Chapter-II

Hybridity and Postcolonialism

Rushdie as a magic realist writer incorporates many techniques that have been linked to postcolonialism with hybridity being a primary feature. The word “hybridity” means an offspring of two different ideas that have been mixed up such as plants or animals, urban or rural, mixed racial or cultural origin and Western or Eastern. In the same way “Post” means aftermath of something and “Colonial” means countries that are colonies; therefore “Postcolonial” means the country which eased the colonial rule and became independents such as India and Pakistan. Rushdie as a postcolonial writer rejects the British colonial portrayal of India and builds a new world through his novels. He pictures the Indian citizens and its history to provide the true images of India. Instead of providing the idea of magic and reality separately, he fuses them through a new technique called magic realism.

Magic realism is fully prompted in Rushdie’s oeuvre. The technique of magic realism used by him provided a conflict among the critics. It is a means for political promise in a literary text; the invocation of magic is associated with traditional mythical writing. Therefore, magic and realistic writing co-exist simultaneously and function as a metaphor for the idea of multiplicity of truth and history. And according to Rushdie the postcolonial writers write about their experience of displacement, which resulted in the incomplete vision of reality.
Stephen Selmon has contributed greatly to the association of magic realism and postcolonialism. In “Magic Realism as a Postcolonial Discourse” Stephen stresses the function of magic realism as the weapon of the “Silenced, marginalized, dispossessed voices” in their battle against “inherited notions of imperial history” (59-60).

Rushdie’s novel celebrates hybridity, impurity and intermingling of fact that becomes an alteration for the new and unexpected combination of politics, cultures, ideas, movies and songs. Hybridity reflects a conscious discontinuity that comes from immigration and displacement of writer experience. Hybridity is associated with the appearance of postcolonial discussion and its review of cultural imperialism. It is a theory that studies the mixture of identity and culture. The principal theorists of hybridity are Homi. K. Bhabha, Nestor Garcia Canclini, Stuart Hall, Gayatri Spivak, and Paul Gilroy.

Homi K. Bhabha, a Professor of English, American Literature and Language, Harvard University, Cambridge, has coined a key concept of hybridity. He says hybridity is the appearance of new cultural forms of multiculturalism. Seeing colonialism as something locked in the past, Bhabha shows how its histories and cultures constantly intrude on the present, demanding that we transform our understanding of cross-cultural relations. Homi Bhabha in his book, *The Location of Culture* states:

If the jargon of our time post modernity, post coloniality, post feminism has any meaning at all, it does not lie in the popular use ‘of the post’ to indicate sequentiality - after -feminism; or polarity *anti*-modernism. (6)
Instead, he argues these terms have “only embody its restless and revisionary energy if they transform the present into an expanded and ex-centric site of experience and empowerment” (6).

This chapter explores the way in which Salman Rushdie says about hybridity in his novels. His works show his strong belief in magic realism where the theme is mixed with many cultures and does not limit to any particular cultures or society. The various cultural identities in his novels are postcolonial history, national narratives, individual migrant identity and the English language.

Rushdie who has immigrated to the West has discovered a new way of looking forward rather than behind. In the past people who immigrated to the West were considered to an exile or diasporic writers. They write about their personal and Indian experience in their work. It may be cheerful or sad, but most of the works discuss the physical pain and mental agony. But Rushdie’s presentation is vice versa. Marangoly George in “At a Slight Angle to Reality: Reading Indian Diaspora Literature” says:

At the centre of Indian diasporic literature - is the haunting presence of India - and the anguish of personal loss it represents. It is precisely this shared experience of absence that…unites the literature of the Indian diasporal. (183)

Rushdie’s works do not portray the physical pain or mental agony; it embraces the globalization with peace and harmony. As a migrant he is free to create his own cultural identities based on his own experience at home.
Like Rushdie, Bharati Mukherjee, Amitav Ghosh, Jhumpa Lahiri, Rohinton Mistry, and Kiran Desai are living and writing about the West. They not only write about the pains for the loss of India as an immigrant, but also openly welcome their connections for both the East and West. Their writing portrays the immigrant society their mixing of cultures, race and languages in both the countries. Rushdie as an enthusiastic and optimistic portrayer of such themes of hybridity discusses the potential beauty of the immigrant condition. By stepping away from the past diasporic writers he looks to the future, where he can live, imagine and create his work according to his wish. Rushdie writes about the western culture and their identity as influenced immigrant to England. He thereby uses specific postcolonial literary techniques such as fragmentation, plurality and language in his works.

As an Indian emigrant living in England and writing in English, Rushdie is able to view and write about India with objectivity, yet distance from India causes some break up of memory and thereby results in the unreliable narrative techniques. Therefore, Rushdie’s position as an emigrant postcolonial writer functions as a double-edged sword; he is praised for his objectivity at the same time criticized for his inauthentic representations of modern India. The desire to regain India’s beauty and harmony of the past influenced him to write *Midnight’s Children*. Rushdie realized the importance of India to restore its past identity. *Midnight’s Children* is his first literary attempt to recapture Bombay, India. The novel explores the ways in which history have been told through the retelling of Saleem’s individual experience.
Saleem in Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children* remains the central figure among the postcolonial literature. Saleem Sinai the protagonist and narrator explains his family history to the reader and Padma his listener. While narrating his grandfather and grandmother’s personal history, he intertwines Indian history with his family history. India’s setting and its history becomes the major theme of his narration. *Midnight’s Children* is all about the struggle for independence and the partition of India. It focuses on the post-independent India with its socio-political disturbance, religious injustice or hatred, violence and finally the immoderation of Indira Gandhi’s Emergency Rule. Syed Amanuddin in “The Novels of Salman Rushdie: Reality as Fantasy” says “*Midnight’s Children* mythologizes the very consciousness of independent India with its memories of the past, dreams of the future and harsh realities of the present” (42).

*Midnight’s Children* as a postcolonial text begins from the novel’s ability to intertwine the three major themes. First, the creation and telling of history, then the creation and telling of individual’s identities and finally the creation and telling of fairy tales. These three connected themes look at the problems of postcolonialism and its difficulties in assigning one’s personal or national origin, personal or national history and personal or national authentic identity. The novel expresses these themes of creation and telling of history through connected and dependent forms of hybridity.

Saleem’s life becomes inextricably linked with the political, national and religious events of India. All the children born in and around India’s independence had a special gift, in the same way Saleem had a special gift of telepathy. He was
able to telepathically communicate with other gifted children. He acts as a telepathic medium, bringing hundreds of physically different children into contact and he attempts to discover the meaning of their gifts. He finds out that those children who are born closest to the stroke of midnight possess more powerful gifts than the others. Shiva of the Knees, Saleem’s evil opponent and Parvati, called Parvati-the-witch, are the two children with notable gifts and played the major character in Saleem’s narration. There was thousand and one midnight’s children born between 12 to 1 a.m. in the night of August 14-15, 1947, the hour of the nascence of free India and Saleem is one among them born at 12. Out of such 1001 children 420 were dead and 581 lived till 1957. Among the 581, 261 were boys and 315 were girls:

By 1957, the surviving five hundred and eighty-one children were all nearing their tenth birthdays. (272)

... Altogether brighter reality of the five hundred and eighty-one.

(Two hundred and sixty – six of us were boys: and we were outnumbered by our female counterparts – three hundred and fifteen of them, including Parvati. Parvati- the-witch. (274)

Saleem explains his role as a creator of the new India and it is possible for him by his childhood omniscience and telepathy:

[T]he feeling had come upon me that I was somehow creating a world; that the thoughts I jumped inside were mine, that the bodies I occupied acted at my command; which is to say, I had entered into
the illusion of the artist, and thought of the multitudinous realities of
the land as the raw unshaped material of my gift. (207)

Thereby he creates an illusionary world, where he is the creator and forms the
Midnight Children’s Conference. There are meets, discussions and quarrels among
the children in the mind of Saleem. These children are a sort of multi-headed
monster, speaking infinite languages. It is spirit of multiplicity of looking at things
from one thousand and one ways, which becomes good example of hybridity.

Accepting the view as a creator in his mind, Saleem remembers the
congratulatory letter written by Nehru to him at his birth:

Dear Baby Saleem, My belated congratulations on the happy accident
of your moment of birth! You are the newest bearer of that ancient
face of India which is also eternally young. We shall be watching
over your life with the closest attention; it will be, in a sense, the
mirror of our own. (167)

Saleem as the creator of new India explains the difficulty of narrating his life story
because there are multitudes of different lives within him, as he is thinking for
thousand and one children. Like India, he must bring together this multiple
identities in order to define himself. He says:

There are so many stories to tell, too many, such an excess of
intertwined lives events miracles places rumors...I have been the
swallower of lives; and to know me, just the one of me, you’ll have to
swallow the lot as well. Consumed multitudes are jostling and
shoving inside me. (4)

The alternative illusionary world of Saleem's life flourishes between the
political and economic growth of India. The thousand and one midnight’s children
are not only the product of his illusion, but they represent the events of India’s
future history. The children of midnight are the heirs of darkness welcoming the
new beginning. The number of children is the future plan of India. The imaginary
world created by Saleem welcomes the new beginning that mixes with East and
West, celebrating the multiple hybridity.

Rushdie’s relationship with India and the nature of his connection to
Bombay starts from his birth. His birth coincides with the independence of India.
After nearly one hundred years of colonial rule, the British occupation of the South
Asian subcontinent was nearing its end. Exactly three months after his birth,
Pakistan and India achieved their long awaited independence at the stroke of
midnight on August 14 and 15, 1947 respectively; the power was transferred from
Great Britain to the governments of each country. Exactly at 12 a.m. on 15th of
August Jawaharlal Nehru announced to the public and the Constituent Assembly:

‘... Long years ago we made a tryst with destiny; and now the tome
comes when we shall redeem our pledge – not wholly or in measure,
but very substantially’ ... ‘At the stroke of the midnight hour, when
the world sleeps, India will awake to life and freedom’ ... ‘A moment
comes, which comes but rarely in history, when we step out from the
old to the new, when an age ends and when the soul of a nation, long
suppressed, finds utterance’... ‘We end today a period of ill – fortune.’ (154-55)

Like Rushdie, his protagonist Saleem Sinai is also born on the eve of independence and the events of his life are closely connected to the events in the development of both India and Pakistan. Saleem becomes the notice of the whole country, experiencing the life and time of the multitudes, thereby becoming the symbol of Independent India.

Rushdie has a strong desire to restore his past identity, he uses magic realism for describing the important events that had happened in history. Saleem’s narrative gives all details about himself and his family members, especially the experiences of his grandfather provide a unique perspective to view the events during the period of India’s independence. Saleem’s life is a microcosm of post-Independent India. His attempt to reunite his various multiple identities reflects India’s struggle to reunite its multiplicity after colonial rule. Saleem reflects on the significance of India’s independence and recognize that postcolonial India is a unified nation that didn’t exist before. In the narrative build-up Saleem refers the aftermath of India’s independence:

a nation which had previously never existed [that] was about to win its freedom, catapulting us into a world which, although it had five thousand years of history, although it had invented the game of chess and traded with Middle Kingdom Egypt, was nevertheless quite imaginary; into a mythical land, a country which would never exist except by the efforts of a phenomenal will—except in a dream we all agreed to dream. (124)
Saleem’s story is half real, half dreamy and turns out to be the story of India with its painful moments due to colonization. The self - refluxing attitude of Saleem is clear from the beginning. He reflects with an element of nostalgic memories that is magical. He feels the inter-relation of his life with the history of modern India. He gets numerous historical events and dates mixed up in his narration to make him the centre of India’s history. He is always conscious of the fact that, “historical coincidence have littered, and perhaps befouled, my family existence in the world” (119). He finds history eagerly waiting for his arrival, when he says:

At the end of that January, history and finally by a series shoves, brought itself to the point at which it was almost ready form to make my entrance. There were mysteries that could not be cleared up until I stepped on the scene. (119)

The novel portrays India’s historical events after independence through Saleem’s familial and personal story. In the same way the story of his grandfather Aadam Aziz reflects the historical events of his personal stories in the pre independence period. The Jallianwala Bagh Massacre also known as Amritsar Massacre which Aadam Aziz participated was a brutal massacre that occurred on April 13, 1919 in the Indian city of Amritsar:

The largest compound in Amritsar is called Jallianwala Bagh. ... On April 13th, many thousands of Indians are crowding through this alleyway. ‘It is peaceful protest,’ someone tells Doctor Aziz. ... He arrives at the mouth of alley. ... He is, I know, felling very scared,
because his nose is itching worse than it ever has; but he is a trained
doctor, he puts it out of his mind, he enters the compound. (40)

This blending of history and fictional stories of Saleem and Aadam Aziz are
eamples of hybridity.

