Chapter V

Impact of the Neo-imperialist strategies, Terrorism individual life – *Shalimar the Clown*

Rushdie's novel *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) is a case of how the contemporary postcolonial novel verbal confrontations fear mongering, the neo-colonialist procedures of post-war US outside strategy and the Indian state's military nearness in Kashmir and how India suffered from terrorism. This novel also extends premise of their controversy about cultural and economic globalization, resurgent separatist and terrorist movements and its impact on individuals. As other novels of him, *Shalimar the Clown* crosses hurdles of different time periods and territories, challenging the legacies of empire, nationhood and emergent new empires. Yet the novel’s focus on Kashmir and international terrorism reframes Rushdie’s earlier arguments. *Shalimar the Clown* engages with the repressions and exclusions that the postcolonial state imposes on its periphery, exemplified in the continuing struggle between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. By discussing “terror” and “terrorism” and how Rushdie subverts these terms in relation to identity, violence and the effects on the individual, *Shalimar the Clown* reroutes postcolonial paradigms by examining transnational terror networks, and their regional and international impact on politics, cultures and identities. Periphery, exemplified in the continuing struggle between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. We perceive how terrorism influenced the entire humankind with its hurtful results. Through the character of Shalimar the Clown, we perceive how exact retribution makes him fear based oppressor who later on turns into the reason for murdering of individuals and afterward concealment turns into the reason for crackdown. Fear based oppression is a worldwide marvel which needs exceptional consideration. Hostile to fear based oppressor activity is best and fruitful when it is upheld by popular assessment. This has been the explanation behind the end do danger
of psychological oppression. Patriotism is a honorable estimation. Be that as it may, a lot of patriotism is terrible. It can prompt to worldwide clashes. Unreasonable patriotism gets to be distinctly forceful and it makes the general population bigoted of different groups and nations. So one ought to have a universal viewpoint. One ought to understand that no men are remote and no nation is bizarre. In this way to control the psychological oppression common comprehension is likewise essential between various societies and groups. The message of universal fellowship can be spread everywhere throughout the world to conquer terrorism.

In this Chapter I try to address the issues of mobility, identity crisis, transnationalism and global terrorism in Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown* (2006). In other words, the attempt is to throw light on how image of India is portrayed in the representation of the bond between the local and the global and the foreign and the exotic through an in-depth analysis of the novel. The narrative structure of *Shalimar the Clown* encodes the dis-ordered temporality, driven as it is by personal and political resentment. The temporality of resentment negates the structure of revenge. The describer of *Shalimar the Clown* continually flashes the dividing line between the personal and the political. Diasporic communities and post-colonial world have traditionally served as a bridge between the particular and the universal. In this respect, Bill Ashcroft maintains that:

“post-colonial experience demonstrates the fact that the key to the resistance of the global by the self-determination of the local lies not in dismissal, isolation and rejection but more often in engagement and transformation. The diffuse and interactive process of identity formation proceeds in global terms in much the same way as it has done in post-colonial societies, and it is the model of post-colonial appropriation which is of most use in understanding the local engagements with global culture.”
The state of Diaspora is resulting from a twin procedure: it begins right now of uprooting from well known frameworks of information, and forms into a lived marvel when different spaces develop in a transnational circle of correspondence. Such spaces can get to be spaces of ensnarement. The individual living in this space deliberately builds himself by interestingly joining the way of life of his foundations and of his territory of habitation. This recently developed "self", conceived out of connection amongst various and, potentially, clashing frameworks of learning, relies on upon a feeling of good respectability, an apparent feeling of good and bad, that is impossible to miss to such a space. The world has turned out to be borderless with the globalization and its progressions are described in Shalimar the Clown. Salman Rushdie voices this concept of a borderless world and its implications:

“Everywhere was now a part of everywhere else. Russia, America, London, Kashmir. Our lives, our stories, flowed into one another’s, were no longer our own, individual, discrete. This unsettled people. There were collisions and explosions. The world was no longer calm.”

(Shalimar the Clown :61)

Rushdie's characters effortlessly differs their personalities and love; their characters are molded, and surf starting with one space then onto the next. Rushdie's novel tries to represent the way that "not having a place, a feeling of illusion, confinement and being on a very basic level „out of touch’ with the world get to be distinctly endemic in such a culture" (Parekh 5). The possibility that ought to be brought up here is that personality is dependably a procedure which is framed in "the third space" (Bhaba7), a zone that exists between the well known and the remote. Rushdie's Shalimar the Clown mirrors an origination of post-provincial personality that is liquid, different, moving, and receptive to changed circumstances.
All are of deliberate or unexpected trips looking for an attractive position for themselves and a steady meaning of their personalities. In any case, all things considered, they live in no place, in a circumstance of not having a place with wherever. In Shalimar the Clown Rushdie enjoys social system through exhibiting Pachigam as place that is known for unceasing magnificence and appeal where peace, love and fraternity portray the Kashmiri lifestyle. In Pachigam, Muslims and Hindus live in peace and concordance. To cite from the content: The words Hindu and Muslim had no place in their story, he let himself know. In the valley these words were simply portrayals, not divisions. The wildernesses between the words, their hard edges, had developed smirched and obscured. This was the manner by which things must be. This was Kashmir (Shalimar the Clown :91). Abdullah Noman, Shalimar's dad proclaims: “We are all siblings and sisters here … There is no Hindu-Muslim issue”. (Shalimar the Clown :110)

Rushdie endeavors to highlight the crossover pollutions of metropolitan life style. He keeps up that "the loss of… one family's house" is "the loss of each home" (Shalimar the Clown: 138), and consequently all the characters live like “a summed up state of vagrancy," personalities are progressively coming to be, if not completely de-territorialized, in any event diversely territorialized (Shalimar the Clown: 65). Rushdie passes on a message in this time of extreme globalization "everybody on the planet has two mother countries" (Shalimar the Clown: 140). In one of his meetings, Rushdie announces that "we as a whole cross boondocks, in that sense, we are all vagrant individuals" (Gordon 4). Rushdie exhibits his characters as having portable and liquid personalities. Los Angeles is the heaven on the earth and the novel starts describing the greatness of the place. Olga, Kashmira's neighbor, says that

“Today I live neither in this world nor the last, neither in America nor in Astrakhan. Additionally I would include neither in this world nor the following. A lady like me, she experience some place in the middle of .Between the recollections and the everyday stuff. Amongst yesterday and tomorrow, in the nation of lost joy and
peace, the place of misplaced quiet. This is our fate.”

