer and his culture- over what Edward Said describes as “a double kind of exclusivism.” (68)

Daniel Roberts in his “Rushdie and Romantics” talks about the politics of Kashmir in the novel *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* and views that:

If the politics of Kashmir is selectively relocated in Haroun, I have argued, it is worth considering its central action concerning the warfare between Guppees and Chupwalas as a hypothetical resolution, albeit an obliquely realized one, of the standoff between India and Pakistan, and the unhappy positioning which this has Kashmiries. (128)

Here, Roberts opines that the resolution of the conflict between Guppees and Chupwalas is the hypothetical resolution provided by Rushdie for the conflict between India and Pakistan in Kashmir. Likewise, Suchismita Sen talks about memory, language and society in Salman Rushdie’s *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*. In her *Reading Rushdie: Perspective on the Fiction of Salman Rushdie* she says that:

The story of Haroun and Rashid Khalifa, written by Rushdie in his forced exile, deals with the theme of writer’s freedom to make up stories. Rushdie’s current predicament is the latest replay of age- old battle between the proponents of freedom of speech and its enemies. (72)

In Sen’s view *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* is the outcome of Rushdie’s present predicament, his love for freedom of expression and his struggle against its opponents.

Thus it is evident from the review of the criticisms available on the novel none of the critics has yet thrown light upon *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* as a project advocating free speech. And Rushdie is advocating free speech with the literary

techniques such as allegory, magic realism, pastiche etc. So, it is the newer perspective to look at the implication of the novel behind these criticisms.

Khattam shud collectively represents the dictators who tend to control, suppress, silent and to censor the people's voice to complete their evil motifs. The idea of censorship is a major motif in Haroun and the sea of stories. To some extent, it is a reflection on Rushdie's own experiences of censorship and the placement of fatwa after the publication of *The Satanic Verses*. Chupawalas and its dictators Khattam-Shud represent the forces of censorship. He not only wants to poison the treasure of stories but also wants the absolute silence of the stories. In this ground, Chup is not only the land of darkness, it is also silence and under the shadow of censorship. On the other, Gup is the land of speech and expression.

The next chapter makes a discussion on the theory of allegory and magic realism to explore the allegorical, symbolic and political dimension of the novel. The theorization of allegory by Paul de Man and Walter Benjamin and Borges' theorization would be considered to dig out those aspects within the narrative. To support this claim that *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* is a project advocating free speech, an extensive textual analysis will follow this introductory chapter of the thesis. The thesis has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter deals with the basic information of the novel along with the aspect of Freedom of expression. The second chapter focuses on the theoretical methodology. In the same way, the third chapter deals with the extensive textual analysis of the novel. Moreover the final chapter is conclusion which ultimately concludes the main points of the thesis. This chapter can be called a very brief critical summary of the textual analysis concerning the allegorical dimension of the narrative.



## **Chapter II: Theoretical Methodology**

### **Allegory and Magic Realism**

This research deals with the allegorical dimension of Rushdie's *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*. The novel appears as an allegory at different levels but this research focuses on a particular allegorical aspect of the novel. Rushdie's noble characters in the novel such as Guppees, Rashid, Haroun etc. collectively represent the people who desire freedom of expression or of speech. On the other hand, the antagonist of the novel Khattam-Shud represents the dictators of the entire world who intend to control, poison and end people's right of freedom. Not only this Khattam-Shud in particular represents Ayotollah Khomeini who imposed Fatwa upon Rushdie to control his expression. Rushdie's experiences with the censorship appear in the novel under the guise of the Old Zone section of the Sea of stories and the division between the Guppees and the Chupwalas. Rushdie himself appears allegorically in many characters of the book namely Rashid, Batcheat, Bolo and Haroun. With the allegorical approach Rushdie proposes his own belief about his situation and those responsible for censorship. This novel stands not only as a personal testament for Rushdie's son but also a strong document universally opposing the oppression of writers. By allegorizing the narrative Rushdie is turning spotlight at the evil qualities of rulers who feel threatened by the power of imagination and language. And ultimately strongly advocate the freedom of speech. Khattam-Shud regarding word and language says "a world, a story-world, that I cannot Rule at all" (161).

Rushdie has used magic realism as a dominant literary technique in this novel. Realism pretends to reveal the world as it is. Magic realism however uses myth, oral tradition, fantasy, imagination and other supernatural elements along with everyday things to depict the magic hidden behind the everyday things. The magical realist as

Luis Leal says: “do not try to copy the surrounding reality but to seize the mystery that breathes behind things” (119). In this novel too Rushdie uses this technique to expose censorship and to protest it. So, magic realism crosses the border between two separate literary discourses. In this regard M. H. Abrams writes, “The writer’s interweave, in an ever shifting pattern, a sharply etched realism in representing ordinary events and descriptive details together with fantastic and dreamlike elements, as well as with materials derived from myth and tales” (196). In this novel, Rushdie has fused these magical elements with allegorical dimension. Stephen Sleman regarding the relationship of magic realism with other genres says:

In none of its applications of literature has the concept of magic realism ever successfully differentiated between itself and neighbouring genres such as fabulation, metafiction, the baroque, the fantastic, the uncanny, or the marvellous, and consequently it is not surprising that some critics have chosen to abandon the term altogether.(13)

Rushdie identifies himself with Guppees, who show honour, courage and dignity in risking their life for the liberation of Kahani, the source of stories. Through their courage they saved the ocean so that the source of stories can continue to produce rich collections of new. This novel is a document which strongly resists the censorship and demands freedom of expression by using the mixture of credible and incredible elements of magic realism. Here, Ross Murfin and Supryia M. Ray talk about the various elements used in magic realism. They define magic realism as:

The works characterized by a mixture of credible and utterly fantastic elements. Realistic details, esoteric knowledge, fairy tales, myths, and

dreams are intertwined in a complex, even tangled plot that often involves abrupt chronological shifts. (252)

The main significance lies in exposing the mechanisms of dictatorship that oppresses free speech in general and freedom of the imagination in particular. Magic realism advocates for multiplicity and multicultural tradition and opposes totalitarians. Regarding this aspect of magic realism Christopher Warnes says:

Magic realism has by turns been praised for founding ‘new multicultural artistic reality’ and denigrated as ‘dangerous and shallow’. It has even been accused of being underpinned by ‘pernicious-even racist-ideologies’.[. . .] Magic realism, at least in its conceptional state, is not wedded to any particular political orientation- and is far from always being the subversive, revisionary force many critics seem to assume it is. (54)

Warnes opines that magic realism is not directly associated with any kind of political ideology. The land of Gup takes care of the Sea of Stories, while the Chupwalas under the leadership of Khattam-Shud, wishes to poison the sea and even remove language completely. Rushdie proposes a purely polarized dispute between sides of complete good and complete evil and shows his displeasure and disagreement with the censorship he has faced. Rashid Khalifa, the storyteller in Rushdie’s novel *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* loses his ability to make up and tell stories when his wife Sorya elopes with Sengupta, a man who always complains about the usefulness of storytelling. Haroun the only child of the Khalifas blames himself for the breakup of his parents’ marriage and father’s disability. His constant efforts are plenty enough to restore his father’s ability of storytelling and to reunite his parents.

