國立臺灣師範大學英語學系

碩　士　論　文

Master's Thesis

Department of English
National Taiwan Normal University

失去的樂園：
魯西迪《小丑薩利瑪》的空間再現

Paradise Lost:
Spatial Representations in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*

指導教授：蘇　榕

Advisor: Dr. Jung Su

研 究 生：林　憶　珊

中華民國一百零四年七月

July 2015

摘要

《小丑薩利瑪》是魯西迪首次探討有關喀什米爾衝突以及恐怖攻擊議題之小說。有別於其他著眼於恐怖主義與反恐怖主義關係等論述，本書可視為魯西迪書寫樂園的寫作計畫之延續。樂園乃至失樂園的意象可謂是魯西迪作品中相當重要的主題，除了代表作者對於逝去之理想的哀嘆，亦是提供魯西迪述說那些在當代現實生活中未被提及的故事的藝術空間。在《小丑薩利瑪》中，魯西迪透過書寫虛構的喀什米爾村莊帕希岡以及美國加州的洛杉磯，重塑了對於失去的樂園之想像。除了描繪出樂園如何被破壞，帕希岡與洛杉磯的空間再現可視為是魯西迪試圖連結無法回復的樂園意象與逝去的喀什米爾主義的一種表現。本論文旨在檢視魯西迪於《小丑薩利瑪》中如何透過描述居民們的觀點去表現樂園不再之意象。

本論文共計五章。第一章為緒論，說明魯西迪作品中樂園意象與喀什米爾主義的關聯，並簡述《小丑薩利瑪》在再現失去的樂園過程中所呈現的相關議題。第二章援引列斐伏爾的空間生產理論，並探討再現的空間如何展現抵抗的力量。第三章閱讀帕希岡村莊的空間再現，試圖理解該空間如何從和諧的村莊風景轉變為處在交戰狀態中的失樂園，並檢視人們如何經歷並記憶樂園的逝去。第四章則檢視洛杉磯作為帕希岡對應與相關的樂園意象，探討遷移帶給城市想像的不同敘述觀點，以及故事中角色印地亞/卡什米拉的紀錄片計畫如何呈現她試圖抵抗外在強加的知識與暴力。第五章總結本論文，探討魯西迪書寫帕希岡以及洛杉磯兩地的空間再現所呈現出的共通點，並連結魯西迪對於喀什米爾主義的看法，釐清作者於《小丑薩利瑪》中書寫失去的樂園之意圖以及作者如何面對暴力之反思。

關鍵字：魯西迪、《小丑薩利瑪》、列斐伏爾、空間生產、再現的空間、喀什米爾主義

Abstract

In Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*, the writer directly talks about the issues of Kashmir conflicts and terrorist attacks directly for the first time. Different from dominant discourses on terrorism and counter-terrorism, the novel can be regarded as a continuous part of Rushdie's literary project of writing paradises. The image of paradise, especially lost paradises, has become an important motif in many of Rushdie's works. It not only refers to Rushdie's lament for his lost ideals but also serves as an artistic space for the writer to speak for those untold stories of our contemporary realities. In the novel, Rushdie reinvents the remote village in Kashmir, Pachigam, and the metropolis in California, Los Angeles, as his emblem of paradise lost. Both of them do not merely represent the destruction of paradises in general. Instead, the spatial representations of Pachigam and Los Angeles as irretrievable paradises can be connected with the loss of Kashmiriyat. My thesis aims to examine how Rushdie portrays the two places through perspectives of their residents to represent irretrievable paradises in *Shalimar the Clown*.