(Shalimar the Clown :13-14)

Midnight’s Children’s Kashmir is a micro presentation of India Pakistan partition as in Shalimar the Clown it becomes macro as it canvasses more political issues minutely. Here Kashmir has been commemorated as a symbol to point out the inner fissures caused by the US representative and Islamic insurgents. The Hero in Midnight’s Children’s meanders India, Pakistan and Bangladesh however not able to discover peace for a safety life. Midnight’s Children’s is a story of removal and isolation created by movement. All are transients floating from top to bottom looking for some “fanciful countries” and clearly Rushdie recognizes himself with his vagrant personae. Midnight's Children is the main novel, pre-Shalimar, to have given Kashmiri governmental issues and its belongings. Kashmir’s woes and pangs are piled on to the ancient shoulders of the loving Tai the Boatman, who sincerely believes in his personal political mantra “Kashmir for the Kashmiris” (Shalimar the Clown :1).

Shalimar the Clown is, in certain ways, the extension of Tai’s story with conspicuous deep insights. Here too Kashmir is caught among violent and opposing political interests. Apart from these striking similarities there are some differences too, however, the two Kashmiri protagonists of Shalimar the Clown, Noman and Boonyi are born by the time of bifurcation of India and Pakistan. They look like the resemblances of India after Independence. Saleem stands for Kashmir in the Independent India.

With these differences Kashmir becomes the living hellfire of encounter that unsettles its social and cultural fabric, its identity as well as the identity of its people. History and individual
both are corrupted. Not only has the eponymous hero of the novel but other characters too highlighted this very aspect of rottenness. The novel is a beautiful story of a small village named Pachigam, in Kashmir situated besides the river Muskadoon, story of an innocent Kashmiri boy Noman Sher Noman, and best performer of his troupe of dancers who could catwalk the rope and later slit the throats also.

A tale of love, hatred, betrayal and revenge surrounds the four major characters. The novel also reveals some harsh pictures of globalization and terrorism. The novel has a base Kashmir where a small village Pachigam. The story revolves around four characters: Shalimar (Noman), Boonyi (Bhoomi), Maximilian Ophuls (Flying Jew) and India (Kashmira). It is surprising each character carry double trouble names reflecting their fates and their identities are reformed in the story. Salman Rushdie has shown different locations and this gives different flight of thoughts to various places beyond imaginative grounds.

The main protagonist of Shalimar the clown is Noman Sher, a Kashmiri Muslim boy. Pachigam, a village popular for actors of Bhand Pather, the traditional plays of the valley. Shalimar falls in love with a Kashmiri Hindu girl Bhoomi whom he calls Boonyi.

“Bhoomi signifies the ‘mother earth’ and Boonyi is the local name Kashmiri China tree. Both, Noman and Boonyi are love birds. Bhoomi never liked her name, she says: “My name is mud”, she said, “It’s mud and dirt and stone and I don’t want it,” and asked him to call her “Boonyi instead” (Shalimar the Clown:72).
Boonyi’s unhappiness with her name reflects later in her life also. Noman, calls himself Shalimar the clown partly in the honour of his lady love. As she reveals in the text:

“He was sweet Noman, who called himself Shalimar the clown partly in her honour, because they had both come into this world on the same night in the Shalimar garden almost fourteen years ago and partly in her mother’s because she had died there on that night of many disappearances when the world began to change. She loved him because his choice of name was his way of honouring her deceased mother as well as celebrating the unbreakable connection of their birth. She loved him because he would not—he could not—hurt any living soul. How could he cause her harm when he would not harm a fly?”

(Shalimar the Clown :80)

The Pandit’s deceased wife’s name is Pamposh Kaul means a lotus flower but she prefers her nickname ‘Giri’ (a walnut kernel). Abdullah Sher Noman’s wife was Firdaus Butt and she preferred ‘Bhat’ as her nickname. One fine day PamoshKaul reveals her hidden secrets to Firdaus which burns her ears and shatters her soul. Firdaus finds Pamposh not a happy wife and contented of her marriage. But Boonyi is far from happy. Claustrophobia grips her, and she realizes rather too late that she wants to escape. For Boonyi Kaul and Shalimar’s beloved, changing her place stands for the possibility of finding her identity far from her,

“She knew then that she would do anything to get out of Pachigam…

she would move faster than fortune.” She wishes,

“…get me away from here, away from my father, away from the slow death and slower life, away from Shalimar the clown” (Shalimar the Clown :114).

Rushdie has portrayed Boonyi’s character carrying maternal genetics of discontentment in her relationships. Noman and Boonyi are in love and ready for the nuptial knot. Shalimar is
portrayed as a mad and passionate lover. He reveals his would be reactions for her betrayal if ever happen in his life:

“Don’t leave me, he said, rolling over onto his back and panting for joy. “Don’t leave me now or I’ll never forgive you, and I’ll have my revenge, I’ll kill you and if you have any children by another man I’ll kill the children also.”

*(Shalimar the Clown: 98)*

Noman remains unaware to explore the hidden layers of Boonyi’s desires. He becomes true victim of her betrayal later. Boonyi’s love had no traces of platonic love though Noman considers and regards it with pure heart without malignity:

“Boonyi was Pandit’s only child, as she and Noman approached their fourteenth birthday they both discovered that they had been in love for their whole lives and it was time to do something about it, even though that was the most dangerous decision in the world.” *(Shalimar the Clown: 74)*

The problem of “broken self” arises in Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown* where characters’ selves are wounded and reconstructed with the construct of the novel. Then Maximilian Ophuls walks in the story as an American ambassador to India. Max pays an official visit to Kashmir, where he is entertained by the dancers of Pachigam. Boonyi’s first meeting with Max highlights her infidelity.