The book appeared one year after Ayatollah Khomeini's Fatwa and the allegorical relationship between a storyteller who has lost his power to create and a writer who has been sentenced either to silence or to death was strong enough to allegorize. Rushdie the real-life storyteller at the time of the composition of the novel *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* were suffering from a similar kind of disability imposed by real life followers of Khattam-Shud, the dictators in the land of Kahani. The technique of magic realism is very popular among them who want to oppose the repressive tradition. In this respect, Maggie Ann Bowers views, "Magic Realism has become a popular narrative mode because it offers to the writers to write against totalitarian regimes, a means to attack the definition and assumptions which support such system." (4) On the basis of this remark, we can call magic realism a subversive genre which attacks the traditional norms and values for the establishment of new one. Salman Rushdie as quoted in Maggie Ann Bowers' book views magic realism as 'commingling of the improbable and the mundane.'

The story of Haroun and Rashid is about their adventure to restore the wonderful capacity of storytelling and to rescue Gup, the land of freedom of expression and speech from the murderous hands of Chupwalas and Khattam-Shud. The novel is written by Rushdie in his forced exile intrinsically deals with the writer's freedom to make up stories. Rushdie's contemporary predicament is only the age old battle between the proponents of freedom of speech and its enemies. And Rushdie's position is very clear who through the story forecasts the triumph of light over darkness, of freedom over tyranny and dictatorship. He shows the triumph of plurality, dialogue, expression over monolithic, hegemonic and repressive view. Thus, the novel allegorizing the conflict between tyrannical and repressive dictators and

people loving free speech, and expression shows the inevitable victory of freedom, light and knowledge.

The word 'allegory' means fictional literary narrative or any other artistic expression that conveys a symbolic meaning parallel to the literary meaning. But in this research paper the word has been used as Paul de Man's interpretation. Paul de Man in his essay titled "The Rhetoric of Temporality" manifested his conception regarding allegory. Paul de Man defines allegory as:

a sign that refers to one specific meaning and thus exhausts its suggestive potentialities once it has been deciphered. [. . .] Allegory appears as dryly rational and dogmatic in its reference to a meaning that it does not itself constitute. Whereas the symbol is founded on an intimate unity between the image that rises up before the senses and the super sensory totality that the image suggest. (189)

Here, de Man talks about the suggestive potentiality which is inherent in the allegory. He differentiates allegory with symbol. For him allegory is dryly rational and dogmatic in relation to its meaning whereas the symbol forms its meaning on the basis of an intimate unity between the image that rises up and the image that suggests to.

Paul de Man talks about the question of intentionality of rhetorical figure raised by the recent developments in criticism. Which rival the possibility of a rhetoric that would more or less apparently raise the question of the intentionality of literary figure. He views "such concerns are implicitly present in many works in which the terms "mimesis", "metaphor", "allegory", or irony plays a prominent part. One of the main difficulties that still hamper these investigation stems from the association of rhetorical terms with value judgement that blur. Destinations and hide

the real structures” (188). Man, here opines that the investigation of rhetorical terms blurs the destinations and hide the real structures.

An allegory is a figurative mode of representation conveying meaning other than the literal. Allegory communicates its message by means of symbolic figures, actions or symbolic representations. Allegory is generally treated as a figure or rhetoric, but an allegory does not have to be expressed in language; it may be addressed to the eye, and is often found in realistic painting sculpture or some other form of mimetic art. M.H. Abrams’ A Glossary of Literary Terms defines allegory as:

An allegory is a narrative, whether in prose or verse, in which the agents and actions, and sometimes the setting as well, are contrived by the author to make coherent sense on the ‘literal’ or primary level of signification, and at the same time to communicate a second, correlated order of signification. We can distinguish to main types: 1) Historical and political allegory, in which the characters and the actions that are signified literally in their turn represent, or ‘allegorize’, historical personages and events and 2) The allegory of idea in which the literal character represents concepts and plots. (5-6)

An allegory is generally a narrative which has at least two levels of signification. The first one is the surface level which states who did what to whom and when. But to understand the secondary or allegorical meaning, a certain amount of decoding os necessary which helps the readers to recognize the existence of a second and deeper level of signification which may be religious, historical, political, moral or philosophical.

Paul de Man while dealing with the allegory, opines that the traditional conception about allegory takes it as the product of the enlightenment. He says: “In

the perspective of traditional German Classicism allegory appears as the product of the age of Enlightenment and is vulnerable to the reproach of excessive rationality” (189). German classical perspective assumes allegory to be the outcome of the Enlightenment which is vulnerable at criticizing the ‘excessive rationality’ of enlightenment age. There is an age long debate regarding the superiority between symbol and allegory. Paul de Man evokes this debate and writes: “The supremacy of the symbol, conceived as an expression of unity between the representative and semantic function of language become as a common place that underlies literary taste, literary criticism and literary history” (189). Not only de Man, many critics such as S.T. Coleridge, Hans George Gadamer, Johann George Hamann documented their ideas about the supremacy of allegory and symbol. Gadamer in his book *Truth and Method* critiques the legacy of symbol and writes: “The basis of aesthetics during the nineteenth century was the freedom of the symbolizing power of the mind. But is this a firm basis? Is the symbolizing activity not actually bound today by the survival of a mythological and allegorical tradition?” (72) Gadamer interrogates the relevance of symbolizing power of mind as the still and firm basis. He also raises the question about the type of the relationship between symbolizing activity and mythological and allegorical tradition.

Coleridge’s assertion claims the superiority of the symbol over allegory. In his words in the world of symbol life and firm are identical. He focuses on ambiguity while dealing with allegory. In which it is said that the allegory “conveys, while in disguise either moral qualities or conceptions of the mind that are not in themselves object of the senses. Allegory can combine the parts to form a consistent whole.” (9) Coleridge stresses on the quality of allegory which convey meaning in disguise form. It conveys something else which are not themselves in objects, words and senses.

Walter Benjamin theorizes allegory in his book titled *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*. Benjamin regarding the emergence of allegory writes: “Where man is drawn towards the symbol, allegory emerges from the depth of being to intercept the intention and to triumph over it.”(256) An author uses allegory to make coherent sense on the literal and literary level at once. For Benjamin allegory emerges where man is inclined towards the symbol. According to Morton W. Bloomfield allegory enriches the relevance of a document. The use of allegory for him mainly aims at making the document valid. He opines that: “One of the basic functions of allegory is to make literary document relevant. Allegory in this sense is the seeing of the significance of a literary work beyond its meaning” (306). The allegorization in Haroun and the Sea of Stories makes Rushdie’s disagreement valid that censorship is an unjust act and the defeat of such censorship, dictatorship, tyranny is unavoidable which ultimately paves way for the freedom of expression.

Allegory was taken and responded in various ways with the change of time. Paul de Man in his essay ‘The Rhetoric of Temporality’ talks about the changes that occurred in the use of allegory. He writes: “The secularized allegory of the early romantics thus necessarily contains the negative moment which in Rousseau is that of renunciations, in Wordsworth that of the loss of self in death or in error” (207).