There are many instances in Midnight’s Children where Rushdie uses the
framework of magic realism. Saleem’s gift of having an incredible sense of smell
allowed him to find out emotions and thoughts of others, came from his
grandfather Aadam Aziz, who also had a large nose and the magical gift to judge
others mind. For example, Aadam’s sensitive nose ultimately saved him from
being killed in the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre. The sneeze of Aadam Aziz provides
a sense of humour and cheerfulness that distracted the violent attack of massacre:

... fifty men put down their machine-guns and go away. They have
fired a total of one thousand six hundred and fifty rounds into the
unarmed crowd. Of these, one thousand five hundred and sixteen
have found their mark, killing or wounding some person. (41-42)

Rushdie very beautifully plays with magic realism in such serious and realistic
incidents of history.

Like Rushdie, the characters in the novel attempt to solve the mystery of
their own identities. For example, Aadam Aziz becomes familiar with his future
wife, Naseem. He is allowed to examine her body through a singular hole in a
white perforated sheet. “So gradually Doctor Aziz came to have a picture of
Naseem in his mind, a badly-fitting collage of her severally-inspected parts. This
phantasm of a partitioned woman began to haunt him…” (22). In this way, Aadam
joins together the body of Naseem’s appearance. The perforated sheet is repeatedly
mentioned throughout the text to present the fragmented identities that Aadam Aziz attempts to solve it. Saleem and Aziz character brings out their experience with history at different period of time, which is hybridization.

In *Midnight’s Children*, the self-determinant fantasy of creating a new India depends upon Saleem’s key roles as an author, and national spokesman. Saleem is repeatedly damaged by his unreliable narrative with its biased truths and deviation. He is a mixture of many cultures and religions, born and raised by wealthy Muslim parents Ahmed Sinai and Amina, he is by birth the son of a low caste Hindu and Englishman. Saleem’s distractive blue eyes present his biological mistake, in real it links to his Kashmiri heritage, as well as his birthright from his English father. Saleem is therefore a hybrid a product of the Englishman William Methwold. Methwold seduced Vanita the wife of the street singer Wee Willie Winkie, who are the real parents of Saleem. Therefore, “I became the chosen child of midnight, whose parents were not his parents, whose son would not be his own…” (157). However, when the family discovers that Saleem is exchanged at birth with his midnight enemy Shiva, made no difference “it made no difference!” he exclaims. “In a kind of collective failure of imagination, we learned that we simply could not think our way out of our pasts” (137).

Therefore, Saleem is a hybrid of an Anglo-Indian. Padma exclaims with horror, “An Anglo? ...what are telling me? You are an Anglo-Indian?” (158). Saleem himself does not refuse the charge that he is an Anglo – Indian, leaving uncertain to the racial details of his birth. The narrative that repeatedly charges doubts on its own reliability, as the story of Vanita’s seduction by Williams
Methwold are never revealed. Thereby the question is whether Methwold is
Saleem’s biological father or not, Saleem tells:

…My inheritance includes this gift, the gift of inventing new parents
for myself whenever necessary. The gift of giving birth to fathers and
mothers… How many things peoples notions we bring with as into
the world, how many possibilities and also restrictions of
possibilities, Because all of these were the parents of the child born
that midnight and for every one of the midnight children there were
as many more. (144-45)

By upholding his place in the family, his naturalized birthright, Saleem reminds of
the unavoidable British legacy in India. Saleem is unconcerned with who his true
father is. The narrative of his life is spent not in finding out the origin of his birth,
but rather to know the increasing number of his origin. Therefore, Saleem is not an
heir of single parents, but he is a binary product of many. He stands in-between
East and West. His fathers are Ahmed Sinai, Wee Willie Winkie, William
Methwold, Nadir khan, Hanif Aziz, General Zulfikar and Picture Singh. They not
only represent racial or religious categories of India but also bring out the hybridity
between various classes present in India.

Saleem retells the history of India by public and private stories. They are
carefully linked and interdependent. Even before his actual birth, he is aware of the
historical dates and important events of history. His birth which is a private event
becomes public because of his mother’s announcement as “‘Listen well’ I am with
child. I am a mother who will have a child, and I am giving this man my shelter.
Come on now, if you want to kill, kill a mother also and show the world what men
you are!” (100). And the letter is sent by the Prime Minister stating that Saleem’s life is to be a mirror of public events, for India. Later Saleem describes himself as a “handcuffed to history” (3). All these events are personal, but in Saleem’s narrative they are made public to make the text fairy tale. Rushdie deliberately makes changes in the dates and events of history through his protagonist to make it a fairytale. He says: “I took to hiding myself, from an early age in my mother’s large white washing-chest; because although the creature was inside me ... I buried myself in fairy-tales” (210).

Rushdie is very particular that history should add some meaning to his novel. He says that, hence he is writing a fairy tale, he has made Saleem make mistakes deliberately in his narration through a weak memory. He constantly works to rebuild the traditional method of historical discussion and questions the notion of what history means. He attempts a new way of writing his own history. Saleem alters the facts of Indian history according to the listener’s interest:

- Does one error invalidate the entire fabric? Am I so far gone, in my desperate need for meaning that I’m prepared to distort everything-to re-write the whole history of my times purely in order to place myself in a central role? Today, in my confusion I can’t judge. I’ll have to leave it to others. For me, there can be no going back; I must finish what I’ve started, even if, inevitably, what I finish turns out not to be what I began. (230)

Saleem Sinai’s narrative position in the novel makes him central of hybridity. He self-consciously narrates his story with theatrical and literary devices. Saleem’s authorship and creation of his life’s narrative becomes inextricably linked to the...
Independence of India. As a postcolonial writer Rushdie makes Saleem choose his story and blend history according to his wish. Saleem as a character with the story and a participant in history changes the events of history for the growth of India’s maturity and individuality:

How in what terms, may the career of a single individual be said to impinge in the fate of a nation? I must answer in adverbs and hyphens: I was linked to history both literally and metaphorically both actively and passively. (228)

Saleem’s connection to history exists in four distinct forms: actively - literally, passively - metaphorically, actively - metaphorically and passively - literally. Saleem expands on the different categories: “By the combination of ‘active’ and ‘literal’ I mean, of course, all actions of main which directly literally, affected or altered the course of, seminal historical events” (331) and he defines the other categories as follows:

The union of ‘passive’ and ‘metaphorical’ encompasses all socio-political trends and events which, merely by existing, affected me metaphorically. … Next, ‘passive’ and ‘literal’, when hyphenated, cover all moments at which national events had a direct bearing upon the lives of myself and my family. … And finally there is the ‘mode’ of the ‘active – metaphorical’, which groups together those occasions on which things done by or to me were mirrored in the macrocosm of public affairs, and my private existence was shown to be symbolically at one with history. (331)
Saleem’s character affects the course of history in the active – literal mode. He also causes changes between the history of real life and the history of the fictional world. For example, the assassination date of Mahatma Gandhi is projected wrongly. Twenty pages later in the novel, upon reviewing his work, Saleem admits “Re-reading my work, I have discovered an error in chronology. The assassination of Mahatma Gandhi occurs, in these pages, on the wrong date. But I cannot say, now, what the actual sequence of events might have been” (230). The purpose of this deliberate mistake is to highlight the difference between history and fiction. Rushdie stresses the telling of this story as an act of creation or recreation from the mind and memory of Saleem. Although factually incorrect, his recollection of the date of the Mahatma’s death is very real and truthful and he is unable to change the reality. “In my India, Gandhi will continue to die at the wrong time” (230). Therefore Rushdie has changed history according to his wish, which is a characterization of hybridity.

Rushdie writes about Bombay to be the city built up by foreigners upon the domestic land and it is entirely Indian in spirit and sentiment. Gyan Prakash in “The Idea of Bombay” says about Bombay “as a city that we had heard of New York, Paris and London but they were foreign exotic places with no emotional resonance for us. Bombay on the other hand was our own a part of India” (3). The setting of Bombay in the novel has various forms of hybridity. Bombay is a city that embodies multiplicity in diversity. Bombay’s history expressed by Saleem in the novel explains the process of Indian colonization by the various Europeans such as Portuguese and British. Bombay plays a central role in the Indian independent movement. The city with its religious diversity, social
caste differences and multiplicity illustrate the struggles of forming a postcolonial identity.

Bombay became a major centre of shipbuilding textiles and manufacturing. The people of Bombay became the hero of the postcolonial nation because of their efforts on business and law. Trading communities from Hindus and Muslims played an important role for the development of the city. The city becomes the sources of hybridity as Muslims, Sikhs, Hindus and Christians lived together. Bombay’s massive population with various religious and social backgrounds brings out the hybrid concept to present the theme of hybridity. Saleem comes from middle class Muslim family, “ayah” Mary Pereira is a Christian family and Shiva is a Hindu comes from an extremely poverty family, that echoes the religious and social diversity in the city. Saleem begins his narration from the city of Bombay “I was born in the city of Bombay…once upon a time” (3) that illustrates the hybridity between his birth and independence of India. Saleem claims Bombay as his story’s setting and his own place of origin, his birthplace. In introducing his birth at Bombay made Saleem comfortable, but the time portrayed by him was uncomfortable for the characters to believe. The novel describes the origin of Bombay and illustrates the city’s evolutions and changes. Saleem describes the first setters of the city:

The fishermen were here first…at the dawn of time, when Bombay was a dumb-bell-shaped island tapering, at the centre, to a narrow shinning strand beyond which could be seen the finest and largest natural…fish lover of us all. …There were. …may well have become the city’s. (121-22)
These ancient images of Bombay show how India remained a conquered land throughout its history with the “Kolis” arriving first on Bombay’s shores, than by Portuguese and British. This illustrates the multiplicity of the people of Bombay and their theatricality as an authentic Indian citizen with diversity. Portuguese and British illustrated their power by shifting the city’s association with “the benign residing influence of the goddess Mumbadevi, whose name-Mumbadevi, Mumbabai, Mumbai-may well have become the city’s” (122). Even after independence, Bombay remains connected with the British in trading. The final change in power to India from British as a change occurred in the “dominion” of Bombay: “in August 1947, the British, having ended the dominion of fishing-nets, coconuts, rice and Mumbadevi, were about to depart themselves; no dominion is everlasting” (124).