“When Boonyi met Maximilian Ophul’s eyes for the first time he was applauding wildly and looking piercingly at her while she took her bow, as if he wanted to see
right into her soul. At that moment she knew she had found what she had been waiting for.” (Shalimar the Clown :218)

The incidents in the novel are beaded with the surprising events and the narrative shrills the reader’s mind. Boonyi finds in Max an opportunity to escape from Pachigam and explore something different. She seduces Max and paves her way to Delhi to become his mistress. Shalimar unable to bear this personal loss swears to kill his wife and her love. Boonyi after forsaking her husband finds herself polluted and lost.

“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”. (Shalimar the Clown :205)

Boonyi breaks the established prestige of her village, Pachigam, and flys away Max. she strives for the liberation of her village and thus she nods her head to the ambassador’s promise of change “in search of a future” (Shalimar the Clown :367).Our pity evokes for Shalimar who remain sticks to his exclusionary particularistic identity. Shalimar’s identity gets mammocked, forces to reconstruct him into another human being. Characters that move with the protagonist are raised to the global level thus became universal characters. This reveals that this kind of globalization develops mixing ideas, where persons with versatile ideas mix together for a common purpose. Under conditions of hybridity every identity gets reconstructed. Shalimar’s personal loss opens his quest of Max, the invader of his village; his life; his heart. Max snatches
his wife whom she had loved so intensely. He shows his faith and emotional support he discovers in Boonyi’s love for him: “My father’s love was the first phase, “he told her. “It carried me as far as the treetops. But now it’s your love I need. That’s what will let me fly.”(Shalimar the Clown:92)

But now his innocence is robbed and he becomes a dreaded assassin. He is consumed by hatred and rage that he enrolls in a terrorist movement, training himself in their camps. Shalimar’s reconstructed identity highlights a sea change in an innocent Kashmiri artist. Max and Boonyi’s affair is leaked out when Boonyi is pregnant with Max’s child. This defames Max’s position and nation he represents. Boonyi gives birth to a girl child and names her “Kashmira” (A hybrid of Jewish and Kashmiri blood). Max’s enraged wife snatches Boonyi’s daughter. Kashmira later becomes India Ophuls. Boonyi is grown fat and thrown back to Kashmir as a waste trash to her village. Now her village has no place for her as they all had declared her dead after her betrayal. She is a living and walking dead person. Shalimar murders her in the hills. She meets with this tragic end. One wrong move and she is without identity, home, village and name. Boonyi or Bhoomi ultimately goes into Bhoomi(The mother earth). Her corpus finds grave after so many days.

Before this damage she takes her revenge with Max by giving birth to his illegitimate child, India Ophuls. Her father is a polyglot cosmopolitan. Boonyi fulfils her revenge by not consuming contraceptive pills sent to her to kill her foetus. This foetus becomes India Ophuls, whose father Max wants to kill her at the time of her birth. Later she lives with the same person whom she calls her father but not the murderer. With the construct of the novel, every character is revenging
towards his or her wrong doers. Boonyi meets her death in the hands of her husband Shalimar, a fate that awaits Max as well.

Sushiela Nasta points out that for the diasporic, “a desire to reinvent and rewrite home” is as strong “as a desire to come to terms with an exile from it”. New identities are generated in this space which interacts with other previous spaces of knowledge that one has experienced. The identities born in such interactive spaces inevitably retain influences from memories of origins, or “roots” but also absorb influences of the new culture in the transnational space. Shalimar’s quest magnified his involvement with the militant groups which help him to reach America. Shalimar is a disturbed soul; he is broken by the Boonyi’s betrayal. To quote from the text:

“For Shalimar the clown the total abnegation of the self was a more problematic requirement, a sticking place. He was, he wanted to be, a part of the holy war, but he also had private matters to attend to, a personal oaths to fulfill. At night his wife’s face filled his thoughts, her face and behind hers the face of the American. To let go of him would be to let go of them as well; and he found that he could not order his heart to set his body free.” (Shalimar the Clown:436)

Shalimar gets employed at Max’s American residence. He desired to draw the ambassador nearer, as near as lover. He tends to know his true face, his strengths, his weaknesses, his secret dreams. To know as intimately as possible, the life he planned to terminate with maximum brutality. (Shalimar the Clown 525) Shalimar’s first encounter with India (Kashmira) annihilates Boonyi’s death as he imagines as rebirth of the mother in the daughter:

“When he saw her, when those green eyes speared him, he began to tremble…
She was living in America now and by some miracle she was twenty-four years old again, mocking him with her emerald eyes, she was the same and not the same, but she was still alive”. (Shalimar the Clown :526)

Shalimar’s revenge is derailed in encounter with India. India Ophuls (Kashmira), the protagonist again troubled with double names. Kashmira (from Kashmir) living in America. India Ophuls longs for the hidden truth about her lost Kashmiri mother, of whom it is forbidden to speak. “The ambassador had entombed her memory under a pyramid of silence.” (Shalimar the Clown :22). Kashmira or India Ophuls is in the process of discovering truth about her bio mother and her birth history.