Similarly, de Man also speaks about the debate regarding the supremacy of symbol and allegory and writes: “Whereas the symbol postulates the possibility of an identity or identification, allegory designates primarily a distance in relation to its own origin, and renouncing the nostalgia and the desire to coincide, it establishes its language in the void of this temporal difference” (216 ). Here he views that symbol posits the possibility of identity where as allegory designates primarily a distance in relation to its own origin.

Allegory has long been a prominent feature of literary, religious and mythic writings throughout the world. Allegory in Renaissance period has to do with conveying some moral and religious values and thought. Even after the vast change allegory is taken as a timeless genre in our time too. This can be used to replace monolithic tradition with a cross-cultural pluralism. The allegory is a genre which exists within the ideal time. Talking about the nature of allegory Paul de Man writes:

. . . allegory exists entirely within an ideal time that is never heard and now but always a passed or an endless future. Irony is a synchronic structure while allegory appears as a successive mode capable engendering duration as the illumination of continuity that it knows to be illusionary. (226)

For de Man, allegory deals either with past or with endless future. Unlike irony allegory appears as a successive mode which is capable of engendering duration of the illusion of continuity that it is aware of being illusionary.

Thus, this research uses Magic realism and Allegory as theoretical tools to excavate Rushdie's view against censorship and his advocacy of free speech. None of the critics has thrown light upon this novel from the perspective of magic realism and allegory so this will be a newer perspective.

### **Chapter III: Advocacy of Free Speech in Haroun and the Sea of Stories**

This chapter explores how far the characters, author and the events have employed the technique of allegory and magic realism to advocate the message of free speech in Rushdie's Haroun and the Sea of Stories. Rushdie's characters such as Rashid, Haroun, Bolo, Kitab and Guppees are the representative of those known and unknown figures who struggle and will struggle for their individual identity, freedom of speech resisting the dogmatic repression. The characters and Gup are suggestive individuals, groups and nations who fought and will fight for freedom against the dictatorship of tyrants. Guppees are of credulous souls. They are gentle and peaceful people. They love debate and they called their parliament 'chatterbox' because "debates there could run for weeks or months or even, occasionally, years, on account of the Guppees fondness for conversation" (88). Guppees are fond of conversation who probably believes in ' bade bade jayete tatwa bodha (conversation leads to comprehension)' There is not any restriction upon the expression of individual. As a result "the land of Gup is bathed in endless sunshine while over in Chup it's always the middle of the night" (80).

Furthermore, "Gup is bright Chup is dark. Gup is one and Chup is freezing cold. Gup all chattering and noise whereas Chup is silent and a shadow. Guppees love the ocean Chupwala try to poison it. Guppees is love stories and speech; Chupwalas, it seems, hate these just strongly" (125). Here, brightness, warmth, stories and speeches have positive connotation. They are pleasing and they allow other's existence too. Brightness and sunlight refer to awareness among the people which becomes clearer when light falls upon the dark ship of Khattam-Shud. "The sunlight had undone the black magic of the cult master Khattam-Shud. Shadows could not remain solid in that brightness; and the huge ship itself started to melt, had started

losing its shape, as if it were a mountain of ice cream left out in the sun by mistake” (173). Here, sunlight represents awareness and consciousness in the people which no longer allows the shadows to be solid, where shadow refers to ignorance and tutelage. Moreover, not only Guppees Haroun and Rashid, Khattam-Shud also is an antagonist who collectively represents all the dictators, tyrants who intend to control language, speech and expression to seize people’s freedom. For Khattam-Shud “the world is for controlling [. . . ] They are all there to be Ruled. And inside every single story, inside every stream in the ocean, there lies a world, a story-world that I cannot rule at all.” (161) Being a representative of those antagonist rulers Khattam Shud is threatened with the power of people’s voice. So, “ he is the Arch-Enemy of all stories even a language itself. He is the prince of silence and the foe of speech” (118). Here, binary opposition of silence and speech suggests the fundamental proposition of Haroun and the Sea of Stories: the loss of the ability of storyteller Rashid Khalifa, the Shah of Blah, whose talent seems to have disappeared at the same time as his wife has eloped with his neighbour, Mr. Sengupta who is supposed to be Khattam-Shud in dream vision. Rashid’s silence initiates the destruction of collective imagination because the very source of stories, the Sea of Stories is being slowly poisoned by the Arch-Enemy of stories, the tyrant Khattam-Shud. It suggests to the exclusive existence of people’s wish, will and voice and dictators interest which can be seen in day to day politics too. The dream narrative as an element of magic realism uses the locations such as valley of K, mountain of M, tunnel of I and the like. Rushdie’s novel being an allegory avoids using specific names for the locations because an allegory exists within an ideal time that is never here and now. In this dream narrative, most of the names of the characters and the locations seem to point toward a fight between democracy and dictatorship reminiscent of the cold war with its clearly polarized world.

The characters appear to be personification of certain vices or virtues. The fact that the main course of narrative takes place within a dream also places it in the allegorical tradition. The Guppees view prevails in the dream narrative, allowing their moral code to take on the mode of established authority. It is their world and their ocean of the stories that Haroun feels threatened by the evil side and since he loves stories and is determined to recover his father's gift of storytelling. The use of allegory and magic realism has one significant politics that they simply advocate freedom of expression.

The allegorical tradition continued due to its potentiality of including multiple voices, multiple locations, existence in ideal time. The tension in literaria as per Paul de Man is not between the two distant literary sources the one erotic and the other puritanical but between the allegorical language and the symbolic language.

According to him:

This conflict is ultimately resolved in the triumph of a control and lucid renunciation of the values associated with a cult of the moment, and this renunciation establishes the priority of an allegorical over symbolic diction. The novel could not exist without the simultaneous presence of both metaphorical modes, nor could it reach its conclusion without the implied choice in favour of allegory over symbol. (204)

This novel Haroun and the Sea of Stories reaches its conclusion with the choice which privileged allegory over symbol, where characters appear to be personification of certain vices or virtues.

The publication of Haroun and the Sea of Stories just after a year of the Fatwa issued against Rushdie by the Ayotollah Khomeini is significant for its allegorical interpretation. The novel is an artistic revolt of Rushdie against the so called Fatwa

and censorship. Rushdie's choice of and favour of allegory allows him to depersonalize this experience with censorship as a result Rashid in the novel not only represents Rushdie, who was supposed either to accept death or to silence himself, but also represents to those creative writers who are tormented by the evil called censorship. By the same token, Khattam-Shud not only represents Khomeini and annoyed authorities of Muslim communities but also those dictators of who desire to control others to sustain their cheap interest. Khattam-Shud is the representative of the vice called censorship who is threatened by the creative power of language. He thinks that each story has its own world which cannot be ruled so the words are to be finished. He tells their plan:

We are going to pluge the well spring itself, the source of stories, which lies directly beneath this ship on the ocean-bed. As long as the source remains unplugged, fresh, unpoisoned, renewing story waters will pour upwards into the ocean and our work will only be half done. But when it is plugged! Ah, then the ocean will lose all its power to resist my anti-stories and the end will come very soon. (162)

While explaining his plan of unplugging the source of stories Khattam-Shud sounds very excited. He wants to finish the speech completely.