The role of multiple parentages in Saleem’s life is a good example of hybridity. Switched by Mary Pereira at birth and raised by parents that are not biologically his own. He says

> Even a baby is faced with the problem of defining itself; and I’ am bound to say that my early popularity had its problematic aspects, because I was bombarded with a confusing multiplicity of views on the subjects. (178)

Like Rushdie, who is a product of multiple nations such as India, Pakistan and England, Saleem sorts his own multiple identities. Rushdie made Saleem meet the multiple diverse peoples in the city of Bombay and bring out the multiple in his narration and to create new story from those stories.
*Midnight’s Children* as a postcolonial novel depicts Nehru’s vision of modern India, where the family attempts to welcome hybridity in religion, caste, language and ethnicity in order to modernize India. Nehru offered that India will be a model for the entire nation where the children may settle in peace. He exhorted the Assembly to “build the noble mansion of free India, where all her children may dwell” (647). Rushdie changes the metaphor through Saleem, towards the end where he compares his son to India’s future. He says:

All in good time, they will trample my son who is not my son, and his son who will not be his, his who will not be his, until the thousand and first generation, until, a thousand and one midnights have bestowed their terrible gifts and a thousand and one children have died, because it is the privilege and the curse of midnight’s children to be both masters and victims of their times, to forsake privacy, and be sucked into the annihilating whirlpool of the multitudes, and to be unable to live or die in peace. (647)

Saleem reflects the relationship between the reader, narrator and nation. The meaning and narrative pleasure depends upon the alignment of the narrators with postcolonial India. The metaphor is created through the family epic of content and structure of Saleem’s life story. When Saleem announces at the beginning of the novel, “I must work fast, faster than Scheherazade, if I am to end up meaning--yes, meaning-something” (4) to achieve the modern vision of Nehru, but towards the end he finds he was unable to achieve it therefore he predicts that Aadam, the infant he raises as his son, will continue to work:
was a member of a second generation of magical children who would grow up to be far tougher than the first, not looking for their fate in the prophecy of the stars, but forging it in the implacable furnaces of their wills. (534)

Rushdie observes the future of India through Aadam Sinai. He wishes the city of Bombay to be peace and live with harmony.

Rushdie uses migration, rootlessness, searching for identity, mixing of various religions in the city of Bombay, blending of East and West, magical elements presented in the Midnight Children’s Conference, telepathy scene, deliberate change of dates in history and multitude in the mind of Saleem, all these elements bring out the concept of hybridity that has been used in this novel.

Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children* describes hybridity of Indian history and the idea has been shifted to Pakistan in his next novel *Shame*. As *Midnight’s Children* mythologizes a new independent nation with hope and dream, *Shame* mythologizes the acts of shame and shamelessness of another new nation called Pakistan, which was created by partition of Indian subcontinent. This new nation divided people from people, resulting in physical and moral scars on individuals, families, neighbourhoods, towns and cities. Pakistan was a part of India when India got its independence from the British Empire in 1947. In 1971 the partition took place, by dissociation of Pakistan and Bangladesh from India. Rushdie’s family migrated from India to Pakistan. This novel describes his dislike about the politics in Pakistan.

The narrator describes the origin of Pakistan. He observes: “To build Pakistan it was necessary to cover up Indian history, to deny that Indian centuries
lay just beneath the surface of Pakistan Standard Time. The past was rewritten; there was nothing else to be done” (87). According to the narrator’s view, there is no true history; history can be rewritten according to his wish. But the problem arises in writing it; he says:

As for me: I, too, like all migrants, am a fantasist. I build imaginary countries and try to impose them on the ones that exist. I, too, face the problem of history: What to retain, What to dump, how to hold on to what memory insists on relinquishing. (87)

The narrator has gathered certain facts from the past history and made it a fantasy to describe Raza Hyder’s victory in the battle of “Aansu” very effectively. He just mentions Hyder’s drive away to the battle field, and at once gives, “an extract from the family’s saga of Raza and Bilquis, given in the formulaic words” and the legend begins: “When we heard that our Razzoo had pulled off an attacking coup so daring...” (78).

The mingling of fantasy and history is clearly commented by Rushdie: “By now, if I had been writing a book of this nature, it would have done me no good to protest that I was writing universally, not only about Pakistan... Fortunately, however, I am telling a sort of modern fairytale, so that’s all right ...” (70). The policy that the narrator adopts to overcome the natural problems is to change history according to his wish, by replacing realism with surrealism.

The protagonists of the novel Iskander Harrappa and Raza Hyder are modelled on the real powerful political personality of Zulfikhar Ali Bhutto and the General Zia Ul Haq in Pakistan’s history. The backdrop of the main story is the political history of Pakistan, where the leaders control the needs of the people for
their own purposes. Iskandar Harappa rises to power and falls suddenly and Raza Hyder made use of the opportunity and became cause of Harappa’s death.

Rushdie recreates the major strands of the contemporary history of Pakistan, where politics is a kind of family quarrel. He tells the story of a very small group of people who are responsible for the making of history. The centre of power is peripheral figure of the novel Omar Khayyam Shakil, the hero of the novel and Sufiya Zinobia the heroine of the novel who symbolizes the literal way of Pakistan. However, there is another figure, the narrator himself who emphasises his own marginal status, as a loose symbol for Pakistan, in aligning himself with the other peripheral figures of the novel, inaugurates an imaginative coalition between himself and them. The narrator conflates himself with his hero Omar Khayyam Shakil and points out that he was not very popular in his native Persia but existed in the West “in a translation that reality is a complete reworking of his verses” (29).

Like Saleem Sinai, the narrator being universal at the centre of all things and claims the authority to speak about Pakistan. The narrator’s expression of Pakistan’s misfortune is marked by a keen consciousness of his own intrusion into the original affairs. He also examines the problematic nature of all languages and specific difficulties in speaking English. A protestor shouts:

Outsider! Trespasser! You have no right to this subject! … I know nobody ever arrested me. Nor are they ever likely to Poacher! Pirate!

We reject your authority. We know you, with your foreign language wrapped around you like a flag: speaking around us in your forked tongue. What can you tell but lies? I reply with more questions! is
Rushdie uses English with awareness that it is an ambiguous choice for a writer to choose the language of imperialism to his own wish. The choice of language indicates the audience for whom the writer writes. Rushdie chooses English to write his novels as English in India has a moreprivileged position than in other postcolonial countries. Rushdie legitimatizes the spoken language by reflecting the Indianization of English. Rushdie’s dialects and phrases are often fictional work like angrez for an Englishman, babuji for a clerk or semi-anglicized intellectual and bewaqoof for an idiot or fool. His option of words from Hindi and English brings out his rights as a postcolonial writer, mingling the concept of hybridity.

The narrator in Shame represents himself to be an appropriate narrator of Pakistan’s post-colonial history. As an immigrant he brings out his migrant status and the status of Pakistan and India. “I, too, know something of this immigrant business. I am an emigrant from one country (India) and a newcomer in two (England, where I live, and Pakistan, to which my family moved against my will)” (85). When he describes the status of Pakistan: “When individuals come unstuck from their native land, they are called migrants. When nations do the same (Bangladesh), that act is called secession; ... I may be such a person. Pakistan may be such a country” (86). The term “Pakistan’ is an acronym, was originally thought up in England by a group of Muslim intellectuals” (86). Pakistan, in other words was “dreamt” into being by “Muslim” intellectuals located in England.
“P for the Punjabis, A for Afghans, K for the Kashmiris, S for Sind and the ‘tan’ for Baluchistan” (87) brings peoples under this double secession of hybridity. The rewritten past of Pakistan by the immigrants proved to be a failure of the dreaming mind. Rushdie is not sure for the cause

Perhaps the pigments used were the wrong one … a picture full of irreconcilable elements, midriff baring immigrant saris versus demure, indigenous Sindhi, Shalwar – Kurtas, Urdu versus Punjabi, now versus then: a miracle that went wrong. (87)

Therefore, he is tempted to give his fairyland a title namely “Peccavistan” from the word paccavi meaning “I have sind”. He says “‘Peccavi’. I have Sind. I’m tempted to name my looking-glass Pakistan in honour of this bilingual (and fictional, because never really uttered) pun. Let it be Peccavistan” (87).

As Rushdie, his narrator is also located in England. As a writer “the job of re–writing [Pakistan’s] history” was “commandeered,” first by “the immigrants, the mohajirs. “Who commandeered the job of rewriting history? - The immigrants, the mohajirs. In what language? - Urdu and English both imported tongues” (87). The narrator suggests that separating Pakistan is an act of past that formed as “a palimpsest on the past,” thereby “obscur[ing] what lies beneath.” By rewriting history Rushdie and his narrator insisted on their tripartite of being an Indian, Pakistani and British. A multiple hybrid dislocations of Rushdie are clearly stated in “The Indian Writer in England” that he “is not will to be excluded from any part of his heritage” (87). He is like the mohajirs, who demanded that Pakistan’s history should be rewritten, be imposed, that of the previous Indian history. He undertakes to sallow up what lies beneath just as the mohajirs suppressed the
histories of Pakistan. The “suppressed history” includes “excluded” histories of women in a traditional patriarchal history.

But Rushdie and the narrator claims to be writing an alternate oppositional history. For example studying the occurrence of “*purdah*” in the patriarchal Islam society is more traditional. The word “*purdah*” has two distinct meanings. One is physical, in the sense of women wearing a veil or burqa to cover their faces from public view; the other is more complex where women live in seclusion, both from men and from the sphere of civic and public action. One might be in “*purdah*” for both ways, and still they are in control of the individual and public affairs, as the Islam tradition says that women should be behind mask and net screen. Similarly, one might not be in “*purdah*” and yet could be habitually influenced by “*purdah*” culture and this is the aspect of the postcolonial writers. Rushdie’s *Shame* starts with an impending death that highlights the negative aspects of “*purdah*” culture. His statement is that society need not overlook “*purdah, *” not only because it oppresses women but because such oppression unleashed a violence that will destroy all the society. As he says in *Shame* it “humiliates people for long enough and a wildness bursts out of them” (117)

*Shame* is a politically charged novel because it presents “*a mohajirs eye view*”. Rushdie’s family came as *mohajirs* to Pakistan; therefore *mohajirs* is an Arabic word referring to separation and migration. Exclusively the word *mohajir* is used to denote the figure of the Muslim migrant and it is not applied to the Hindu and Sikh populations. The narrator seems to privilege the *mohajir*, who is like Omar Khayyam, the novel’s dizzy peripheral hero culturally positioned at “The Rim of Things”. Omar’s loyal hesitates from the origin towards the end and the
choice of shame and shamelessness reflects the mohajir’s. Rushdie as a mohajir repeats the political scope as an Angezi or English brings out his multiple position as a hybrid. Rushdie situates the diasporic condition in a Pakistani context because it fictionally allows him to return to a place of reality and to write about the socio – political fabric of the nation. He used the magic realist way of narrating the real picture of Pakistan. He writes “the country in this story is not Pakistan or not quite” (29) or “I may be such a person. Pakistan may be such a country” (87).

Rushdie blends the native tongue with English and adds new dimensions of beauty and charm to his style of narration that marks him to be one of the most successful postcolonial writers. Narrator’s feeling is often brought out with “plaintosee” and the characters go on asking “don’tyouthinkso”. Even a feeling of lost by a character is aptly embedded in “wheream I;” all these words become the typical aspects of Rushdie’s writing. The use of ambiguity highlights him to be a postcolonial writer. He states:

To unlock a society look at its untranslatable words. Takallouf is a member of that opaque, world - wide sect of concepts which refuse to travel across linguistic frontiers: it refers to a form of tongue – typing formality, a social restraint so extreme as to make it impossible for the victim to express what he or she really means, as species of compulsory irony which insists for the sake of good form, on being taken literally. (104).

Through words which are unique and do not find equivalents in a foreign languages used in a country reflects its society’s needs and ways of living. Along with English, Urdu serves as a local language to express the society of Pakistan.
English as a universal language used in Pakistan cannot be avoided. The languages used in Pakistan are good example of creating a hybrid, where two or more cultures influence one another to produce something new.