Kashmira’s regained identity symbolizes the new beginning of chaos and atrocities to the full of hope and regeneration. Her presence is an identification of the symbols of readers by the author that Kashmir will not be lost; it will emerge from the darkness into the light of true freedom and hope for its entire people, a new life. She symbolizes this new beginning in her realization and acceptance of her new phase of identity. She was no longer a prisoner of hate when she lets her arrow find its mark. Her identity reconstructs in this manner. She consumes her revenge and make herself burden free. Her soul was curious to know about her real mother. Her father, Max Ophuls is unable to peep into her psyche and know her tribulations:

“What was not hidden, what was overt, was not true. She wanted her mother. She wanted her father to tell her about her mother, to show her letters, photographs, to bring messages from the dead. She wanted her lost story to be found. She didn’t know what she wanted.” (Shalimar the Clown :18)
Every character in the novel is disturbed and their psyche is wounded. The novel is full of surprises, discoveries, cultural collision marked by bewilderment, a sense of shock, withdrawal or adaptation. Max’s murder breaks her into pieces but her identity gets shattered when she visits Pachigam. India visits India to enquire about her mother Boonyi’s tormented life. India finds her mother murdered, killed and died many times by all whom she had loved. Boonyi’s identities have been magnified here. India is broken after her mother’s story and visit she pays to her place of murder by Shalimar:

“She saw her mother standing in a blizzard while the people among whom she had grown up treated her like a ghost. They had killed her too; they had actually gone to the proper authorities and murder her with signature and seals. And meanwhile in another country the woman she would not name had killed her mother with a lie, killed her when she was alive, and her father had joined in the lie so he was her killer too, Then in the hut on the hillside followed a long period of living death while death circled her waiting for its time and then death came in the guise of clown, The man who killed her father had been her mother’s husband. He killed her mother too.” (Shalimar the Clown :598)

India nurtures revenge for Shalimar who is facing trial for Max’s murder. She feels the resurrection of her parents in her and she keeps haunting by writing Shalimar in the prison as he waits for his life sentence. She curses Shalimar:

“A woman, my mother, died for the crime of leaving you, Kashmira wrote. A man, my father, died for taking her in. You murdered two human beings because of your
egotism your amazing egotism that valued your honour in their blood but you did not wash it clean it’s bloody now. You wanted to wipe them out but you failed, you killed nobody. Here I stand. I am my mother and my father. I am Maximilian Ophuls and Boonyi Kaul. You achieved nothing. They are not dead not gone not forgotten. They live on in me.” (Shalimar the Clown :618)

India’s letters again disturbs Shalimar as his revenge remains unfulfilled and his enemies are alive again .India’s genetic legacy and reincarnation of her parents provokes him to kill her. But she kills him with her favorite arrow piercing his heart highlighting India’s revenge fulfilled. The cyclical death of Shalimar is also a way for India to maintain her cynicism. As indicated by Jean Amery, the propagation of hatred and the subsequent refusal of common time are decisions that the casualty makes, and this decision is basically moral, however hostile to organic, against genuine and even hostile to social:

“The moral power to resist contains the protest, the revolt against reality, which is rational only as long as it is moral. The moral person demands annulment of time—in the particular case under question, by nailing the criminal to his deed”.

(Shalimar the Clown :172)

History repeats again and again and every character seeks revenge towards their fatalists. Max’s revenge towards his parents’ murder reflects his personal loss in 1930’s Strasbourg Anaya Ophuls and Max senior in the French resistance. He saves his life by flying Bugatti
Racer and earns a sobriquet of “The Flying Jew”. He creates another world similar to his historical happenings and he becomes the real culprit for the changes.

As Bacon famously warned, “Revenge is a kind wild justice, which the more man’s nature runs to, the more ought law to weed it out, for as for the first wrong, it doth the law; but the revenge of that wrong, putteth the law out of office” (Shalimar the Clown :347). In Shalimar the Clown, the “wild justice” of revenge is justified. The faith in revenge, Shalimar chooses simple solutions to his past, and Kashmira’s identity promised to seek justice with less blood. The revenge is substituted by character with forgiveness, this novel moves around the same fundamental belief of justice is viewed as an achievable goal.

Rushdie depicts every character’s story behind their anger, escape, betrayal and revenge. Every character’s innocence has been robbed and shapes the identities towards their reconstructive modes. The negation of revenge is a powerful motto in Shalimar the Clown. The novel is identified by various types of vengeances as their identities undergo different reconstructions.

It is indeed clear Shalimar is the victim in the novel, whose personal grudge against Max is intensified into his shaking hands with terrorists. This highlights the transformation of Shalimar into an assassin. India is the second victim. With the frustration of this victimization her identity completely changes. She wants to reciprocate in the same manner to kill Shalimar. She nails the criminal to his deed with her arrow. So what India seeks:

“She wanted avenging angels, angels of death and damnation, to come to her aid. Blood called out for blood and she wanted the ancient Furies to
descend shrieking from the sky and give her unquiet father's spirit peace.

She didn't know what she wanted. She was full of thoughts of death”.

*(Shalimar the Clown :331)*

The account travels through a progression of emergencies, yet each new emergency, apparently detached to the past one, thinks back to it in a way that must be perused as a ponder reproduction of what occurred sometime recently. Shalimar's change from a pure delight adoring craftsman to a wanton professional killer mirrors his recreated character. Shalimar murders Boonyi in the hills and Max in Los Angeles comforting his burning desire of revenge. Max and Boonyi get treatment for becoming reason for destroying Shalimar’s life. They become victims of Shalimar’s revenge. Shalimar becomes victim of India’s revenge. India’s dropout from her American life and her thoughts are occupied with single obsession of vengeance is same as in Shalimar’s response to the “injustice”. Her different thinking power, like Shalimar’s, are transformed into negative traits. Shalimar and India’s individual catastrophe followed by the alteration, time “standing till” frozen for revenge. Memory, disdain and vengeance yet again get to be distinctly instrumental in revealing covered stories and histories.

India’s life has been shaped out of revenge by Shalimar. Rushdie highlights fate also makes wild justice and humans become its real puppets. Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown* is a well-knitted narrative from his witty fictional yarn. Every character’s identity is reconstructed from national to transnational and their fateful mobility’s from the East to the West reconstruct their lives.

When the researcher comes across the novel, it is found that the Shalimar the Clown is made up of two narratives: one a love story in a beautiful setting, the other an assassination of the
American ambassador in brutal manner. The first story depicts Kashmir as a paradise with, multi-cultural, multi-faith tolerance and harmony. Boonyi Kaul, who is the beloved in the story, is a dancer and the daughter of a Hindu pandit. Shalimar the clown, who is the lover in the story, is a performer. His father is the Muslim by religion. The space they live is Kashmir and there is no antagonism.