As the cult of dumbness rules in the city of Chup the schools, the law courts and theatres are closed, unable to operate because of the silence laws. Chupwalas lips were zipped as a sign of prohibition of expressing feelings and ideas. Khattam-Shud manufactures anti-stories to nullify the stories in the factories. Khattam-Shud describes about his poison factories:

These are the poison blenders. We must make a great many poisons because each and every story in the ocean needs to be ruined in a

different way. To ruin a happy story, you must make it sad. To ruin and action drama, you must make it move too slowly. To ruin a mystery you must make the criminals' identity obvious even to the most stupid audience. To ruin a love story you must turn into a tale of hate. To ruin a tragedy you must make it capable of including helpless laughter. (159-60)

He feels victorious when he tells the death of story. He declares that he personally has discovered that for every story there is an anti-story. He is of the view that "the world is for controlling" (161). So, his mission will be completed only when the ocean will be dead-cold and dead and black ice freezes.

The land of Chup has fallen under the power of the cult master. It is the land of darkness; the dark side of Kahani and it is full of negative names, suggesting silence, the field of Baat-mat-karo, the cult master Bezaban, the arch-villain Khattam-Shud. Because stories are made up of words, there is a textuality in the entire fabric of the Guppee society and even in their institution of army. The land of Gup sharply contrasts to the land of Chup. The land of Gup has positive names suggesting speech, Batcheat, Bolo, and General Kitab etc. Gup soldiers are called pages, they are organized in chapters and volumes. ". . . the land of Chup has fallen under the power of the mystery of Bezaban, a cult of Dumbness or muteness, whose followers swear vows of lifelong silence to show their devotion" (101). Khattam Shud needs absolute silence. Speech for him is not more than a threat for his absolute authority and power. He is obsessed with maintaining silence i.e. silencing people.

An allegory uses characters from the opposing side: one is vice the other is virtue and it aims at showing the defeat of vice to convey a certain moral lesson. In this novel too Rushdie allegorizes both side and show the victory of freedom of

speech over the censorship. Paul de Man regarding allegory talks about the dialects within the allegorical signs. For him dialectic of historical scheme is not the relationship between subject and object rather it is based on the temporal relationship existing within the system of allegorical signs. In his own words:

To a historical scheme that differs entirely from the customary picture. The dialectical relationship between subject and object is no longer the central statement of romantic thought, but this dialectic is now located entirely in the temporal relationship that exists within a system of allegorical signs. (208)

The use of allegorical frame allows the heterogeneity. It seeks to replace the monolithic tradition with a cross-cultural multiplicity and diversity. The allegorical mode allows multiple voices: voices from every corner of the both cities, Gup and Chup.

### **Censorship Vs Freedom of Expression**

In the novel the fundamentalist ruler, Khattam-Shud make announcement to censor on another's narrative. The censorship is resulted separating the moon of Kahani into two halves, Chup land and Gup land. His efforts to establish 'Grand culture of silence' cannot be entertained by a group of people including Haroun. Not only Haroun and people of his side Mudra, the second man of Khattam-Shud too revolted against Shud's suppressions and evil plans. As a result, instead of strict culture, opposite culture is created in equal strength. No matter of them encounter many troubles in the conflict they do not accept imposition. Then, these two distinct cultural trends exist side by side with their own distinct identity. But the defeat of Khattam-Shud is the end of grand narratives. The other side serves mini or petty narratives and let people free to reach in every streams of stories. Even the Chupwalas

revolted against their own leader. “Many Chupwalas had started breaking the laws of silence now, cheering, shouting and so on” (186) . Naturally shouting and cheering allow the multiplicity of expression.

The newly formed government in the land of Chup is too an ideal which shares various voices and perspectives. “ The new government of the land of Chup, headed by Mudra, announce its desire for a long and lasting peace with Gup , a peace in which Night and Day , speech and silence would no longer be separated into zones by Twilight strips and walls of Force”(191). Accepting the humanitarian values of Guppees by Chup is a kind of declaration which welcomes and provides equal space for distinct voices. Here, in Haroun and the Sea of Stories, Rushdie has created an allegory that emphasizes the importance of exchange between different cultural groupings and societies. He has shown how the Gup and the Chup become able to create a harmony among the people. At the symbolic level, he has given us an image of the story Sea that seems healthy when the stories from different places are permitted to intermingle. The Sea of stories becomes more valuable and precious when the voice stream of Chup enters in it. Most importantly this text is a Sea of stories where diverse narrative traditions intermingled.

Describing the Guppees, Rushdie writes, they have “magical golden liquid” that is called “wish water” (170). The person with wish water can be benefited every time with its magical power. The harder the wish water holder wishes the better it works. Guppees wish as well as work is always in balance, contrary to Chupwalas. Their balance state helps them defeat Chupwalas. After conveying such comparative message of this two lands, Rushdie as the essence of his idea writes: “ Gup is bright and Chup is dark, Gup is warm and Chup is freezing cold. Gup is always chattering and noise, whereas Chup is silent as shadow. Guppees love the ocean and Chupwalas

tries to poison it. Guppees love stories and speech; Chupwals, 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 cult master Khatam Shud had in mind for the ocean and for the princess too)” (125). Through these above points it is clear that there are some Guppees among Chupwalas too. Many Chupwalas are forcefully compelled to hate the stories so that the writer explains the Chupwalas activity as surface. It is in above lines cleared by the phrase “it seems”.

Allegorical core of the narrative makes possible for the existence of heterogeneous ideas and voices. Even the ‘zipped lips’ (148) have opportunity to express themselves. Chupwalas “had the same strange reversed eyes with white pupils instead of black ones, bland grey irises instead of coloured ones, and blackness where the whites should have been.”(148) The story also includes the voice of floating Gardener. He heroically makes the Khattam Shud’s mechanism or poisoning system unfunctional. His songs:

You can chop a flower bush  
You can chop a tree  
You can chop liver, but  
You can’t chop me  
You can chop and change,  
You can chop in ka-ra-tee,  
You can chop suey, but  
You can’t chop me! (164-65)

Through his song, he asserts his identity. The ship’s entire power supplies is cut off at once so that every action of the ship is stopped abruptly. “Stirrers stopped stirring and whirrers stopped whirring; blenders stopped blending and menders

stopped mending; squeezers stopped squeezing and freezers stopped freezing” (164). Chupwala guards attack Mali in large numbers with axes and swords but instead of Mali the ship itself is ruined. After the victory the gardener, Mali reveals to Khattam Shud that one could do everything out of his will.

The holistic culture is ruptured by the presentation of multiple voices which strengthen the heterogeneity as the alternative of homogeneous monolithic tradition. Haroun wishes for the betterment of his city. It is heterogeneity which always welcomes the free speech. He not only wishes for his personal well being but also for the well being of the entire Kahani. He knows that “happy endings are much rarer [. . .] they are the exceptions not the rule.” (201) Even then he wishes for a happy ending for his city too. He said: “I came from a sad city, a city so sad that it has forgotten its name. I want you to provide a happy ending, not just for my adventure but for the whole sad city as well.” (202) Here, Haroun’s wish for the whole city to suggest his wish for the existence of multiplicity.