Certain untranslated words also came as the fusion of East and West and has an Indianized ending such as “Customswallahs” which shatters all the glamour of a customs officer’s job and gives it a tinge of serving the sahib. And certain words have been abrogated:

Bilquis Hyder’s head whirled. Trapped in a language which contained a quite specific name for each conceivable relative, so that the bewildered new – comer was unable to hide behind such generic appellations as ‘uncle’, ‘cousin’, ‘aunt’, but was continually caught out in all her insulting ignorance. Bilquis’s tongue was silenced by the in – law mob. (75)

By way of gathering the essential linguistic peculiarities, Rushdie makes use of literal translation of words such as “sister fucker”, spellings for “biskuits”, idioms like “allowing their necks to meet”, unique word combinations as “black hair; shifting, shifting,” etc. for understanding bitterly.

As a postcolonial text the native realities get subsumed in the realities of the west and it becomes very difficult to rise above the throttling of values. So magical realism as a tool with its support in fantasy becomes a solution to restore history. Rushdie attempts to study the rise and fall of many true and imagined events in history. The fall of Bhutto on one hand and on the other hand he seeks Khayyam, Hyder, Babar and rest to restore their life.
Hyder and Babar were the glorious rulers of the Mughal dynasty whereas the character of Harappa brings out the make–up of modern day sin that lies in the Islamic pre-colonial period. Timothy Brennan in “Salman Rushdie and the third world: Myths of the Nation” feels that the history in Shame “is a history filtered through the ambitious self–images of its protagonists – the history they in effect ‘try on’ to inflate their importance” (53).

The story of the novel blends with the story of Shakil sisters in the form of magic realism. The mingling of the western culture to the Indian culture is reflected in the party, after their father’s death. Shakil sisters came to know after their father’s death that his enormous debts had been covered behind the wall of the patriarchal society. In settling the accounts, they lost all the vast estates around “Q.”. Only the unmanageable infinite mansion of Nishapur was left to them. In their abhorrence for their father they threw a party to celebrate his death and their financial ruin. Invitations embossed in gold were issued to only a few local non–white Zamindars and their wives and mostly to the “Angrez Sahibs” and “their gloved begums!”:

... sisters had committed the ultimate solecism: invitations, scorning the doormats of the indigenous worthies, had found their way into the Angrez Cantonment, and into the ballroom of the dancing sahibs. ... the sisters were visited by a uniformed and ball-gowned crowd of foreigners. The imperialists! – the gray–skinned sahibs and their gloved begums! – raucous–voiced and glittering with condescension, they entered the mirror worked marquee. ‘Alcohol was served’. (15-16)
Rushdie calls them the imperialists. It was a wild night with flowing alcohol and western style, music and dance as an influence of the western culture reflects hybridity.

The dialectic of shame and shamelessness is symbolically entwined with the power struggles of Bhutto and Zia via Iskander Harappa and Raza Hyder. Arjumand Harappa the daughter of Iskander described famously as “Virgin Ironpants” (107) is loosely modelled on Benezir Bhutto. The first Prime Minister of Bangladesh, Sheikh Mujib and General Yahya Khan are models for the character of President Shaggy Dog and Sheikh Bismillah respectively. Robert EMC Dowell writes in “World Literature Today” for instance:

Salman Rushdie has attempted in *Shame* to illuminate Pakistan’s hideous political realities in an extravagant satire in which Raza acts out the role of the Pakistani General Zia-ul- Haq, while Iskander (Harappa) represents the deposed (and later executed) head of state, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. But one might fairly ask how many readers will know enough of the inside details of these men’s lived and of the grim events of the new nation of Pakistan to appreciate a satire on them. (328)

In the conflict between Raza Hyder and Iskander Harappa for leadership brings out the true history of Pakistan. Hyder is appointed to guard the gas fields against the local tribes. He obtains a military conquest and enjoys a meteoric rise; as a result a martial law is imposed; thereby he becomes the administrator. Raza ruthlessly sends the prisoner to be hanged, that ultimately led him to his downfall. He was demoted from his position as a minister to a commander in the military
training unit. As the successor of Raza Hyder, his cousin Little Mir Harappa prompts Iskander Harappa to be the minister. Raza was angry for leaving his power and behaved wickedly to his way of living. Subsequently his immoral crony Omar and his mistress Pinkie Aurangzab made him unfit to his political agenda.

D.C.R.A Goonetilleke in “Salman Rushdie” observes:

Isky, like Bhutto, is self – contradictory man, the scion of an enormously wealthy landowning family (the surname Harappa is double appropriate because the site of the Harappan civilization borders Bhutto’s family estate in the sind province), patrician, Westernized, yet he adopts a populist manner to succeed as a politician – rhetorical speeches, bad language, and histrionics. (58)

The entire story of *Shame* is about Raza Hyder and Chairman Iskander Harappa and the surprising marriage of Sufiya Zinobia to Omar Khayyam Shakil. The climax reaches with the hanging of the chairman Iskander Harappa. Rushdie sums up his destiny, “six years in power, two in jail, and eternity underground” (225-226). Iskander Harappa’s daughter Arjumand later recollects the power through elections which was not straight forward. “How could they be in that country divided into two wings a thousand miles apart, sundered by the land mass its greatest foe, joined by nothing but God” (178). The creation of nationalism in Pakistan was made through the burden of laws by the leaders, without considering the people. The political scenario is fictionalized in the figures of Harappa and Hyder, similar to the relationship between Zia and Bhutto.

The relationship between Bhutto and Pakistan is similar to the marriage of Omar to Sufiya. Through marriage Omar ultimately reinforces his power over
Sufiya and through election Arjumand reinforces her power. In history it was Bhutto who reinforced power through elections. Sufiya and Omar are polar opposites; they are married in spite of their huge difference in age. The incident that brings them together is interesting to explore. Sufiya is put in the hospital during a life – threatening illness under Omar’s care. The disease is of vaccinated origin, “a hot flush spread from scalp to the soles of her feet” (234), brought by Sufiya upon herself as a “plague of shame.” Omar seems to be the right consultant to treat her not only because he is a vaccinated person, but also because he is one with no shame, the best treatment of shame being the shameless. By marrying Sufiya, Omar saved and redeem her from shame.

Rushdie has exposed how shame becomes a part in the construction of a society, where several people grow upon “a diet of honour and shame” (115) within them, “But shame is like everything” (116) that has to be rejected in order to understand each other. Studying upon the nature of rejection of shame in between men and women is highly misdirected because women are only products of male shamelessness. Sufiya is a picture of the treatment that women receive in Pakistan.

Raza Hyder’s only misery is his home, as one daughter commits suicide and the other becomes an uncontrollable monster, who is able to tear both people and animals. His political acts of shame ultimately lead to his wife’s suicide and his own miserable end, which he had planned for chairman Harappa. Sufiya Zinobia is perhaps the most powerful character Rushdie has created. He had created her with many stories of vampires and folktales of ghost. She is seen as an embodiment of evil or ghost perpetrated by the leadership of the nation, especially
by her own father. Just like Saleem Sinai in *Midnight’s Children* personify India’s independence and who is responsible for the control of a nation, Sufiya personifies Pakistan, but she is controlled by her father. The author narrator gives three incidents that he had heard about London that was responsible for the creation of Sufiya Zinobia.

*Shame* is a reflection on gender politics. Society sees that Sufiya becomes seriously ill, develops right to fight for her rights and privileges. Narrator’s imagination goes beyond the communal possibility, when Sufiya becomes illogical and destroys men, fields, animals and finally murders her husband, the peripheral hero, Omar Khayyam Shakil. Sufiya Zinobia, an outcaste from ordinary society, moves into a world of fantasy and make believe. Magical realism seems to explain the reality of a postcolonial environment because of two separate realities which are relevant and neither of which is completely accurate or work simultaneously. They demonstrate the magical realism has a hybrid nature. The double side of Hyder and the bending character of Sufiya Zinobia bring out the hybridization presented in the novel.

Rushdie included the fantastic elements without showing surprise that these elements are present in the novel. And in this casual manner that magical realism finds strength as a tool of social criticism tool. Issues from people’s daily life are presented as something very ordinary. The hybridity in the character of Omar Khayyam as a doctor and a husband is revealed in his treatment he gives to Sufiya. As a doctor he finds out that it is “a hypnotic trance the subject can require what seems like superhuman strength Pain is not felt, arms become as strong as iron bar,
feet run like the wind. Extraordinary thing”. As a husband he treats her “I shall watch her closely;” “there is a possible treatment” (234).

The novel is actually based on the rude corruptions of an oppressive nature of two rulers, Raza Hyder and Harappa whose fictional images portray their real identity. For example, the quintessence of Zia’s method of governance-Islamization-cannot be messed in this dictate:

But the third reason is that these are laws, my dear fellow, which we have plucked out of the wind. These are the holy words of God, as revealed in sacred texts. Now if they are holy words of God, they cannot also be barbaric. It is not possible. They must be some other thing. (245)

Rushdie gives a semi-invisible representation of the misdeed of the two controlling rulers of Pakistan. The most interesting is that, there is no basic fundamental difference between the attitudes of the military dictators and the civilian. The self-confessed portion of the conversation, as the narrator says, “I am forced to reflect that world in fragments of broken mirrors” (69) pictures the symbolic characters. While mirroring the criminalities of the two dictatorial manners, Rushdie has excluded the day to day suffering of the common people. Perhaps in excluding the details, he seeks to focus on the socio – political aspect of the misdeeds under the dictator’s rule. The close correspondence between history and fiction is further strengthened by the representation of major events in the careers of the protagonists Raza:

‘Take over a government and you don’t know your pricks from your sticks’. The opposition had never accepted the election results. ...
Army was sent to fire on civilians. ... Arjumand Harappa tempted fate. ... General Hyder was at first reluctant of move... falling with him. On the morning after the coup Raza Hyder appeared on national television. He was kneeling on a prayer-mat, holding his ears and reciting Quranic verses; then he rose from his devotions to address the nation. This was the speech in which the famous term ‘Operation Umpire’ was first heard by the people. (223)

Through a postcolonial interpretation, Rushdie encourages his western audience to view the life of Pakistan.

    The narrator’s tale is one that insists on “excavating what lies beneath” the histories of Pakistan’s intellectual and political leadership suppress or exclude. Narrator’s fairy tale distorts the official truth only to draw “better maps of reality” (100). Thus *Shame’s* “anti-history” is about Raza Hyder and Iskander Harappa. Rushdie depths his truth against the “politicians” version and his fabulous tale gives the lie to the official truth. This artistic journey through myth and fable has been marked by awareness to produce a mythic Pakistan. Fabulous story of a mythic land called Pakistan is imposed upon the actually history of Pakistan.

    The paradox lies in the fact that the “Military dictators, venal civilians, corrupt civil servants brought judges,” are the pale, phantom images of the “exclusion” of Pakistan’s official history, caricatures of real life personalities. In juxtaposing the real with the fantastic, Rushdie presents the “anti-history” of Pakistan. Unlike conventional history that describes the golden ages and glorious conquests, the novel describes the real events and its tragedies about Pakistan.
Rushdie is aware of his limitation in respect to real country called Pakistan. He dreams and imagines a postcolonial, theocratic state called Pakistan and connects the mythic land with the “new moth nibbled land of god.” Thus, *Shame* is a real document of the postcolonialist as well as a myth of the nation. The theme of the text is mainly the colonial determination of modernity, the corruptions of post colonialist and myths of the nation and separation of India.

*The Moor’s Last Sigh* is another version of *Midnight’s Children* that used unbelievable fantastic family history to retell the story of modern India. The novel is a family saga with the family chart of the birth and death of the Da Gama and Zogoiby families. It is a novel about the Indian history told from the perspective of minorities rather than the Hindu or Islamic Indians. The spreading of western rationalism, during the nineteenth century was the major event of independent movement until the progressive vision of Nehru. This modern vision of Nehru was destroyed by the Emergency rule of Indira Gandhi. Indira Gandhi’s unacceptable Emergency period of nationalism was replaced by obsessive people of India, who violently destroyed whatever they regard as non-Hindu. Thereby the Jews who were considered to be a non Hindu have become the rootless Moraes and symbol of India’s helpless minorities. The narrator has become a homeless emigrant representing the Jews.

