Both Márquez and Rushdie are post-modernist novelists. They interpret a culture not with the tool of reason but with the magical power of imagination and intuition. Márquez narrates the reality of everyday life of Latin America in the fantastic way. This reality of everyday life appears magical and supernatural to the Europeans because they view it from the lens of reason and logic but it is quite natural and credible to the people of Latin America. Rushdie, on the other hand, chooses to deal with the outre and bizarre in the matter of fact style. He imposes the semblance of everyday reality on the fantastic and the supernatural. Thus, both Márquez and Rushdie represent the intermingling of the everyday reality and the fantastic, the bizarre and the real. In this sense they are magic realists.

The novels of Márquez and Rushdie are difficult to interpret because of their intertextuality and ingenuity of language. Read The Autumn of the Patriarch. You will find that each of the five chapters holds increasingly few sentences, until the last chapter is just one. Or read Shame and see how English language is twisted to construct a modern fairy tale. Due to this reason only two novels of each novelists are selected for close reading.
One Hundred Years of Solitude and Midnight's Children are studied together mainly for three reasons. First both of them narrate the family history, which is intimately interlinked with the history of the Independence of a nation. Second, both of them rewrite the history of their respective nation from the viewpoint of the peripheral hero. Third, both of them deal with the solitude of everyday life.

Similarly, The Autumn of the Patriarch and Shame are clubbed together mainly for three reasons. First, both of them deal with the theme of the solitude of power. Second, both of them trace the rise and fall of a dictator. Third, both of them narrate in the fantastic mode of narration.

I have analysed and interpreted the theme and the technique of the two most controversial and debated novelists. My findings are as under:

1. The past of the decolorised country is generally interpreted from the viewpoint of the centre, Europe in the nineteenth century and America today which believe in progress and reason and which judge the other countries with the yardstick of enlightenment and development. Their interpretation seems to be palimpsest that hides or erases the other side of the reality. Márquez and Rushdie reinterpret the past of their country from
the peripheral point of view so that the other side of the reality is brought to light. Their perception or presentation of the reality may be described as subversion or inversion in popular terminology; for them it is natural, valid and credible.

Márquez and Rushdie believe in multiplicity and plurality; for them there are many ‘jars of pickles’. They deal with plurality and many jars of pickles to disclose alternative reality, which is more enchanting and acceptable.

2. Márquez and Rushdie elaborate the theme of ‘solitude of everyday life’ and ‘solitude of power’. Today human beings have grown selfish and self-centred; so they are isolated from others. This is the solitude of everyday life. Similarly, a tyrant dictator is always busy with evolving the strategies of acquiring and retaining absolute power; so he is isolated, not only from his close associates but also from the masses. He always feels insecure and unstable and so he resorts to atrocities and cruelties. This is the solitude of power.

It is difficult to agree with the view that power always leads to solitude. It might be true in the case of a tyrant dictator or a certain group of
people. Otherwise, power, management theorists say, leads to growth, development and fulfilment. Moreover, solitude does not always have a negative effect. One may use solitude for introspection and self-perfection.

3. The European narratives of the nineteenth century are chronological; they have close endings. They have also a coherent structure. Márquez and Rushdie seem to believe in cyclical time. They construct a spiral structure to narrate many tales of multiple and mundane realities. Moreover, their narratives have open endings. The spiral structure of the narrative we find, is appropriate to represent multiple and fleeting realities. In such a structure action generally moves from present to past to present to past to future. It indicates that reality is not fixed. It may recur time and again in a different form.

4. Intertextuality is the main feature of the narratives of Márquez and Rushdie. These narratives are replete with main features of different genres; they also include different narrative techniques or devices practised by the recognised novelists of the East and the West.
Intertextuality is not the case of imitation or borrowing. It does not promote forgery. It, on the contrary helps us tell our thought and feeling in the familiar genre and terminology.

5. Márquez and Rushdie adopt the combination of the first person and the third person narration. They also use post-modern techniques like collage, fantasy, fairy tale, parody, interior monologue, visual images, metaphors, journalistic tricks and the like.

6. We refrain ourselves from commenting on the use of English language by Márquez and Rushdie because the novels of Márquez are in the English translation. However, we admire Rushdie’s handling of English. Rushdie has admitted that he had been influenced by the use of English in All About Hatter by G. V. Desani. Like Desani he twists and barnds British English to speak in an authentically Indian voice. The phrases like ‘fut-a fut’, ‘baap-re-baap’ ‘nakko’ etc; are the most appropriate illustrations in point.
Márquez and Rushdie offer the bleak and despondent perception of man and the world in which he lives. Márquez’s Macondo and Rushdie’s town of Q decay and are destroyed. Márquez’s Patriarch kills the spirit of democracy and Rushdie’s Chaotic and corrupt democracy stifles talented Midnight’s Children. Perhaps self-centredness, greed, overambition, misuse of power, corruption, poverty and failure of socialism have made Márquez and Rushdie sad and hopeless.