The novel covers from the country of Alifbay to the earth’s second moon named Kahani . Its covers the voice from “Rashid the oceans of nations” or “ the shah of Blah” (15) to Sengupta , from Mudra to General Kitab . The novel encompasses the various voices from the different sphere of life which make the narrative diaglossic and multivocal . The precious regime of Khattam-Shud has been destroyed, constructing united Chupland with multi cultural system . The throwing of real person causes the destruction of shadow too. His large container of poison is “growing flabby and melting like dark butter “(173). The throwing of Chupland ruler Khattam-Shud in the novel following by describing the idea: why Chupwalas have had to bear defeat in the war? Rushdie gives reason and says that Chupwalas “have mechanical brains” (174) - one dimensional and monotonous – which can be replaced

and repaired by “service stations” (174) in Gup city. The service station is nothing but free speech and free narrative that are assured for every people in performative nations like Gupland . In these nations every idea can freely play rounds its territory. By showing the ruin of dark ship and the death of Khattam-Shud Rushdie wishes the end of the dictatorship , censorship and tyranny imposed upon him in particular and upon all the people all over the world in general.

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 twilight stripes and walls of force” (191). In *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*, Khattam-Shud , the fundamentalist ruler makes announcement to censor on narratives . The censorship is resulted separating the Kahani into two halves: Chupland and Gupland . His efforts to establish “Grand culture “cannot be entertained by a group of people including Haroun and his father. That very grand narrative does not encompass the people from different walks that are monolithic and reductive. Unlike this kind of narrative allegory is a narrative which helps to include multiple voices with equal strengths. Instead of strict culture Khattam-Shud’s imposition fuelled to the development of democratic and multivocal culture with equal force.

An allegory makes a document valid and relevant. Rushdie through the novel wants to criticize the censorship imposed upon him, the totalizing tendency, the dictatorship and tyranny. Rushdie claims that dictatorship and censorship is a serious treat to individual right of freedom of expression and they are evil which bring the destruction of harmony in the society. Rushdie succeeds to make his claim valid , relevant and trustworthy with the help of the allegory . It becomes clear in the novel

Haroun and the Sea of Stories that the Khattam-Shud, the representative of the totalizing tradition fears with storytelling.

For Khattam-Shud , storytelling is one of the greatest threats to his empire of silence Power of storytelling attacks the power of totalitarians. Storytelling undermines the loss of power for ruling people as long as possible. We can take Rushdie's The Satanic Verses which halted Khomeini's rule in Iran and Rushdie was ordered to sentence to death. Like Khomeini, Khattam-Shud too is obsessed with the desire to establish a univocal interpretation of culture by imposing the silence rule . He dictates who may and may not speak what should be spoken and what should not be spoken etc. It is his politics of excluding others . In the novel when Haroun asks why he hates stories so much , Khattam-Shud replies :

The world, however , is not for fun [ . . . ] the world is for controlling .

“which world ?” Haroun made himself ask. Your world, my world , all worlds , came the reply . They are all to be ruled. And inside every single story, inside every stream in the ocean there lies a world, a story world the cannot be ruled at all. (161)

The novel aims to reveal how the wild pursuit of totalitarian rule results in a society with full of jealousy, mistrust lack of mutual understanding, disharmony, suspicion and deformity instead of harmony, uniformity, mutual understanding etc. And contrary to the expectation and logic of authoritarian rule, the novel shows how freedom of speech and freedom of thought will ultimately create a stronger community on the behalf of freedom of expression.

A society only through the free exchange of ideas, views, and opinions can achieve its full potentiality. The Gup is presented as a free society which defends the sea of stories. This very sea reflects the diversity within the community and its

multicultural nature. Their society takes the power of speech with a great respect and it is “exercised to the full” extent. (119) They know a large many secrets of “great juiciness and interest” (119). The open and free exercise of speech narrow down the gap among the Guppees. This finishes the suspicion and mistrust to each other. As a result they fight boldly and become victorious. As per the narrator : “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 purposes. All those arguments and debates, all that openness, had created powerful bonds of fellowship between them” (184-85). With the help of the unity and cooperation among them , they become able to resume “power of speech” overrunning Chupwalas .

### **Restrictions on speech and its Consequence**

Unlike the Guppees Chupwalas are prohibited to speak to each other. They are ruled with the silence law. This very lack of communication fuels to the misunderstanding and suspicion among them. As a result they are destined to loss the battle:

Chupwalas, on the other hand, turned out to be a disunited rabble had to fight their own treacherous shadows! And as far the rest, well , their vows of silence and their habits of secrecy had made them suspicious and distrustful of one another . They had no faith in there generals, either. The upshot was that Chupwalas did not stand shoulder to shoulder, but betrayed one another, stabbed one another in the back, mutinied, hid, destroyed . . . and after the shortest clash imaginable , simply throw down all their weapons and ran away. (185)

We can see in the above passage, unlike Guppees who are united and fight collectively, Chup people are disunited, unhappy and suspicious with each other . which ultimately defeat themselves . A free society in which there are not any absolute limits which define what can be said and what cannot be said, will always be proved stronger than a society that is superficially bond by imposed government policy and enforced ideology is what Rushdie wants to convey through Haroun and the Sea of Stories.

The formation of story world is very hostile and destructive to Khattam-Shud. It cannot be ruled absolutely according to his wish. There is always the potentiality of construction of new meanings, new ideas and new perspective and point of view. This construction of new ideas disturbs the selfishly constructed mind of the autocratic ruler like Khattam-Shud. Khattam-Shud, “. . . the Arch-Enemy of all stories even of language itself” is the prince of silence and the foe of speech because everything ends, because every dream ends, stories end, life ends.(39) This total mess and destruction is non other than Khattam-Shud. His name means “The end” (39). The power intoxicated Khattam-Shud hates stories very much. In his perception, story worlds are funny enough to be mocked at. These story worlds become the subject of his tension and headache. The world is not for fun, cooperation and enjoyment but it is simply to be controlled. That is why he thinks that people have to follow his command, obey his decree and have to do what he asked to do.

Water Genie evaluates Khattam-Shud as:

The Arch-Enemy of all stories even of language itself. He is the prince of silence and the foe of speech. At least that’s what they say. What it comes to the land of Chup and its people the Chupwalas, it’s all

mostly gossip and flim-flame, because it's generation since any of us  
went across the twilight strip into the perpetual Night. (79)

These two opposite campaigns: Guppees and Chupwalas do their best to serve their respective interests of related people. On the way of their own, a war between these two groups has been penetrated. This war can be viewed as the war between wisdom and weapon, expression and suppression, free speech and censorship.

As the writer associates himself to the Guppees he remarks from their 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 the Guppees are not swords, guns and rifles but the ideas in their texts. In the same manner Rushdie is also fighting against the censors, and swords of censorship not with any weapon but with the ideas which are in the text he has created. These weapons become the cause of the greatest treats among the nation like Chupland that believes in totalities.