Rushdie’s first full length post fatwa novel *The Moor’s Last Sigh*, presents clearly the form of nostalgic tale about a fallen empire. The sigh refers to the last Nasrid King who handed over the keys of Alhambra to the conquering Catholic Monarchs of Spain- Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile.
It was four and a half centuries old, the last crown to fall from the head of the last prince of al-Andalus; nothing less than the crown of Granada, as worn by Abu Abdallah, last of the Nasrids, known as ‘Boabdil.’ (79)

The major part of the novel is a Jewish – Indian, Moreas Zogoiby the protagonist, who tells about the family quarrel, disloyalty, disillusioned artists, caste politics and communal violence. The major theme presented in the novel is the migration of the Jew from Spain to India and returning to Spain from India, the novel starts at Spain and ends at Spain.

_The Moor’s Last Sigh_ portrays the local culture and tradition of the Indian traders before independence. Rushdie’s fiction has come to stand for the writing of postcolonial literature that brings together the peaceful textual spirit of the trader culture, with the historical and political struggles. It is a text with self-consciousness that is constructed from a multiple of hybridity. Rushdie reintroduces a sense of political and historical content in the creation of the novel. While engaging in a process of self – revision, his fiction often seems to predicate the needs to revise and to reassemble his narratives on English and European tradition. The title not only invokes the end of the Granadan Islamic rule but also brings the end of the Cordoban courts that are familiar to the western audience. This brings out Rushdie’s multiplicity to understand the world and accept the world with hybridity.

_The Moor’s Last Sigh_ portrays Bombay as the place of love and art than with the national political events like _Midnight’s Children_. The novel is a pessimistic updating of Indian political history, chronicling the rise of corruption and Hindu fundamentalism at Bombay. Multidimensional portrayal of Bombay as
the centre of globalization in India is highly portrayed by Rushdie in this novel. Aurora’s painting brings out the idea of multitude in choosing her character from the city of Bombay. She sketches the day to day lives of the people of Bombay. She goes among them as the “unblinking lizard on the wall of history, watching, watching, watching” and dreaming (131-32). She is a “social realist” artist. “She returned day after day to her chosen scenes, and in slow steps the magic works, people stopped noticing her; they as a house and even had curtains over its windows, and allowed the truth of their lives to return to their faces” (130).

*The Moor’s Last Sigh* tells the complicated history of a Christian – Jewish family in India. Moraes’s father, Abraham Zogoiby is a South-Indian Jew, who claims descent from Spain when the last Moorish King Sultan Boabdil of Granada was driven out by the Catholic armies. And his mother Aurora da Gama was the last in the prosperous Portuguese family of Vasco da Gama. “CHRISTIANS, PORTUGUESE AND JEWS: Chinese tiles promotion godless views; pushy ladies, skirts- nor- saris, Spanish shenanigans, Moraesish crowns... can this really be India?” (87). Moraes and his father represent the three major western influences of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. He is the last survivor of a family descended from Vasco da Gama, therefore Moraes is half Jewish and half Christian narrator. The hybridization of globalization is been presented from his birth.

*The Moor’s Last Sigh* envisions shift from traditional to globalization, specifically through Aurora’s painting. She attempts to imagine a world where there is no insider and outsider issues, to separate or to prevent an individual from interacting with each other. In her painting, she creates a world with nationality; there are no boundaries and divisions among the countries. She is attempting to
create “one universe, one dimension, one country, one dream” where people and creatures of all types walk the beach together without boundaries, divisions and margins in her paintings:

‘This seaside, this hill, with the fort on top. Water-gardens and hanging gardens, watchtowers and towers of silence too. Place where worlds collide, flow in and out of out another, and wash off away. Place where an air-man can drown in water, or else grow gills; where a water-creature can get drunk, but also choke off, on air. One universe, one dimension, one country, one dream, bump ing into another, or being under, or on top of. Call it Palimpstine. And above it all, in the palace,…’. (226)

Rushdie describes Aurora’s painting of Moraes as a hybrid form of painting. The word “Moor” is connected with two paintings made by two different painters. The first is the painting of Aurora Zogoiby and secondly, an artist paints over or repainted the famous sigh. In Aurora’s painting, she mingles the various multi-cultural characters within a single painting “an attempt to create a romantic myth of the plural, hybrid nation; she was using Arab Spain to re – imagine India” (227). Aurora’s major paintings chronologically trace her development as an artist and the progression of her ideas of a globalized world. She re – envisions India, where people are co-operative and collaborative with diverse in culture, just like Alhambra capital of Spain, was in the times of Boabdil. Rushdie stresses the various religions presented in Aurora’s painting as a form of hybridity: he says “Aurora Zogoiby was seeking to paint a golden age. Jews, Christians, Muslims,
Parsis, Sikhs, Buddhists, Jains crowded into her paint – Boabdil’s fancy – dress balls” (227).

Rushdie interweaves Indian and Spanish history throughout the novel. Moraes’s Grandmother Isabella Souza in nicknamed Queen Isabella and even credited with her own form of “reconqista” (43-44). The Jewish ancestors of Abraham Zogoiby had came to India during the Christianization of Spain. According to family myth, the Indian Zogoibys are descended from Boabdil. Rushdie’s fascination with Spain and Spanish history turns him as a model of a multicultural society “the fabulous multiple cultural of ancient al - Andalus” (398). He wishes the post independent India to be like that of the multi-cultural nation of Spain. India faced multi-cultural problems during the transformation of the Muslimism rulers to the Christian and Jewish.

_The Moor’s Last Sigh_ represents “an elegy for a lost age,” says Paul Canter in “Tales of the Alhambra: Rushdie’s use of Spanish History in _The Moor’s Last Sigh_.” He also says that “for an era where different religions, culture and ethnicities could have existed as palimpsest as they did in Arab Spain four and half centuries ago” (323), whereas Rushdie tries to create a super hybridity of Moorish Spain and Mughal India as the architectural styles of the two cultural fuses in Aurora artistic vision: “The Alhambra quickly become a not – quite – Alhambra; elements of Indian’s own red forts the Mughal place – for tresses in Delhi and Agra, blinded Mughal Splendors with the Spanish buildings Moor’s grace” (226). Paul Cantor also states:

In the dream of different cultures merging into a larger unity attracts Rushdie to Spanish history. Moorish Spain appears to have solved the
problem that has figuratively and literally torn India apart in the
twentieth century. Religious conflicts between Hindus and Muslims
led to the division of the subcontinent into India and Pakistan and
later to the splitting off of Bangladesh but even within contemporary
Indian product tension that periodically erupt into murderous
violence. (324)

The Emergence of “anti – democratic political leaders,” the alarming of
Hindu nationalism and the global market economy have shattered the democratic
secularist vision that Gandhi and Nehru had for India after independence. Rushdie
strongly protested the assumption of Indira Gandhi’s emergency powers in 1975
for the rise of nationalism and globalization, but it has resulted in people’s
separation, “After the Emergency people started seeing through different eyes.
Before the Emergency we were Indians. After it we were Christian Jews” (235).
Rushdie’s Moorish Spain offers a historical alternative to the miserable vision of
religious violence. Moorish rule lasted nearly eight centuries in Spain and during
much of their period Muslims, Christians, and Jews were able to live together in
peace and harmony and encourage each other for their greater cultural
achievements. Even though Moorish Spain was separated by architecture,
astronomy, medicine, mathematics, music, literature and philosophy, they have
achieved their goal and became superior in the cultural development in Europe.
The complex interaction of Islamic and Jewish philosophers in Moorish Spain is a
good example of the fruitful hybrid nature of the culture. Atef Laouyene in
“Andalusian Poetics: Rushdie’s The Moor’s Last Sigh and the Limits of Hybridity”
states:
Andalusian history and India’s national narrative in *The Moor’s Last Sigh* is less nostalgia for an exotic and lost Golden Age, as many Rushdie critics have suggested, than an attempt to map out the limits of postcolonial hybridity as an empowering subject position (145).

In spite of the historical accuracy, it points out the cultural politics of diaspora that provides an index to the study of hybridity. The Emergency rule in India turns the Moraes and his family from Indian into Christian-Jews. As Dohra Ahmad in “This Fundo Stuff is Really Something New: Fundamentalism and Hybridity in *The Moor’s Last Sigh*” puts it “Indian Jews represent the ultimate test of the category of Indianness to absorb diverse subjects. … Jews are important both in their own right, and also as symbolic of a more generalized minority existence in India” (4).

Through the identification of the narrator, Moraes and his family have a connective metaphor towards family tales of subjectivity and national identity. In the novel’s postcolonial India, the family metaphor attempts to show a difference in religion, caste, language and ethnicity in order to reach globalization. Moraes towards the end of the novel dies with the hope that the world will regain its peace and harmony and he will awake and enjoy it in future:

I will rest, and hope for peace. The world is full of sleepers waiting for their moment of return: ... I’ll drink some wine; and then, like a latter-day Van Winkle, I’ll lay me down upon this graven stone, lay my head beneath these letters R I P, and close my eyes, according to our family’s old practice of falling asleep in times of trouble, and hope to awaken, renewed and joyful, into a better time. (433-34)
The novel portrays Rushdie’s double exiled position at national and the individual level. His dialectical interrelationship between the author, narrative and the nationality has been brought out in the novel. The narrative pleasure of the novel depends upon the placement of the narrator with postcolonial India and its allegory is built through content and structure of the family epic. Moraes the son of a Christian mother and Jewish father represents the minority perspective. Rushdie brings out the political history of India from the Moorish invaders to the Emergency period of Indira Gandhi. Rushdie says the Christian Jews enjoyed the rights in the pre-colonial India where as in present, they are treated ill. As a magic realist text, Rushdie makes it a place to create and recreate the potential beauty and harmony of the aesthetic India in the multiple form of hybridity. Timothy Brennan, one of Rushdie’s most passionate critics in “Cosmopolitans and Celebrities” reads Rushdie’s semantic and textual hybridity as a choice of cosmopolitanism over political action. He says:

[P]ropelled and defined by media and market, cosmopolitanism today involves not so much an elite at home, as it does spokespersons for a kind of perennial immigration, valorized by a wandering, and rife with allusions to the all – seeing eye of the nomadic sensibility. (2)

Rushdie’s playful satirical writing is evidence to hybridity. His style of language, form and allusion remains authentic even after the narration of the genealogies or family saga. In Rushdie’s novel hybridity is loaded with self-conscious inferences of the colonial relationship of India. In *The Moor’s Last Sigh*, the story of India is told by a descendant of the last Moorish Sultan, the literal and
aesthetic references to the decline of the Moorish empire make the fictional tale more unusual.

Mine is the story of the fall from grace of a high-born cross-breed: me, Moreas Zogoiby, called ‘Moor’, for most of my life the only male heir to the spice-trade-‘n’-big-business crores of the da Gama-Zogoiby dynasty of Cochin, and of my banishment from what I had every right to think of as my natural life by my mother Aurora, nee da Gama, most illustrious of our modern artists. ... What was true of history in general was true of our family’s fortunes in particular...

descent from great Vasco da Gama himself... . (5-6)

Rushdie’s feels unhappy for the disappearance of the Jewish community in India; he gives a lot of detail about the Jewish and their treatment at Cochin in order to bring the hybridity present in India. Samir Dayal in “Subaltern Envy? Salman Rushdie’s The Moor’s Last Sigh” consistently codes Rushdie as a Muslim and his creation of Moraes’s primary identity as a marker of hybridity: “presumptive hybridity: his colonization – and – displacement of the structural place of the minority figure” (267) and Moraes as “an instance of the appropriation of subalternity” (268). Moreas’s involvement in communal violence brings out Rushdie’s oppression to violence:

Violence was violence; murder was murder two wrongs did not make a right. … In the days after the destruction of the Babri Masjid ‘justly enraged Muslim’/ ‘Fanatical Killer’ (… use your blue pencil as your heart dictates) smashed up Hindu temples, and Killed Hindus, across
India and in Pakistan as well. … They surge among us. … Hindu and Muslim, Knife and pistol, Killing, burning, looting” (365).