Boonyi-Shalimar love story is a node through which another story opens onto a wider domain of importance – an act of ‘terrorism’. The second story, which culminates into an assassination of the ambassador, starts with the coming of Maximilian Ophuls, an American Ambassador to Kashmir. Getting access to Max as his driver, he finds a comfortable space to accomplish his intention i.e. to slaughter the ambassador very brutally. In this sense, the murder story entails alternative definition of terrorism, which in turn provides significant domain for analysis due to two important reasons. Firstly, it supplies the content that is against the spirit of his earlier novel The Satanic Verses (1988) and in tune with pro-Islam statements that he made later; and secondly, his statements post to the publication of Shalimar the Clown again reiterate the statements in the Satanic Verses. Taking into the entire history of Salman Rushdie’s definition and redefinition of the term terrorism, I would argue that Rushdie’s redefinition of terrorism in Shalimar the Clown is hypocrisy for survival.

No doubt, whether the novel is studied by foregrounding its setting or the storyline, the researcher finds the prime concern of critics to be territoriality. Taking into account a major aspect in Rushdie’s life i.e. the history behind Fatwa imposition by Ayatollah Khomeini in 1989 over him. In The Satanic Verses, Rushdie has presented what Khomeini called “a calculated move aimed at rooting out religion and religiousness, and above all, Islam and its clergy”. As the novel
was labeled an ‘apostasy’, he was condemned to death by Khomeini. Consequently, a $2.5 million bounty was put on his head, forcing Rushdie to go into hiding. In his attempt to escape from the decree, Rushdie announced and published apologies as a strategy for survival. In one of his announcement to apologize, Rushdie expressed regret as the publication hurt sincere followers of Islam.

Any of his apologies, however, were of no use; he had no any option to go hiding. One planned attack on Rushdie failed when the would-be bomber, Mustafa Mahmoud, blew himself up along with two floors of a central London hotel. Similarly, Hitoshi Igarashi, the Japanese translator of the book, was stabbed to death in July 1991, and many others were made targets of attack. Italian language translator, Ettore Capriolo and William Nygaard, the publisher in Norway, were among others who survived an attempted assassination. It was good that Rushdie could survive unharmed to hear Iranian government’s statement about the lifting of fatwa in September 1998. But, some fundamentalist Muslim groups declared that a fatwa cannot be lifted.

The corollary of Fatwa and Rushdie’s apology to lift it in 1989/90 reappears in 2005 and reveals an interesting fact behind the publication of Shalimar the Clown. Khomeini’s fatwa against Rushdie was reaffirmed by Iran’s spiritual leader in early 2005 in his message he explained that the day will come when they will punish Rushdie for his insults against the Koran and the Prophet. With it followed the publication of The Shalimar the Clown. The novel, like his essay “In Good Faith” does not attack Islam in the spirit of The Satanic Verses: there is neither the criticism of recent Muslim political figures such as Ayatollah Ali Khamenei nor the questioning to the authority of the very root of Islam: Qur’an and Prophet Muhammad. The only compelling instance
in the novel that describes ‘fundamentally Islam’ a characteristic is ‘jihadi training camps’. But here too, he is not straightforward as before.

Another instance, in which Shalimar assassinates Max which was viewed by many of the westerners as terrorist attack, is shown to be the case of personal revenge. The intention here is clear: by explicitly castigating western historical specificity about terrorism, he implicitly makes plea again to lift Fatwa. But the novel fails to function as such. In 2007, Fatwa was again reaffirmed. Leading Iranian cleric Hojatoleslam Ahmad Khatami declared that the revolutionary fatwa issued by Imam Khomeini remains valid and cannot be modified. What followed Khatami’s statement was Rushdie’s reaction in an interview with Pamela Connolly. Responding to her question, why he adhered to Islam and spoke in favor of the religion, he answered that it was deranged thinking.

Rushdie’s answer is clearly non-pro-Islam. His response shows that he lives in between the guilt for the past (criticizing Islam) and faith in the statements manifested in The Satanic Verses. Shalimar the clown dramatizes the guilt in the form of resistance to western discourse of terrorism as a consequence of Islamic fundamentalism. His faith, which is blasphemous for Islam, remains palimpsest here. By foregrounding his guilt, he attempts to appear true to Islam among the Muslim and thus make an apology to lift Fatwa. But once he knows that there is no such possibility, his anti-Islam mind resurfaces and does not hesitate to claim that he adhered Islam as strategy to escape ‘the pressure’. Hence, his redefinition of terrorism in the novel at the backdrop of the whole story from Khomeini’s Fatwa to his response to why he adhered to Islam cannot be dissociated. The close nexus compels any reader to conclude that Rushdie’s anti-western definition of terrorism
in Shalimar the Clown is another hypocritical effort to survive from the Fatwa reaffirmed over
him.

The transformation of thoughts into pictures – figurative composition – is plainly of
extraordinary import to postcolonial creators in their battle to interpret their socially particular
material into an outsider tongue and in addition, on the other hand, to redo English to mirror their
unique social substances. Not exclusively do such journalists, then, cross etymological
wildernesses however they additionally navigate different fringes: the worldly, as they move far
from their pasts into altogether different presents and fates; the mental, as they shed old selves to
embrace new ones; and the social, as they are both changed by and change their new social orders.
Furthermore, albeit even non transients encounter fleeting, mental, and social change, vagrants
remain the primal deciphered and making an interpretation of creatures, subject to and bringing
about more radical social bursts and re-definitions than others. (Mann, 1995; 37)