By the same token, the weapon of words of Rushdie creates the great threat to the totalitarian of Iran and many other countries. In the text, Chupland is always afraid of stories of book or of ideas. To suppress people, free speech, free narrative and ideas Chupland tyrant Khattam-Shud orders his arm force with full of ultramodern weapons to clash with Guppees. The narrator of the novel indicates it 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 age invisible

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

Here, as described by the narrator, the man is fighting with his own shadow because the people of fundamentalist nation always remain in the condition of restriction. They are forced to different from what they actually wish to do. People's rights are curtailed in Chupland but they cannot resist it publicly. Every individual likes to enjoy freedom to live with dignity and self respect. Thus, the kicking of sword is a symbolic resistance against Khattam-Shud and against authoritarian rules of the whole world that ultimately resists any kind of obstructions in freedom of expression. Guppees have 'magical golden liquid' which is called "wish water" (170). The harder the wish water holder wishes the more it works. Guppees can be benefited every time with the magical power of wish water. Haroun using the power of this magical liquid wishes: "I wish this moon, Kahani, to turn, so that it's no longer half in light and half in darkness. I wish it to turn, this every instant, in such a way that the sun shines down on the dark ship, the full, hot, noonday sun" (170). And then, "with a mighty shuddering and a mighty juddering" (171). Haroun's wishes come true. And "the moon Kahani turned-quickly, because as Haroun has specified during his wishing, there was little time to be lost- and the sun rose at high speed, and zoomed up into the sky until it was directly over head; where it remained" (171).

The entire narrative of the novel is developed around Haroun, a teen aged protagonist who accomplishes adventures to rescue his parent's lost gift of storytelling which succeeds the breakup of his parents' marriage. Haroun during his journey find out the secrets of poisoning the sea of stories especially of his father. To complete the single agenda of rescuing the ocean of stories Haroun landed to the hell, the dark zone of Kahani with help of his companion Iff, the water Genie riding on

the bird, Butt, the Hoopoe. In the deep dark region there is a large darkship with various tendrils and Khattam-Shud with his Chupland armies. Who “had the same strange reversed eyes with white pupils instead of black ones, blank grey irises instead of coloured one, and blackness where the whites should have been” (148). Chupwalas have made the dark ship which was really a “colossal ship” and at the same time they “ had invented artificial darkness just as other people had artificial light! (150). There are artificial dark bulbs producing extra ordinary and strange darkness. The armies attack Hoopoe’s head. The Guppees are plunged into the frightened, gothic situation. That gothic situation doesn’t disturb Haroun and his group rather they go forward with more vigour and enthusiasm. The presents of the absolute darkness in the dark land is replaced with the “dim twilight” (159). In this very twilight Haroun and his group destroyed “the largest and the most efficient plug ever constructed” (162). the plug is constructed to switch off the source of stories. Khattam-Shud is declaring among the Chupwalas, “when it is plugged! Ah, then the ocean will lose its power to resist my anti-stories” (162). Therefore, it was imperative for Guppees to break the darkship and the plug to save the treasure of stories from the vicious anti-stories.

To resume the ocean which is poisoned, the Guppees slowly go on to break the darkship. Mali “leapt into air disassembling his body as he did so, and flung roots and tendrils all over generator, setting into every hook and cranny of the machine” (164). The entire power supply of the ship is cut off and everything stopped.

Chupwalas guards Mali in large numbers with various weapons but instead of Mali the large ship itself is ruined beyond the hope of repair. After the victory, in the conversation with Khattam-Shud, Mali reveals that one could do everything out of his power but he or she “can not chop a person, his identity and his self” (164).

After the destruction of the darkship, the Gup armies inter more into the depth of Chupland. They came to know that everything and everyone is “a shadow made solid” (166). Haroun invests his efforts to make everything liquid which is not rigid. Haroun thinks Khattam-Shud to be Sengupta. When he saw him he shouted “I know you [ . . . ] You are him. You’re Mr. Sengupta and you stole my mother and you left the fat lady behind and you’re a snivelling, drivelling, mingy, stingy, measly, weasly clerk” (155). Khattam-Shud and Mr. Sengupta are similar in many respects. Sengupta snatches the happiness of Khalifas and takes Soraya away which leads to the disharmony and fragmentation of the family. In the similar manner Khattam-Shud destroyed the happiness of the Kahani.

Many characteristics and qualities of Khattam-Shud and Sengupta are penetrated among all the dictators of the world in general and in Ayatollah Khomeini in particular. The dictators snatch the individuals’ rights to fulfil their cheap and selfish interests. Every person has his distinct self though the westerns used to take their culture as absolute and final one. Not only western tradition many religions, political and ideological trends are monolithic in terms of their orientation towards the so called absolute and unquestionable Truth. If we take Khattam-Shud and his Chupland as the representation of such essentialist tradition the ruination of the large darkship is symbolically a challenge to that entire tradition. When Haroun entered deeper into the ocean he got a view of the source of stories. The sight of the source excites him. the source of stories is a whole or chasm, “through that whole [ . . . ] the glowing flow of pure, unpolluted stories came bubbling up from the very heart of Kahani” (167). The stories or kahanies are the symbolic of the expression and feelings.

## **Allegory and Multiplicity**

Allegorical dimension opens the path for the multiplicity, diversity and heterogeneity. No allegory claims for a fixed and final truth. In the same manner the stories around the sea are no more truth when they go around person to person they change their shape themselves. A fundamentalist tries to keep the change in stories in his control. He wants to dictate the change in stories and wants to allow only the stories which support his claim and interests. He desires to shape the stories according to his wish so that they could advocate on the behalf of the 'Meta Narrative' proposed by him. A fundamentalist believes in grand narratives which have been assumed true to maintain externally imposed order. The leaders like Khattam-Shud, Snooty Buttoo want to make the interpretations of the story on the basis of their wish. Mr. Buttoo and his unpopular local government tries to win the people's support by making Rashid tell "up beat, praising sagas" and cutting out the "gloom puss yarns" (205). In spite of the extravaganza in Buttoo's election campaign people didn't care for Mr. Buttoo, while is evident from the scrawling expressing though they had gathered there to hear Rashid.

Haroun wishes to turn moon Kahani, 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 Kahani gives its light. In the mean time defeated Khattam-Shud orders his supporters to possess a power beyond imagination. His hunger and lust for power is still dominant. The citizen of Kahani can speak with full of open and wide mouths for the first time. After the victory of Bat-Mat-Karo, the army of Gup entered Chup city in triumph. "Many Chupwalas threw in their lot with the Guppees. Chupwala maidens rushed black-nosed into the icy streets and garlanded the red-nosed and halo-headed Guppees with black snow

drops; and kissed them too; and called them ‘Liberator of Chup’.” (185) Guppees fought bravely that they became able to liberate Kahani from the cruel and poisonous palm of Khattam-Shud.

The totalitarian ruler Khattam-Shud and the totalizing nation such as Chupland no more remain in power. Nation’s power and ruler’s power is the collective of the power of people. It is the sum of the power citizens of the state. So, when people do not take ownership to the nation they naturally do not add their power to the power of nation. As a result, the nation becomes weak and it may crumble. That is to say, a nation should be inclusive so that people can earn their ownership in it. It should be a platform which provides space for all voices. The previous regime of Khattam-Shud has been destroyed, constructing united Chupland with multicultural system. The throwing of the real person causes the destruction of the shadows too. Khattam-Shud’s large container of poison is “growing flabby and melting like dark butter” (173). Not only container, even the gigantic crane was tilting and drowning in the shocking light of the day. The huge ship loses its shape and starts to melt like an ice-cream. Chupwala soldiers were screeching and rushing about madly dissolving into pools of shadows. They are “vanishing altogether, because once the sorcery of Khattam-Shud had been destroyed by the sunlight, no shadow could survive without someone or something to be attached to, to be the shadow of” (173). The cult-master was no more and nowhere to be seen.