The construction of Jewishness in *The Moor’s Last Sigh* is very clear.

When asked by Raman Fielding to Abraham Zogoiby to participate in an illegal bomb project, he realizes that he is a Jew, he had been a “no – community man – and proud of it” so the surprise is an “astonishment” (336). His father, Abraham, who has been raised in the Cochin Jewish community, responds to the Moraes’s announcement with derision: “You’ll be wanting a yarmulk now’. …[he] sneered. And phylacteries. Lessons in Hebrew, a one – way trip to Jerusalem?” (341)

Moreas declares himself to be Jewish and refused to participate in Abraham’s plan:

> I refused to be involved with the covert operation of the Khazana Bank, in particular the manufacture of the so-called Islamic bomb. ‘You’ll be wanting a yarmulke now,’ my father sneered. ‘And phylacterier. Lessons in Hebrew, a one-way trip to Jerusalem? Just, please, to let me know. Many of our Cochin Jews, by the way, complain of the racism with which they are treated in your precious homeland across the sea.’ (341)

Revathi Krishnasamy’s in “Mythologies of Migrancy: Postcolonialism, Postmodernism and Politics of (Dis)location” says:

> [B]y decontaminating the migrant of all territorial affiliation and social affinities, the mythology of Migrancy ironically reinvents, in the very process of destabilizing subjectivity, a postmodernist avatar of the free – floating bourgeois subject. Once this autonomous and unattached individual, this migrant, exiled or nomadic consciousness, is legitimized
as the only true site of postcolonial resistance, all other forms of collective commitment get devalued as coercive and corrupt. (143)

Another example of hybridity used by Rushdie in the novel is the mingling of East and West through the characters, Epifania and Francisco’s marriage. Epifania is the true believer and upholder of her western values, she likes everything to be English and stick to her Catholic values handed down to her from her Portuguese heritage. She and Francisco are polar opposites, but she suffocates her husband and this leads to his premature emotional death. Rushdie again introduces the element of misogyny in Epifania’s portrayal. Like Sufiya in *Shame*, she is compared to the black window spider, the only difference being that unlike the spider, Epifania waits for a good opportunity before suffocating her husband to death “Epifania swallowed the news of his death without a tremor. She ate his death as she has eaten his life; and grew” (24).

Rushdie portrays the behaviour of the Indian population during the colonial era through Epifania and Francisco. Moreas’s great grandfather Francisco da Gama rebels against colonial exploitation and announces to his family that “The British must go” whereas his wife Epifania claims that the British Raj has been purely beneficent, something for which all Indians should be thankful:

What are we but Empire’s children? British have given us everything isn’t it? – Civilization, law, order, too much. Even your spices that stink up the house they buy out of their generosity, putting clothes on backs and food on children’s plate. Then why speak of such treason? (81)

Rushdie is critical to the character of Epifania; he feels that Europeans have not contributed anything to India. *The Moor’s Last Sigh* strictly comes under the
global context of colonial repression and postcolonial resistance in which the history is more important than that of the Da Gama Zogoiby dynasty, at the same time the family history of Da Gama Zogoiby is inseparable from that of India’s history. He gave the family’s origin as “beneath [Boabdil’s] roof, and then between his sheets” (82).

Rushdie’s portrayal of Boabdil’s discredible story reveals suggestive reference to the drawback of medieval Spain, but the glory of Arab Andalusia from the modern politics, became the possible recoverable place of a multicultural utopia. The marriage of Da Gama and Epifania leads to the birth of two sons Camoens Da Gama and Aries Da Gama. Aires and his wife Carmen bears no children, while the union of Camoens and his wife Isabella leads to the birth of a daughter, Aurora. Aurora Da Gama finds a mate in the Jew called Abraham Zogoiby. They had four children namely Christen, Inamorata, Philomena and Moreas. Moreas life becomes an allegory for that of the Indian nation as he is a hybrid character in terms of race. His lineage interweaves history and fabulous family story “Like Boabdil, the Spanish Moraes that he is palimpsest over, Moreas Zogoiby, in his metaphorical role is a unifier of opposites, a standard - bearer of pluralism … a symbol – however approximate – of the new nation…” (303). Moreas and his mother Aurora becomes an analogy for the nation like the city of Bombay that represent hybridity.

Rushdie’s personal experience after fatwa, a religious order issued by a Muslim leader, has also put a light on the immigration. Moraes’s narrating events of his life reflects the life of Rushdie. Moraes was born within four and half months, half the normal child, when he was one year, he looked like a man of
twenty and in the same way Rushdie was psychologically been affected by his *fatwa* and he had to go in underground existence as he was to put to death at an early age. He comments “Speaking for myself at this late hour? Just about managing, thanks for asking: though old, old, old before my time” (53).

Moreas Zogoiby’s life is at twice the speed he ought to be in his prime. He is aged too quickly and old and weakened as the post – independent India. Aurora uses Moraes the ultimate unfit as an inspiration and object of luck for her work. She attempts to paint a world in which he is no longer an outsider but rather a representative of an ultimate alliance between people, where illusions of boundaries are broken and people are bound together by their humanity at the same time celebrating their difference. The major paintings of Moraes represent the idea of ideal hybridized world. Aurora’s painting blends her family members’ images within the crowd to show that she feels a basic separation between peoples of all sorts but that was impossible. The separation is only a fantasy of human minds; the family in India cannot be isolated anywhere. She paints every picture at the mural as a part of “Mother India,” with love and care. Her opinion is that people in India have a common law, whatever traditions or religion they may be, but they are bound as children of India.

Aurora creates her first major painting at her teenage; she was house arrested for throwing out some precious items from the house. In her frustration she started to paint in the vast mural on wall and ceiling of her room which brings out the hybridity of her family’s past, present and future into one image: “[t]he room was her act of mourning” (61). At the centre of her painting was Isabelle’s
face and when her father Camoens sees the mural painting for the first time, they weep in mourning, that brings Aurora’s major theme to emerge:

Aurora had composed her giant work in such a way that the images of her family had to light their way through his hyper – abundance of imagery she was suggesting that the privacy of cabral Island was an illusion and this mountain this hive, this metamorphic line of humanity was the truth. (60)

Family events inspired her wall painting but they do not dominate it; they appeared at the centre of her painting but what attracted most of the viewers’ eyes was the crowd of different people present in her painting. Camoens views her painting for the first time: “The rapid rush of the composition draws him on world, for away from the personal and into the throng, for above and around itself the dense crowed, the crowd without boundaries” (60). The “crowd without boundaries” is very important because it interweaves with the family, rather than the place secluded on Cabral Island separated from the rest of the world. Therefore, it brings out Aurora’s feelings that boundaries and borders are entirely imaginary and man created it. Though he is separated from India, his love for the nation is inseparable.

Aurora chooses to paint her scenery in Alhambra under Boabdils rule. She has erased all boundaries that she can possibly erase and has created her own Alhambra. She inter-mingles those peoples and creatures and shows them sharing a land and a sea together. There are no divisions of time, reality, fantasy, wealth, poverty and ethnicity. She has created a world in which literally all boundaries are broken. Aurora says that she has created a Palestine land that presented certain face, but that face is the product of its history, layers and diversity. All Indians
share these histories, layers and diversities all over India. Aurora’s inspiration and
centre-piece in her painting is Moraes; he is the ultimate hybrid in the novel. He has
a wide variety of cultural and ethnic histories like that of India.

Jonathan Rutherford in “Identity, Community, and Culture” says about
Rushdie’s usual themes:

[it] is hardly surprise[ing] to find a narrator and title character who
claims from Portuguese stock lives in India, speaks English, bears an
Arabic last name and seem to be a letter day incarnation of his
legendary ancestor Boabdil the last Moorish king of Spain. (94)

But Rushdie does not stop at marking Moraes merely a cultural hybrid but he also
makes Aurora to erase the boundaries between the countries. Moraes’s placement
at the centre of the narrative in novel confirms Rushdie’s well established interest
in hybrid identities. Jew, Muslim and Indian provide as index to the text’s
exploration of hybridity. Moraes the half Jewish and half Christian is on his way to
self exile in Spain.

Salman Rushdie’s Fury is an intellectual and autobiographical novel set in
New York. It is a study of the protagonist’s personal fury on a universal context.
Rushdie as multicultural immigrant from India to England and England to America
vividly portrays the sensitive psyche, pain and suffering of the immigrant in this
novel. He voices for the immigrant caught up in the circle of a multicultural world,
who is trying to define their identity, as a cultural hybrid in the multicultural
society. Rushdie as well as Homi Bhabha considered this hybridization of cultures
as the central aspect of postcolonialism and a product for the growth of
globalization.
*Fury* explores the hybrid nature of the characters: “Everywhere you looked, through Professor Malik Solanka, the fury was in the air. Everywhere you listened you heard the beating of the dark goddesses’ wings” (123). In this exploration of the self, the fury within the protagonist adopts a psychoanalytical as well as sociological study of the world. The narrative is quite simple, the hero of the novel Malik Solanka migrated from Bombay to London, studied and settled as a Professor at King’s College, Cambridge. Solanka got married Sara first, it was a failure, then he married to Eleanor and had a son called Asmaan. Solanka as a historian is not happy with the academic life:

Professor Solanka in the late 1980s despaired of the academic life, its narrowness, infighting and ultimate provincialism. ‘The grave yawns for us all, but for college dins it yawns with boredom’, he proclaimed to Eleanor, adding, unnecessarily as things turned out, ‘Prepare for poverty’. Then to the consternation of his fellows, but with wife’s unqualified approval, he resigned his tenured position at King’s Cambridge. (14)

Professor Solanka finally gave up the academic life at Cambridge and turned to be a businessman, doing philosophical dolls for television. Salman Rushdie as an immigrant chooses his character to be immigrant such as Saleem Sinai, Omar Khayyam Shakil, Moraes Zogoiby, Malik Solanka and finally Shalimar the Clown. Malik suffers as an immigrant:

He was vulnerable to demons. He heard their bat-wings flapping by his ears, felt their goblin fingers twining around his ankles to pull him down to that hell in which he didn’t believe but which kept cropping
up in his language, in his emotions, in the part of him that was not his to control. (82-83)

Professor Solanka lives in an English society and extremely conscious of his fall and carefully thinks over the difference between him and other emigrants in New York. The emigrants from other countries settle down without making any difference in life, they mingle, but being an emigrant form India and to settle in other country is almost like a mask for Solanka. He did not reveal his Indian identity in order to escape from the crime. The story behind the crime goes on to reveal that his friend Jack Reinhart, a black American has been murdering young American girls. Solanka had already identified himself with this friend by the police and has a possibility of committing the same murders himself unconsciously because of his fury. This “identification” and the “merging of identities” are the main story of the novel Fury.

Malik Solanka is an example of a fragmented “self”. Solanka as a migrant from India to England had a childhood experience of rejection and alienation from his family: “As the bonds of family weakened, the furies began to intervene in all of human life” (251). He is neglected and severed by his re-married mother and his step-father. Abused by his step-father and emotionally alienated from his mother, Solanka is further pushed to the edge of fury when he migrated to England:

… in 1963, the eighteen-year-old Solanka had needed rescuing. He had spent his whole first day at college in a state of wild, overweening funk, unable to get out of bed, seeing demons. The future was like an open mouth waiting to devour him…, and the past –
Solanka’s links with his family were badly eroded – the past was a broken pot. Only this intolerable present remained, in which he found he couldn’t function at all. (20)

Unable to manage with the cultural differences, he wildly follows the dictated western society which shocks as well as attracts him with its liberality. He tries to adjust himself, but his adjustment is merely a cover-up; he enters into relationship of marriage only to throw away his fury: “Solanka had never thought of himself as a bolter or quitter, yet he has shed more skins than a snake. Country, family and not one wife but two had been left in his wake. Also, now, a child” (29).