He shut his eyes and imagined his Kashmir. He evoked it its precious stone lakes,
Shishnag, Wular, Nagin, Dal; its trees, the walnut, the poplar, the chinar, the apple, the peach; its
strong pinnacles, Nanga Parbat, Rakaposhi, Harmukh. The Pandits sanskritised the Himalayas…
….O! Those days of peace when we as a whole were enamored and the rain was in our grasp
wherever we went… … Everyone conveys his address in his pocket so that at any rate his body
would achieve home. (Shalimar the Clown :305) The contention pursued by Sara Suleri and Aamir
Mehmud, if all the hypothetical stuff is dropped, rests, basically on their cases of being in the
ownership of "Muslim sensibility." And in this manner are enriched with a unique vantage indicate
reveal the Muslim governmental issues recorded in Rushdie's The Satanic Verses (1988). On the
premise of their being firmly adjusted to the Muslim sensibility, the claim made, a curiously tall
one is that *The Satanic Verses* basically manages the Islamic culture in the South-Asia. The inner conflict of frame so clear in this book you don't should be prepared in the elaborate measurement of his oeuvre is effortlessly related with the undefined structure of Muslim society in the subcontinent. That vacillation in *The Satanic Verses* as likewise in the *Midnight's Children* (1981) is connected with irresoluteness outside is unambiguous. To make the correspondence between the computed shape and the material and ideological worked outside selective to South Asia is less worthy than saying *Shalimar the Clown* is a restrictive safeguard of Kashmiri sensibility. The Shalimar the Clown is as much open to a Kashmiri—where the majority of the Book is attached as it is to somebody in America. In spite of the fact that as one acquainted with the nearby moorings, tastes and sounds, some fascinating experiences might be offered, notwithstanding, at last the book is thrown on cosmopolitan canvas getting the transcendent thoughts of the contemporary world inside its circle. For Rushdie is a think man, an efficient individual. He is as much aware of his topic as that of his all inclusive spread gathering of people.

Normally, Brennan, who trusts that *The Satanic Verses*, when all is said and done, is at its essential introduction, a religious book however obviously having a place with an extremely incredulous branch of Islam, i.e. Sufism, something on which he prides himself—for being the principal commentator to investigate that measurement is infuriated by the readings over controlled by Muslim or Islamic awareness. [i] However, the finish of his article "Salman Rushdie, *The Satanic Verses* and the post provincial feedback" in which he tears separated, point by point, the disputes of the two well known post frontier pundits, he leaves with an easily proven wrong intercession: Debatable on the grounds that, similar to the postcolonial writers whom he genuinely tried to set up for pushing Rushdie into the South-Asian Islamic tin-box, he dangerously outlines
the plan of postcolonial figure of speech. He says, quickly in accordance with the shock communicated:

Unless one keeps running with the ordinary binarism current in many circles of the postcolonial area, it is hard to reinforce this thin condition based valuable portrayal of the more interesting methods of expression of postcolonialism. It doesn't remain to be said that the area has ended up being immensely trying made as it is out of both interceded strands and set apart by the ascent of new strands staying in solitude definitions and expressed gathering.

With which strain in this amorphous game plan of drifting practices should one associate? [ii] Each one has a persuading presentation. There is on the one side the likelihood of family line. The Enlightenment family history takes one back to the hypothetical thoughts of development, propel, wonderfulness and taste. The all the more snappy printed, erratic one retreats to Edward Said's Orientalism (1978) and from him onwards to a whole extent of faultfinders possessing the space. Despite the likelihood that the genealogical field is by passed what remains is comparatively adequately solid to compel our thought. With the theoretical refinement and institutional hardening of postcolonial studies as a social instruct focused on the examination of talk a stray educational institutional quality has sprung up around the past liberatory essentialness. As opposed to aiding in revealing the ideological dissimulation of radical political economy in the gathered postcolonial world, it has immediately transformed into a bit of comparative equipment. With the result an unmistakable "canonization and com modification" (Wolfreys 205) has made advances realizing the strong complicity of the instruct with goals it was suggested to research. Given the change in the genealogical source, weaved systems of the improvements' advancement, differing disciplinary affiliations and not precisely equivalent regions, introduce dominion continues on be a rising
heterogeneous and once in a while contradicting field. It is in this setting Brennan's support of summoning the torments of imperialism presents issues. For when the field is involved by the warring tribes of theoreticians moved by their neighborhood impacts, Suleri and Aamir, despite their unsuspecting case on the Muslim sensibility, do have a benefit to take show expansionism on domains not supported by the conventional binarism under commitment to the essential world Academics. This is issue number one, fairly distant from my provoke concern, yet the second one, reminiscent of the previous, wherein, he gives an outright region and ability to third world researchers after the withdrawal of the material political points of confinement of the domain, is of tireless congruity here. For a verbalization of the unique episodic postcolonial space of Pachigam having an unambiguous obvious authenticity would underline the coincidental quiet. The point made is:

Frankly, it is especially in Third-World fiction after the second world was that the livelihoods of "nation" and "patriotism" are for the most part explained. The "nation" is effectively what Foucault has called "drifting course of action"- not only an ethical story or inventive dreams. Regardless, a gustative political structure which the Third-World specialist is all the time either purposely working of torment the nonappearance of. (Brennan)