The throwing of Chupland ruler Khattam-Shud in the novel is followed by describing the idea: why Chupwalas becomes the defeated party in the war. Rushdie gives his logic and says that they have “mechanical brains” which “can be fixed up, overhauled, even replaced” (174). These mechanical brains can be repaired and replaced by ‘service stations’ in Gup city. The service station is nothing but multiple

free narratives, free speech which are assured for every citizen of Gup. Gup is a performative nation which allows a free play of ideas around the territory of the nation.

Any effort to control people's right to express ideas ultimately turns into defeat. The same thing happened to Khattam-Shud to. His undemocratic and dystopian rule crumbles due to his arrogance and pride. The restoration of Rashid's storytelling is suggestive of restoration people's right after the downfall of dictatorship. When Rashid returns to the Earth he finds that his storytelling power has been restored. And he rewarded his son Haroun by making him the hero of a story, in which a boy single handedly solves a crisis on the second moon of the Earth called Kahani. Rashid and Haroun's home is in a "sad city...a city so ruinously sad that it had forgotten its name" (15). When father and son arrived home they found out that the inhabitants have "remembered the name" (208). If forgetting one's name symbolizes loss of identity, then the ultimate effect of Haroun's heroic achievement is the restoration of this very identity.

Many of the critics view this novel as an allegory at personal level too. For them Haroun and Rashid is an appropriate namesake for Rushdie's father-son team. Eva Konig in her article 'Between Cultural Imperialism and the Fatwa' writes:

Rushdie strive for and achieve similar tolerance and balance in their story world. If the shadow of the Fatwa makes Rushdie a victim of religious fanaticism, it is also true that he is a secondary victim of imperialism. Thus, the fulfilment of author's utopian wish would eliminate the cause of his specific predicament. (56)

Rushdie through the allegorical framework of the novel expresses his utopian vision and claims that true democracy is multivocal and its participants are "in a dialogue"

with each other (193). It can be secured only through free speech. He ensures that the Chupwalas do not have to speak the Guppee language but they can use interpreters to make themselves understood. One such translator is storyteller Rashid who interprets the language of gesture used by the Chupwalas though he is an outsider.

The allegorical narrative raises a serious dispute between fact and fiction. The question “what is the use of stories that are not even true?” (20) is supported by the note that Soraya leaves to 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). In the course of the narrative, the novel offers several responses to these arguments. Rushdie being a storyteller defends story as: “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). Rushdie wants to say that Rashid has no intention to mislead because his intention is not to relay on facts or to tell truth. In this sense, it is also an allegory of a utopian culture that allows its member to be the person without fear of persecution.

Rashid’s situation is analogous to the situation of the artists of our time who are not in constant demand during election time. The “Shah of Blah’s” storytelling magic is not always in the service of the public. But at the political campaigns he is used as the person to convince or to fool people by the political leaders: “The Grand Panjandrums of various political parties all came to Rashid smiling there fat-cat smiles, to beg to tell his stories at their rallies and nobody else’s” (20). The artists like singers, authors etc. are facing the same fate in the politics of our time too. They have ambivalence position. They are taken as someone very especial at the time of election and no political leader cares them after the political campaigns. In this sense Rashid’s

fate in the novel allegorizes the predicament of the artist of our time. The ambivalence of Rashid's position is indicated by the fact that Rashid and his son are heartily welcomed by Mr. Buttoo in his boat, "Arabian Nights plus one" as his respected guests. (37) But the fact is that Buttoo is doing this simply because Rashid can facilitate the election of Buttoo. At that moment, Rashid's talent for creative myth-making is at the service of contemporary politicians seeking votes and satisfying their lust for power.

The predicament of the artists and their ambivalent position is allegorically represented through the fate of Rashid in the novel. The political leaders are guided with the selfish motif of 'use and throw'. The political leaders exploit artists' talent in seeking votes and political power. As Buttoo tells Rashid:

My enemies hire cheap fellows to stuff people's ears with bad stories about me, and the ignorant people just lap it up like milk. For this reason I have turned, eloquent Mr. Rashid, to you. You will tell happy stories, praising stories, and the people will believe you, and be happy, and vote for me. (47)

Here, Rashid is asked to launch a public campaign to burnish the figure of Buttoo. But when his eloquence fails to do so the politicians accuse Rashid of "having taken a bribe from their rivals" and threatened him that "they might cut off his tongue and other items also" (27). Rashid is entertained by the political leaders and parties only as far as his stories have magical attraction and charm. As soon as Rashid lost this charm he faces a death threat. In the same manner, Rushdie is threatened when his stories stopped serving the selfish motif of Ayatollah Khomeini, a representative figure of all fundamentalists. Through this Rushdie is expressing his dissatisfaction to the situation of artists which is similar to the situation of Rashid in the narrative.

Khattam-Shud, a fundamentalist tries to rule according to some pre-existing, pre-established norms neglecting people's will and wish. But Guppees are enlightened enough that they cannot tolerate his activities to respect their rights, dignity, self respect and prestige. As a result, they waged war against the tyranny of Khattam-Shud. Guppees are liberal enough to allow the defeated Chupwalas to entertain their rights in equal footing with Guppees. This very inclusive liberalism easily threatens Khattam-Shud and his unjust political claims. Rushdie, here, is raising his voice against Khomeini by challenging Khattam-Shud. But his cry should not be taken as a target to Khomeini as an individual but it is a critique of absolute power. Rushdie poses a big question mark against entire world system which claims its existence on fundamentalist's principles. The falling of Khattam-Shud's regime in Chuland symbolically refers to the falling of the monolithic system itself, The defeat paves the way for multiple voices where "all those arguments and debates, all that openness has created powerful bonds of friendship between them" (185). The "Gesture language, Abhinaya" helped Guppees to be organized and to express their sentiments (191). Later on they waged war against Chupland collectively and make a vast transformation possible.

To conclude, Haroun and the Sea of Stories is a political allegory at different level and it uses magic realism to advocate free speech. Khattam-Shud allegorizes Ayatollah Khomeini in particular and all the dictators in general, who feels threaten by the power of speech, imagination and language. A Fatwa was imposed upon Rushdie after the publication of *The Satanic Verses*. This censorship and Rushdie's dissatisfaction is allegorically presented in the novel. Guppees Haroun and Rashid allegorically represent moral and peaceful people celebrating the imagination and free speech. On the other hand, Khattam-Shud and Chupwalas collectively allegorize

immoral dictators who not only want to control but also want to finish the stream of stories. Guppees, Haroun and Rashid show their courage and honour and risk their lives to liberate Kahani. Rushdie ironically treats Khattam-Shud. A ruler is supposed to be protective, helpful, kind and responsible towards his people but instead of protecting own citizens Khattam-Shud is destroying them. Rushdie uses this ironic note to criticize the fundamentalists like Khattam-Shud. Likewise, by allegorizing the narrative Rushdie is turning spotlight on the evil qualities of rulers and is resisting the evil called censorship for Free Speech.