Rushdie is alienated from India and he is very tired of writing about India and Indians, thereby he just mentions Bombay as Solanka’s birth place and does not give any details like that of his previous works. Solanka’s Bombay throws light on the dirty actions of his step - father, which is not only associated with Bombay alone but present all over the universe. Therefore, he reflects his relationship with the family and not with Bombay. The reason for Solanka’s “fury” is a secret identity which he carries throughout the novel. His father is an Indian, who neglected them and his mother soon after his birth, got married to another man. His stepfather was a sexual deformer; these reasons brought fury within him. Young Solanka wanted to forget both these facts. Therefore he settled with the mask of an English wife and a respectable job in England. The metaphor of the masks is ultimately the dolls that become a symbol for the intellectual garb of an individual or nation that is trying to become famous by adopting the western philosophy. The exile was declared by his family and not offered by Bombay.
The exile is offered to Solanka by his education at Cambridge. The profession of a philosopher and historian made his personal and intellectual exile. Migrant to a foreign land alienated him socially and culturally. His yearning to reconnect his roots, his native, reflects in the form of the dolls that he creates, giving them life and a past. As he was investigating the creation of Little Brain to be his mask, he comes to know that he is fighting for the survival of life with the mask and it made him to live at England. Salanka, celebrity intellectual and retired historian ideas has left his wife and son and goes to New York; he thinks New York will be place of interval for his fury and his family life. He says through walking abnormally on the streets of the city in the novel’s early pages. Malik’s thoughts indicate some of this contempt:

In all of India, China, Africa, and much of the southern American continent, those who had the leisure and wallet for fashion-- or more simply, in the poorer latitudes, for the mere acquisition of things -- would have killed for the street merchandise of Manhattn, as also for the cast -- off clothing and soft furnishings to be found in the opulent thrift stores. (5)

But America was not the place of peace he expected and continues, “America insulted the rest of the planet […] by treating such bounty with the shoulder-shrugging casualness of the inequitably wealthy” (6).

Rushdie’s attempt to interfere the charges of fatwa imposed at him through Solanka. Solanka’s life is deliberately made by Rushdie to separate himself from his life and his celebrity of consumer culture and the media that markets him, in
order to reflect Rushdie’s separation. He says these dolls which had earlier
performed the role of his substitute family are his real relatives:

Malik locking his thoughts away, confiding only in whispers, only in
the hours of darkness, to the dolls who crowded around him in bed,
like guardian angels, like blood kin: the only family he could bring
himself to trust. (223)

Media throws him out and by marketing his doll “Little Brain,” it separated him
from his life. In the dolls play narration by Solanka, the dolls and puppets play the
role of human being; they give a fable touch to the story mingling the traditional
puppet-show and the computerized animation film. It is an interesting novel of
experiment by Rushdie through the story telling technique, where the dolls and
puppets film not only portray the story but also briefly brings out the human
predicament as imagined by the novelist:

His earliest dolls, the little characters he had made, when younger, to
populate the house he’d designed, were painstakingly whittled out of soft
whitewoods, clothes and all and afterwards painted, the clothing in vivid
colours and the faces full of tiny but significant details: … Since those
distant beginnings he had list interest in the houses, while the people he
made had grown in stature and psychological complexity. Nowadays
they started out as clay figurines. … Such was the paradox of human
life: its creator was fictional but life itself was a fact. (26)

Truly Malik Solanka echoes not only Rushdie’s physical condition, but also
his mental make-up. As the novel begins Solanka walking abnormally in a park of
New York in a melancholic mood as if he has turned senile, old fashioned in apt to
“reconcile himself to and increasingly phoney … reality” (7). He is fed up with the life in England and goes to New York with hope, but New York does not offer him a better situation. He expects America to “eat me … and give me peace” (5). Solanka has come to America to be free of the anger, fear and pain associated with his “back-story” (50). However, as he settles to a new life, unexpected sources of frustration emerge to distress him from the past, he sees himself as an intellectual hitting wealthy Little Brain, as a Cambridge don, the fury follows. But he feels that America has a good future by the new settlers in the near future:

He felt the dull irritation, the slow anger, of the fool. He felt like a drone, or a worker ant. He felt like one of the shuffling thousand in the old movies of Chaplin and Fritz Lang, the faceless ones doomed to break their bodies on society’s wheel knowledge exercised power over them from on high. The new age had new emperors and he would be their slave. (45)

Still New York appears to Solanka as a goal of the world’s lust and the “Insult” made the rest of the planet more eager than ever. The novelist is conscious of the psychological aspect of the people’s fascination for America and perhaps he is one among them. He chooses this country for migration, though he knew New York City as a circle of hell, bore to death with full volume and metropolitan city of fury. For Solanka, America is a possible refuge from his own past, he wants to lose his root and his past identity forever in America.

Even though the novel begins in America, it pictures Solanka’s painful life in London and his childhood days in Bombay. Solanka is unable to cope with the realities of life’s frustration. In a moment of rage he loses control and stands at the
very edge of tragedy and finally saved at the nick of time by the realization of his son’s presence. His son Asmaan is the only person who gives meaning to his disordered life, who also plays the role of his principles, “Asmaan twisted in him like a knife” (126). Solanka escaped not only from his family and his past, but also from the country through his son Asmaan, “He had conceived, in that instant, an almost religious belief in the power of flight. Fight would save others from him and him from himself” (80).

Geographical distances are not able to put out the flames of fury within Solanka. His situation moves back rapidly taking him closer and closer to the edge of complete and complex mental break-down. Mixing problems between the mental fury of Solanka away from his life and the horrible murders of the three society girls, Rushdie shifts the focus to the collective fury of human beings towards the world:

Life is fury, he’d thought. Fury—sexual, oedipal, political, magical, brutal—drives us to our finest heights and coarsest depths. Out of furia comes creation, inspiration, originality, passion, but also violence, pain, pure unafraid destruction, the giving and receiving of blows from which we never recover. The furies pursue us. (30-31)

Portraying the essence of modern contemporary society, Rushdie mixed a variety of elements each having its own distinct flavor. This mixture or “chutnification,” the author calls it multiculturalism. This hybridity is identified in the social setting, where different cultures blend with one another mainly through the process of immigration.
The novel explores both destructive and constructive features of fury. The innermost theme of the novel is broken marriage which results in fury. Solanka fury starts from his first marriage between Sara and Solanka that breaks, again his second marriage to Eleanor also breaks. In the same way Jack Rhinehart and Bronislawa become a failure. Neela Mahendra is also a victim of broken marriage and is looking for a new companion. There is nothing new or shocking as in the western culture. Marriage is a matter of convenience and an easily broken relation. The character of Jack Rhinehart is another example of the author’s agony for the immigrant. Rhinehart’s character is a stark portrayal of the level of conflict caused by multicultural society. His anger is focussed not only on white racists, but also on his fellow blacks for their lack of ethic unity. Rhinehart is angry at rich white American’s “gilded milieu” and its “crassness, its blindness, its mindlessness, its depthless surfaceness” (57). Description of the immigrant’s problems and their strength was the idea of his familiarity and his eagerness to bring out unity among the people resulting in his tragedy.

Rushdie’s protagonist Solanka is a victim of “unbelonging.” Finally, Solanka considers the life in America cannot destroy his fury but he can accept it as a part of his life. After meeting Ali Majnu, Solanka comes to believe that almost everyone is provoked by different kinds of furies: “Human life was now lived in the moment before the fury, when the anger grew” (129). The example of hybridity is presented by the character Ali Majnu, the novice taxi driver in New York as Solanka says:

Manju meant beloved. This particular Beloved looked twenty-five or less, nice handsome boy, tail and skinny, with a sexy John Travolta
quiff, and here he was living in New York, with a steady job: what had so comprehensively gotten his goat? … Beloved Ali was Indian or Pakistani, but, no doubt out of some misguided collectivist spirit of paranoid pan-Islamic solidarity, he blamed all New York road users for the tribulations of the Muslim world. (65-66)

Solanka returns to England as a last attempt to protect his remaining link to life and that is his relationship with his son. Searching for identity is not a lonely journey; it is a journey of an individual in blending of the self with the others; therefore Solanka wanted to find his identity with his son. He was worried by the ghosts of his past and tormented by the cultural diversities of his life in America. Love frees him from such imprisonment and enables him to deconstruct the boundaries between the self and the other. Asmaan his son becomes his future life and he has lots of hope towards his future.

Thus, *Fury* has represented the fury of a man in front of various cultures and his difficulty in settling to the modern world. Rushdie points out towards the end of the novel that act of love, acceptance and celebration of life in its multicultural, multi-faceted and multicoloured aspects are the only solution for such difficulty.

Rushdie deals with colonial discourse that presides over the description of Kashmir in *Shalimar the Clown*. He looks at the different factors that have gradually eroded the beautiful city of Kashmir and brought Kashmir to the edge of destruction. Just as *Midnight’s Children*, *Shame* and *The Moor’s Last Sigh*, the novel *Shalimar the Clown* also portrays the distinction between reality and fantasy. Across the globe and moving through history, the novel is an extensive study of
Kashmir. The valley of Kashmir has been figured already in *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* and particularly mentioned in *Midnight’s Children*. In *Midnight’s Children* Rushdie’s concern is about Kashmir’s irritable condition that has been brought out through the boatman Tai, who considers himself to be more a Kashmiri than an Indian. At Chhumb in the year 1947 during the partition, he was killed by the opposing forces of India and Pakistan.

Just as Saleem Sinai, the protagonist of *Midnight’s Children* is born at the midnight’s stroke on 15th August 1947 and becomes a mirror of post-partition Indian. In a similar way, the two protagonists of *Shalimar the Clown*, Norman Sher Noman or Shalimar the Clown and Bhooni or Boonyi Kaul Noman are born on the last night of Kashmir under the Maharaja rule. Manoj Nair in “The Novelty of Words Lives On” states:

> The novelist in *Shalimar the Clown* tries to understand the global phenomenon of terrorism especially in Kashmir, through the psyche of Shalimar, a terrorist, who, with his personal anguish and dilemmas seems to be representative of quite a number other terrorists. (4)

Salman Rushdie’s, *Shalimar the Clown* is a multi-standard novel that has a deep plumbing phenomenon of inter-relatedness of different persons and places spread over for about two decades. Rushdie’s connections between globalization and localization are clearly mentioned:

> Everyone’s story was a part of everyone’s. Shalimar the Clown at forward camp 22 befriended the luminous little man who had fought with Afghans and al-Qaeda against the Soviet Union, who had accepted U.S. arms and backing but loathed the united stated because
American soldiers had historically backed the settlement of Catholics in Mindanao against the wishes of the local Muslims. (269)

Rushdie as an avid defender and celebrator of cultural hybridity has highlighted the globalization. As a defender he says that a hybridized world has deconstructed and exploded the notions authentic essences and as a celebrator, he celebrates the unity among the people to think beyond the differences between the cultural, racial and national identity. Rushdie as an immigrant, who is caught between three countries is in a position of an everlasting “in-betweenness” and he is unable to survive comfortably to either countries. Shalimar the Clown is seen as an example of the contemporary postcolonial novel that debates the themes of multiculturalism, globalization, identity, tradition, terrorism, neo-imperialism, Islamic radicalism of US foreign policy and the Indian state’s military presence in Kashmir.