A specific division of Third World fiction researchers between the people who are incorporated into the nation surrounding process and the people who end up in an ideological part without the establishment of nation is savvy of, on the one side, an over the top capacity to treat the past domain whose branch the nation is as a sort of viewpoint point and on the other absolutely ignore, if not deny, the universe of alterities available to a third world writer. An unmistakable a substantial case is Salman Rushdie. May be *Midnight's Children* (1981) and some of his
subsequent compositions deal with the two issues yet shouldn't something be said about the *Shalimar the Clown*. At one level the dissents raised might be brushed away by driving the maker into an unyieldingly rootless cosmopolitan space removed from whatever is left of the Third World fiction. In any case, the question stays, paying little respect to whether, for example, his latest novel *Shalimar the Clown*, the lion's share of which is set Kashmir, a piece of the Third World space, can or can't be constitutive of the gathered third world fiction. Another part, which can be accommodately intervened here, is the very considered third world (Aijaz Ahmad in his shrewd intervention, however ascending out of a Marxist-Hegelian cross section, *In Theory: Classes Nations and Literatures* (1992)... extremely attracted with the likelihood of "Third World", its starting, improvement and the ideological repercussions). If *Shalimar the Clown* does not attempt to clearly collect or strengthen a nation it doesn't lament the nonappearance of either. Here survey that the nation or patriotism as it creates in Brennan is not the same as it unassumingly spreads out in Rushdie's novel. In the past, the contemplations are by and by related with the common thoughts of nationhood in the Third World evading the little blended, syncretic spaces as Pachigam which however sharing in a fundamentally one of a kind sense to which I would return soon, yet through its collectible, confounding stream held out the desire of dazzling differentiating choice to the by and large, overwhelming hypotheses. Underneath the vision of hopelessness and the obviously whole loss of desire as the pulverization of the introduced cover common structure of this town lay the purification of an idea which is attempted to be recorded by new time thing Kashmira, young lady of Boonyi Kaul from Maximilian Ophuls. Her visit to Kashmir, searching for roots and repeating the inconspicuous components of her mother's life and furthermore Pachigam passes on a recovering blaze for her own excited self and additionally the leveled downtown as well. She acknowledges the kind of a transmitting expert of the significant arranged ethos of the myth-
stacked town. By and by returning to the central issue; whatever questionable minutes we find in Brennan's work and in various types of the postcolonial talk there are, regardless, from a just utilitarian unmistakable perspective certain components commode indicate here comprehend is that these two strengths notwithstanding others which supplement each other in laying to ruins the magically arranged substance of Pachigam have their source at last in estrangement. Distance caused by innovation and merged by postcolonial ambiguities of the sub-landmass. Maulana Bulbul Fakh, metonymically speaks to the religio-political fundamentalist association Jamaat-e-Islami established by Maulana Abul Ala Maududi (1903-1979) in 1941. This association drew motivation from the bigger evangelist spirits in the Muslim world. The accentuation in this and in addition different developments was on a travel in reverse towards the center occupants of Islam. A review and examination of the Prophet's opportunity was the way to recreate the same in the current confused conditions. It was a recuperating methodology. Innovation wreaked mental destruction in the Islamic world prompting to social separation and nervousness. An exit from this overwhelming situation was found in a more strict understanding of the sacred writings. That is to state accepting the message and headings as they were by the Prophet and friends. Maulana Bulbul Fakh's explosion against Hindus is halfway in light of this simpleton analysis of the sacred text. This went straightforwardly against plural framework of the town in which God was riddle exemplified and most incomprehensible, and not worshiped in the way Maulana sought after to build up and advance.

Standing at the middle of junction, a transient got between three nations, not able to exist serenely in who Salman Rushdie is backed on a passionate footing of talks that empower "trans nearby mélange societies". Edward Said fights, "the intifada of the creative ability", and his works work "as operators of social, scholarly and social change, since they present entire new universes".
Alluded to as a post-9/11 novel, Salman “Rushdie's Shalimar” the Clown is viewed for instance of how the contemporary postcolonial novel open deliberations multiculturalism, globalization, personality, custom, fear mongering, neo-dominion. It has been depicted in the novel that dives profoundly into inner foundations of religious fear based oppression, and as an investigation of the post-9/11 world. Through *Shalimar the Clown* Salman Rushdie endeavors to praise the smoothness of character, the activeness disappears and the cooperation between the worldwide and the neighborhood. In any case, he appears to send a serious cautioning that social transfuse is wilting and the talks that support "non-character" and creolized 'mélange societies' are turning out to be less mainstream due primarily to the conspicuous re-rise of primordial’s or essentialism that regards way of life as "settled and natural, something pre given, foreordained, or natural” and the noteworthy rebound of religion into world motivation in the repercussions of the 9/11 assaults, endangering the meanings of a 'decent multicultural society'. It endeavors to address the issue of "nonidentity" and "glocalization" in the post-9/11 setting in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*. At the end of the day, we will explore the portrayal of and the connection between the far off and the nearby, the neighborhood and the worldwide, and the remote and the intriguing in the post-9/11 world, through an inside and out examination of Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*. It's implied that there is a blossoming writing that arrangement with versatile global impact. This writing endeavors to show the way that the outskirts appear to have stopped to exist. To demonstrate that the world has turned out to be borderless because of globalization and its going with innovative improvements, in his *Shalimar the Clown*, Salman Rushdie rises the voices for the fenceless world and its suggestions: "wherever was presently a piece of wherever else. Russia, America, London, Kashmir. Our lives, our stories, streamed into one another's, were no longer our own, individual, discrete”. The most essential point that ought to be accentuated here is that
speculations of globalization have moved from articulations of the procedure as 'social colonialism' or 'neo-dominion', to investigations of the 'hybridization', 'dispersion', and interrelationship of worldwide social orders, the pressure of the world and the escalation of the cognizance of the world as entirety. Rushdie in this way endeavors to claim that in spite of the fact that globalization may yield a more noteworthy social likeness among people groups; this comparability has a tendency to create not through the inconvenience of one arrangement of social values on another. Rather, social likeness has a tendency to create through the blending of differences of social qualities, drawing nearer to Pieterse's "social melange" than social dominion. In such manner, Craig Calhoun affirms that it is a genuine slip-up to see globalization essentially as the spread of free enterprise and Western culture. To undermine the acculturate proposition that considers globalization to be a Western venture or a metaphorical articulation of Western colonialism, Rushdie appears to concur with Jonathan Friedman's contention that "we are seeing a development of a flimsy period of de-hegemonization" and thus it is inappropriate to state that transworld network is extraordinarily western. In his book “Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory”, Bhikhu Parekh claims that

“globalization basically begins in and is impelled by the West, and includes Westernizing whatever is left of the world] … [Non-Western thoughts likewise go on its back and twist the West's own particular self-understanding methods for life] … [Western trades don't bode well unless they are acclimated to nearby culture] … [Globalization, in this manner, includes confinement and in any event some valuation for and regard for social differences].”