## **Chapter IV: Conclusion**

### **Haroun and the Sea of Stories: An Anti-Censorship Narrative**

This research, in a closer observation and with an extensive analysis of Rushdie's *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*, deals with magic realism along with the allegorical aspect of the novel. The novel is a creative response to Censorship. The rulers are supposed to be kind and protective of their people and should secure their rights but Khattam-Shud is cruel and destructive of his people's right. Through this ironic note Rushdie is criticizing the fundamentalists, resisting censorship and turning satirical spotlight on the evil qualities of rulers.

The novel appears as an allegory at different levels. Rushdie's noble characters such as Haroun, Rashid and Guppees collectively allegorize the peace loving people who desire the freedom of expression and speech. They even become ready to risk their lives to rescue the stream of stories. On the other hand, the antagonist of the novel Khattam-Shud allegorizes Ayatollah Khomeini in particular and all the dictators in general, who feel threatened with the imaginative and creative power of language and speech. Khattam-Shud launches his evil planes to poison the source of stories. He invented anti-stories to kill the multiplicity, plurality and diversity. Similarly, in Rushdie's real life too, Khomeini issued a Fatwa to censor, and control the real-life storyteller, Rushdie.

Rushdie's experience with censorship, his belief about his situation, his dissatisfaction regarding the censorship appears in the novel in disguised form. The novel is not only a personal testament but a strong document which universally oppose the censorship. Guppees save democracy, freedom of speech, creativity thereby rescuing the ocean of stories from the murderous censorship. The Gupland takes care of the sea of stories whereas Chupwalas want to poison the sea and even

remove language completely. The allegorical relationship between a storyteller who has lost his power to create and a writer who has been sentenced either to silence or to death was strong enough to allegorize. The real-life storyteller Rushdie was suffering from the similar kind of disability of Rashid. The novel deals with the adventure of Haroun and the Rashid to restore the wonderful capacity of storytelling and rescuing sea of stories from the murderous palms of Khattam Shud. The real-life storyteller was also struggling to save the stream of stories from the real-life followers of Khattam-Shud such as Ayotallah Khomeini during the composition of this novel.

The use of allegory as per some critics helps a document to be valid relevant and reliable. Rushdie's disagreement to the censorship is exposed in the novel Haroun and the Sea of Stories. The allegorical care of the narrative makes valid to Rushdie's disagreement and his opinion and prediction that the defeat of such censorship and dictatorship is unavoidable and inevitable.

Through the use of magical elements and the allegorical frame in the novel, Rushdie seeks to replace the monolithic tradition with a cross-cultural pluralism. The allegorical tradition continued because of its potentiality of including multiple voices, multiple locations etc. The allegorical core of the narrative makes possible for the existence of heterogeneous ideas and voices. Even the zipped lips of Chupland have opportunity to express themselves. This possibility of multiplicity makes possible to the emergence of open culture instead of strict culture with equal strength. The newly formed Chupland government under the chairmanship of Mudra is ideal in terms of its multi-cultural nature. This shares various voices, and perspectives. The cultural exchange is possible in the new Chupland. The acceptance of humanitarian values makes it possible to provide equal space for distinct voices. The novel covers from the country of Alifabay to the Kahani, it covers the voice of Mali to Rashid and pages to

General Kitab. It encompasses various voices from the different sphere of life which makes the narrative diaglossic and multivocal interrogating the existence of metanarrative.

Ayatollah Khomeini like Khatam-Shud is obsessed with the desire to establish a univocal system. Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses* halted Khomeini's rule. The wild pursuit of totalitarian rulers and rule results in a society with full of jealousy, mistrust and suspicion. A society only through the free exchange of ideas can achieve its full potenciality and the rulers like Khatam-Shud are the obstacles on the way to this achievement. And the downfall of Khatam-Shud symbolizes Rushdie's wish to the downfall of such dictatorship.

The Arch-Enemy of all stories Khatam-Shud is the prince of silence and operating the silence law. He is fearful of the creative power of speech, stories and language. Storyteller Rashid's stories are great threats to his dumbness. Similarly, Rushdie creates a great threat to the totalitarian of Iran and many dogmatic rules of other countries. The previous regime of Khatam-Shud has been destroyed constructing new Chupland with multi-cultural system. The huge ship loses its shape and starts melting like an ice-cream suggesting the downfall of dictatorship.

Thus, Rushdie through the novel *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* is resisting censorship and exposing the worst nature of dictators who instead of being the ruler destroys and encroaches people's right of freedom of expression, life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. Rushdie identifies himself with Rashid, Haroun and Guppies who risk their lives, show courage, honour and dignity for the liberation of Kahani. Likewise, Rushdie too risks his life to guarantee the freedom of speech and he constructs an allegory to show his situation, the trend of dictators and his struggle against the censorship in the novel.

## Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 8th ed. Singapore: Prism Books, 2005.
- Benjamin, Walter. *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*. London: NBL, 1977.
- 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.
- Bowers, Maggie Ann. *Magic (AL) Realism*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Coleridge, S.T. *Miscellaneous Criticism*. Ed. T.M. Raysov. London: Coustable and Co. Ltd, 1936.
- Ellerby, Janet Mason. "Fiction Under Siege: Rushdie's Quest for Narrative Emancipation in *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*." *The Lion and the Unicorn* 22. 2(April 1998): 211-220
- Gadamer, Hans George. *Truth and Method*. New York: Sebury Press, 1975.
- Konig, Eva. "Between Cultural Imperialism and the Fatwa." *International Fiction Review* 33 (2006): 55-56.
- Krishnan, R.S. "Telling of the Tale." *The International Fiction Review* 22 (1995): 67-73.
- Man,Paul de. "The Rhetorics of Temporality." *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd (1983):187-229.
- \_\_\_. *Allegories of Reading*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Mill, John Stuart. "What is Poetry?" *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Florida: Harcourt Brace Javanoivh Inc (1992):551-556.
- Mukherjee, Meenakshi. "Politics of Children Literature: A Reading of *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*." *Ariel* 29.1 (Januray 1998): 163-177.

- Murfin, Ross and Supriya M Ray. *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1998.
- Roberts, Daniel. "Intertextual Politics in Haroun and the Sea of Stories." *Rushdie and the Romantics*. Ed. Jean-Pierres Durix. New Delhi: Ravi Dayal, 2000. 123-42.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*. London: Granta, 1990.
- \_\_\_. "Censorship". *Imaginary Homelands*. London: Granta Books, 1992. 37-40.
- Sen, Suchismita. "Reading Rushdie: Perspective on the Fiction of Salman Rushdie." *The International Fiction Review* 21 (1994): 70-71.
- Slemon, Stephen. "Magic Realism as Post-colonial Discourse." *Magic Realism*. Toronto: Aya Press, 1985. 3-17.
- Warnes, Chrispher. "Naturalizing the Supernatural." *Literature Compass* 2 (2005): 34-57.