Kashmir becomes an idealized place, valued not so much for its beauty or uniformity but rather for the manner in which it symbolizes how culturally different societies can create a heritage of tolerance and civilization. Rushdie attempts to celebrate beauty of Kashmir’s variability of identity, the energy of spaces and the interaction between the global and the local during the pre-independence period. And he strongly protests the current disturbed world that is in need of effective multiculturalism. Shalimar the Clown voices the concept of a borderless world of hybridity and its implications is brought out by Rushdie that “everywhere was now a part of everywhere else. Russia, America, London, Kashmir. Our livers, our stories, flowed into one another’s, were no longer our own, individual, discrete” (37). The theories of globalization have moved from
cultural imperialism or neo-imperialism to the analysis of hybridization and interrelationship of global societies.

Rushdie celebrates the cultural mixture through presenting Pachigam as land of eternal beauty and charm, where peace, love, and brotherhood portray the Kashmiri way of life. In Pachigam, Muslims and Hindus live in a peaceful coexistence:

the words Hindu and Muslim had no place in their story...In the valley these words were merely descriptions, not divisions. The frontiers between the words, their hard edges, had grown smudged and blurred. This was how things had to be. This was Kashmir. (57)

By presenting Kashmir as the ideal world with its unique way of life, where differences and divisions are non-existent, Rushdie highlights and explores a dialect form of cosmopolitanism in this novel.

Rushdie’s symbolic hypothesis of the novel is combining personal human element with globalization. The element of displacement in human being is brought out through the arena of Kashmir. Kashmir is Macando or Bombay or Gupland or Chupland to Rushdie, but he merges with a human importance in the context of hybridity. Kashmir portrays the romantic, patriotic and terrorist image and symbol of human life which Rushdie wanted to picture in his novel. He wanted to portray a fictional Kashmir but mystified in truth and fantasy therefore, there was more real truth than imaginary truth. This is not the story of Shalimar or Max Ophuls or India, but is about the tragedy of Kashmir and Kashmiris.

Rushdie brings out the ideal of Kashmir, the ethos or the values of Pachigam which serve as the basis for hybridity within it. He tends to erase or
reduce the threatening aspects of religious and class differences. This point is clearly personified by Abdullah Noman, Shalimar’s father, when he declares that:

Kashmiriness, the belief that at the heart of Kashmir culture there was a common bond that transcended all other differences] … [So we have not only Kashmiriness to protect but Pachigaminess as well. We are all brothers and sisters here]…[There is no Hindu-Muslim issue. Two Kashmiri-two Pachigami- youngsters wish to marry, that’s all. A love match is acceptable to both families and so a marriage there will be; both Hindu and Muslim customs will be observed. (110)

Rushdie invokes the ideal of Kashmir in his portrait of the village of Pachigam, particularly in his description of the romance between Shalimar the Clown and Boonyi. Though Shalimar the Clown is Muslim and Boonyi is Hindu, their marriage is welcomed by the villagers and they are married in the name of Kashmiriyat. Their marriage represents the victory of Kashmir and comprises a national romance that bridges cultural and religious differences. Kashmir is depicted in this hybrid image as worldly and anti-communal place, where the romance between Shalimar the Clown and Boonyi serves to show the powerful spirit of Kashmir. Rushdie wants to introduce Pachigam as culturally rich, hybrid and diverse place where peace remains between human being without any difference in their religion. He also wanted to portray the pre-colonial societies were multi-cultural and hybridity cherished along with their diversity.

Rushdie clearly pictures the village of Pachigam and its surroundings through his characters. The beauty of the village has been brought out through the mouth of a vanishing trick specialist Sarkar, the Magician, who narrates the origin
of Shalimar Bagh, the garden close to *Pachigam*. Kashmir is a paradise on earth and the heavenly *tooba* tree has been planted on this earthly place in the centre of Shalimar Bagh. Rushdie combines myth and history to declare that some spiritual men exposed the presence of the tree on earth to Emperor Jahangir who has built the Shalimar Bagh around it. The emperor died before reaching the long-lasting heaven of his earthly paradise, his Bagh. This idea is repeated in the middle of the narrative by Rushdie as: “Paradise too was a garden – Gulistan, Jannat, Eden- and here before him was its mirror on earth” (127). Rushdie celebrates in contrast between myth and history and his own experimental views with the incredible and wondrous beauty of Kashmir. The Mughal gardens Nishat, Chashma Shahi and Shalimar are part of landscape as well as the mindscape and add shine to the lives of the people of Kashmir. For example, Shalimar Bagh evokes strong multiple emotions in the hearts and minds of characters in the novel. Abdullah Noman reveals:

> closed his eyes and conjured up to long-dead creator of this wonderland of swaying trees, liquid terraces and water music, the horticulturalist monarch for whom the earth was the beloved and such gardens were his verdant love. Songs to it. (127-128).

Before the arrival of American Ambassador and other destructive forces, the Kashmiri people had no rooms for cultural or religious clashes in the Kashmiri community. Though Boonyi belongs to a Hindu and Shalimar is a Muslim, their prohibited affair was welcomed by their families and communities. Their village Pachigam had a familiar principle of “Kashmiriyat, Kashmiriness, the belief at the heart of Kashmiri culture. There was a common bond that transcended all other
differences. …We are all brothers and sisters here” (71) and Shalimar’s father, Abdullah, the leader of a Felliniesque band proclaims that they don’t have any difference between the Hindu-Muslim in this village. In Pachigam, people of all religions jointly participate in the arts that are the basis of the village’s nutrition and when differences and hostility arise, they are inactive by unity and common respect. In a nutshell, through the novel the Kashmiri people celebrate cultural pluralism and the act of cultural translation leads to the rejection of the importance of a previous unique or culture society.

*Shalimar the Clown* not only tells the story of *Pachigam*, but it is story of the universe. The novel begins and returns at the end of Los Angeles and at times moves to Kashmir then crosses the continental Europe and England through a flash back technique. Its chief characters, Shalimar the Clown, Max Ophuls, Boonyi and Kashmira, are closely linked as a hybrid. Rushdie as a forceful champion of the hybrid declares that the community of *Pachigam* is a multicoloured society that becomes a good example for globalization.

Edward Said in “*Culture and Imperialism*” says that “All cultures are involved in one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinarily differentiated and un-monolithic” (82). In this context of globalization and global migration, people travel freely and they export and import new ideas. There is no way of returning into homogenous and unified cultures, because cultures are all marked and influenced by cultural hybridism. To show the fact that places are dynamic and changing, Rushdie describes how Alsace, a French city, was historically subject to the Frenchification, de-Frenchification and Germanification. This period of migration and multifaceted globalization has
irritated Rushdie: “Get smashed and then they are no longer the places they were” (363), and *Pachigam* is a good example, where the peace, harmony and tolerance prevailed village changes its idealized place into a battlefield between two ideological poles, Islamic radicalism and the Indian army. Rushdie also highlights the impact of globalization on spaces and this is obvious in his description of Los Angeles, Paris and Strasbourg as “shape-shifted” spaces (141). Therefore they are no longer themselves. This indicates that places are no longer firm, bounded and equipped, but rather they are dynamic and changeable where the identities are in a constant state of interaction.

*Pachigam* is a place of the innocent where the people mingle without any difference between Hindus and Muslims. Their hybridity, multi-faith and multi-cultural world of peaceful Kashmir is destroyed by the intrusion of repressive forces. Increasing influence of strange presence on the Kashmiri landscape slowly starts corroding and degrading the values of *Pachigam*, the *Kashmiriyat* and this influence can be seen in the radical preaching of Bulbul Fakh, the “iron mullah.” He lectures on the conflict between Muslim Pakistani and Hindu Indian over Kashmir and made the difference between them by his speech. And the next event that made the difference was the arrival of Maximilian Ophuls who represented the American presence in the subcontinent by their exports and imports. Because of these external forces, *Pachigam* ceases to exist. Charged with harbouring extremists, the village bears the full brunt of the violence of the Indian armed forces. Everyone is killed, people and life are totally obliterated from the place where love had once bloomed and blossomed. Peaceful *Pachigam* is destroyed and becomes only a name on outworn maps; “the village of *Pachigam* still existed on
maps of Kashmir, but that day it ceased to exist anywhere else, except in memory” (309). Thus, the old Kashmir is seen as a tolerant and eclectic society compressed from all sides by “the new zerotolerance world” (290). Through the novel, Rushdie expresses “sadness for the ideal that has been lost in Kashmir and in so many parts of the Muslim world, the ideal of tolerance and secular pluralism” (290).

Significantly, the presence of the Indian army, the influence of the US and the coming of the Jihadists from Pakistan helped Islamic radicalism to spread in Kashmir. The Islamist radicals target Kashmiri moderate Muslim voices and impose the *burqa* and the veil on Kashmiri women. Under the supervision of the Iron Mullah Bulbul Fakh, the fighters are all instructed in the singularity of truth, the truth of a religious fervour that infuses their mission. The Iron Mullah, for example, says:

> Question of religion can only be answered by looking at the condition of the world. When the world is in disarray then God does not send a religion of love. At such times he sends a martial religion, he asks that we sing battle hymns and crush the infidel. The iron mullah says that at the root of religion is this desire, the desire to crush the infidel.

> This is the fundamental urge. (262)

Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown* reflects a conception of post-colonial identity. All characters in the novel have a purposeful or accidental experience of journey in search of an attractive position for themselves and to have their identities in the society, but they don’t have any identity and they don’t belong to any place. For example, Boonyi Kaul changing her place represents the possibility of finding her identity far from her birth country, she “looked like a poem” (100)
but after neglected by her husband, she found herself contaminated and lost. Realizing her mistake Boonyi scolds Max, who represents the American neo-imperialism and economic globalization:

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

Rushdie attempts to bring out the hybrid impurities of cosmopolitan culture, globalization has changed the peace and harmony of each and every family in Kashmir, as he says that “the loss of … one family’s home” is “the loss of every home” (138).

Rushdie instead of seeking to recover lost traditional motherland, people accept hybridity as a part of globalization. The novel’s main characters are craving and yearning for accepting the global culture. The seduction of Boonyi by Max has produced a hybrid subject. India or Kashmira Noman, the literal child of East and West, of the close and far and of the global and local, who lives in America and is left with no particular identity to cling to. Her father Max is somebody from everywhere; he is a polyglot cosmopolitan whose identity floats over global spaces. The message Rushdie wants to convey is that in this period of intense globalization “everyone in the world has two fatherlands” (140). Boonyi misbehaved the established moral, social and cultural values of her village Pachigam and escapes with an American ambassador Max. She hates her village
and is eager for liberation and thus she accepts the ambassador’s offer of change “in search of a future” (367).

The novel starts with the description of Los Angeles, it is a city of rootless people, mostly immigrants, who live in a sort of midpoint. They don’t belong to any one place; they are immigrants who have a lot of identity and belong to two or more countries at times. For example Olga Volgo, Kashmir’s neighbour says:

today I live neither in this world nor the last, neither in America nor in Astrakhan. Also I would add neither in this world nor the next. A woman like me, she lives some place in between. Between the memories and the daily stuff. Between yesterday and tomorrow, in the country of lost happiness and peace, the place of mislaid calm. (9)

Rushdie’s characters live in a situation of not belonging; they easily change their identities and affiliations according the author’s wish.

Rushdie finally confirms that “there was no India. There was only Kashmir and Shalimar the clown” (398). Through this deadly confrontation between Kashmir and Shalimar the clown, Rushdie declares the rebirth and deterritorialized Kashmir. In other words, Kashmir’s killing of Shalimar reflects the destroying present Kashmir and rebirth of the peaceful Kashmir.

Rushdie’s novels represent a new life and a new beginning with the dissolution of all divisions and segments. The multicultural and hybrid world is welcomed on the horizon that has no place for any kind of divisions or borders

Chapter-III

History and Fantasy in the Postmodern Era