This association amongst globalization and confinement is obviously showed in the novel when Rushdie says whether it in Kashmir or in New York, "everybody's story was a piece of
everybody else's". In this way, Roland Robertson proposes that the expression "glocalization" all the more enough depicts the connection between the neighborhood and the worldwide as one of association and interpenetration instead of twofold alternate extremes. Put in an unexpected way, the neighborhood and the worldwide ought not be viewed as basic contrary energies, but rather the nearby adds to the character of the worldwide. Expressed succinctly, neither the worldwide nor the nearby ever exist in an immaculate frame. They are not fundamentally unrelated and they are rather always in a condition of cooperation. Similarly as globalization can upgrade the limit with regards to world citizenship, it can likewise encourage the upkeep and prospering of particularistic characters and connections. Both the dread of the worldwide and in addition the despise of the nearby are positions that disregard to consider that, in all actuality, culture is both neighborhood and worldwide, both national and transnational, both specific and half and half, both local and cosmopolitan. Strangely, Shalimar the Clown does not just recount the tale of Pachigam, a little town in Kashmir. It is for sure worldwide in its degree, starting in and returning toward the end to Los Angeles, moving to Kashmir, additionally crossing Continental Europe and England. Its main characters, Shalimar the Clown, Max Ophuls, Boonyi and Kashmira, are firmly connected to worldwide advancements. As an insistent champion of the cross breed and crossbreed, Rushdie does not paint the group of Pachigam as homogenous but rather as variegated and syncretism. That is to state, in this period of increased contemporary globalization and worldwide Diaspora, "well known lines amongst "here" and "there," focus and outskirts, province and city get to be distinctly obscured". All his characters god worldwide popularity, So He talks and practices that characterize the nearby and the far, the worldwide and the neighborhood, the self and the Other, the well known and the extraordinary are undermined by the new developing procedures of social hybridism and worldwide movement.
Rushdie endeavors to close to the spotlight the half breed debasements of metropolitan culture. He keeps up that "the loss of ... one family's house" is "the loss of each home" (*Shalimar the Clown* :138), and therefore Edward Said called the characters, "a summed up state of homelessness," a world where personalities are progressively coming to be, if not entirely deterritorialized, in any event diversely territorialized. Rather than trying to recoup some lost pristine country, the stories of fundamental characters are needing and longing for grasping the worldwide culture. Promote, the enticement of Boonyi by Max has created a half breed being, India or Kashmir Noman, the strict offspring of East and West, of the nearby and far, of the moderate and quick and of the worldwide and neighborhood, who lives in America and is left with no specific character to stick to. Her dad, Max, is someone from all around; he is a multilingual cosmopolitan whose personality drifts over worldwide spaces. The message Rushdie needs to pass on is that in this time of serious globalization "everybody on the planet has two mother countries". In one of his meetings, Rushdie broadcasts that "we as a whole cross outskirts, in that sense, we are all transient individuals". Basing on that, Rushdie displays his characters as having versatile and liquid personalities. What is vital is that the novel opens by portraying a city of rootless individuals, for the most part outsiders, who live in a kind of limbo. For instance, Olga, Kashmira's neighbor, says that in a philosophical manner. Rushdie's characters, living in a circumstance of not having a place, are chameleon like as in they effortlessly change their personalities and affiliations; their personalities are formed and reshaped, and surf starting with one space then onto the next. In question is that Rushdie's novel tries to represent the way that "not having a place, a feeling of illusion, confinement and being in a general sense 'withdrawn' with the world get to be distinctly endemic in such a culture". The possibility that ought to be brought up here is that personality is dependably a procedure which is shaped in what is called 'the third space', a zone that exists
between the recognizable and the outside. In addition, there are many characters in the novel that live inside the hyphen and these "blended bloods" characters posture both a more noteworthy test and a more serious peril to routine meanings of the country than "full blood" partners. In Shalimar the Clown, Boonyi, Shalimar's better half, transgresses the built up good, social and social estimations of her town, Pachigam, and departures with Max, an American representative. She despises her town and is enthusiastic for freedom, and along these lines she acknowledges the minister's offer of progress "looking for a future". Truth be told, Rushdie's Shalimar the Clown makes an impression on the individuals who adhere to their exclusionary particularistic characters that the words, for example, Muslim, Hindu, Christian, Jew and so forth ought to be simply "depictions" instead of 'divisions'. Consequently, all the significant characters in the books are worldwide and cosmopolitan characters whose connections and fidelities go past the scientific categorizations and limits of the country state. This because of the way that globalization has had a tendency to produce hybridism, where people have complex multifaceted characters and face difficulties of arranging a mix of once in a while clashing methods of being and having a place inside a similar self. Basically, characters in a more worldwide world are excessively various and covering, making it impossible to make feasible "us"/"them" divisions into discrete groups. Under states of hybridity, people who have a place with "them" in one regard have a place with "us" in another. For instance, people who are limited together when they underline a national part of their character promptly get themselves partnered with different circles when they underscore class, sexual orientation, race, or different measurements. In Shalimar the Clown, Rushdie celebrates social syncretism through showing Pachigam as place that is known for everlasting excellence and appeal where peace, love and fraternity portray the Kashmiri lifestyle. In Pachigam, Muslims and Hindus live in a tranquil conjunction on the grounds that "the words Hindu and Muslim had no
place in their story... In the valley these words were just depictions, not divisions. The outskirts between the words, their hard edges, had developed smirched and obscured. This was the means by which things must be. This was Kashmir" (Shalimar the Clown :57). By introducing Kashmir as the perfect world with its interesting lifestyle where contrasts are non-existent, Rushdie stresses and investigates "a vernacular type of metropolitican." This nearby type of metropolitanism draws on the perfect of Kashmiriyat, the ethos or the estimations of Pashigam which fill in as the reason for a vernacular cosmopolitanism. Drawing on the perfect of Kashmiriyat, Rushdie has a tendency to eradicate or decrease the undermining parts of religious and class contrasts. This point is obviously represented by Abdullah Noman, Shalimar’s dad, when he proclaims that Kashmiriness, the conviction that at the heart of Kashmir culture there was a typical bond that rose above all other differences] … [So we have Kashmiriness to secure as well as Pachigaminess too. We are all siblings and sisters here] … [There is no Hindu — Muslim issue. Two Kashmiri-two Pachigami-youths wish to wed, there's nothing more to it. An adoration match is worthy to both families thus a marriage there will be; both Hindu and Muslim traditions will be observed]

(Shalimar the Clown 110).