This thesis is divided into five chapters. Chapter one serves as an introduction, in which I briefly discuss the connection between the motif of paradise in Rushdie's writing project and the author's search for Kashmiriyat and provide an overview of how the novel can be read as a story of irretrievable paradises. In chapter two, I try to investigate into Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space* and his elaboration on resistance force emerging from representational spaces. Chapter three will focus on spatial representations of the fictitious village in Kashmir, Pachigam, in order to examine its transformation from a harmonious village into a smashed paradise in militancy and to tease out how people experience and memorize its destruction. In chapter four, I turn to its counterpart, Los Angeles, to see how migration brings alternate

narratives into the vision of the city of angels and how India/Kashmira's documentary project exemplifies her efforts to resist imposed knowledge and violence. In the final concluding chapter of the thesis, I would like to tease out the common features shared by the two places and examine Rushdie's intention of writing lost paradises and his reflection on encountering violence in *Shalimar the Clown*.

Key words: Salman Rushdie, *Shalimar the Clown*, Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, representational spaces, Kashmiriyat

Acknowledgements

When I was astonished by the beauty of Hagia Sophia during my trip to Turkey for the presentation of a conference paper, an idea came into my mind: we may not know what we will eventually get after the journey, but the landscapes and experiences that we collect during the journey will be the best gift that we are blessed with. The years of studying in National Taiwan Normal University will undoubtedly be a significant journey in my life. I have learned and experienced a lot of things that I had never expected. I genuinely appreciate all the people that have helped me and encouraged me during the past years.

I cannot express my gratitude enough to my thesis advisor Professor Jung Su, who has been helping and encouraging me in many aspects since the first year of my graduate program. Without her encouragement, patience and guidance, I would not have acquired the treasurable academic experience in conferences and completed my thesis. Also, I am deeply indebted to Professor Kun-liang Chuang and Professor Hsiu-chih Tsai. Professor Chuang's insightful questions and advice for my thesis help me clarify my arguments. Professor Tsai's warm encouragement and constructive suggestions sustain me to improve my thesis. I also want to thank Professor Chun-yen Chen for her helpful guidance during my proposal hearing.

I would like to express my great gratitude toward my beloved family and lovely friends for their constant support for my decision and their strong confidence in me. I feel blessed whenever I hear their kind words or feel their warm hugs. I feel blessed when I know my dear grandmother will bless and protect me wherever she is. "I am proud of you!" The sentence my friends and family members have said to me encourages me to fulfill my dream and to achieve my goals in this difficult year. I am a fortunate person and this thesis is dedicated to my loved ones.

Table of Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

Acclaimed as "a writer of an expanding world" (Tygstrup 198), Salman Rushdie addresses not only issues about the East and the West respectively but also the confrontation between them in his great number of stories or essays. In his major novels *Midnight's Children* (1981), *The Satanic Verses* (1988), *The Moor's Last Sigh* (1995), *The Enchantress of Florence* (2008) and other novellas and critical essays, Rushdie tackles a wide range of issues of the day, such as history, migration, identity, politics, globalization, and the essence of literature. As a whole, in Rushdie's literary world, literature offers possibilities of reinvestigating history and opportunities of articulating what has been usually ignored or covered up in our daily life.

In as early as his first novel, *Midnight Children*, Rushdie has alluded to his Kashmiri background by creating Dr. Aziz,[1] an E. M. Fosterian figure coming from Kashmir. In this eighth novel published in 2005, *Shalimar the Clown*, Rushdie directly probes into the Kashmir issue and complexities of migration through an intriguing portrayal of temporal/spatial relations lying in an assassination in Los Angeles. Different from narratives mainly focusing on terrorism and counter-terrorism, the story only ostensibly resembles a post-9/11 fiction for the assassination theme and the protagonist's Islamic background. Essentially, the novel can be seen as a part of Rushdie's larger vision of a lost ideal world and his extended meditation on space, migration and collisions between different values. Through his characters' perceptions of Pachigam and Los Angeles, both of which represent tarnished paradises in different forms, Rushdie manifests his imagination of Kashmir

[1] In Jung Su's reading of *Midnight Children*, Dr. Aziz is apparently "a parody of the protagonist, Dr. Aziz, in E. M. Foster's *A Passage to India*" (74), "whose eclectic mixture of the western liberal tradition and Islamic tradition is very much the reflection of [Rushdie's] own cultural background" (75).

in turmoil and his scrutiny of the cosmopolitan city so as to unfold our changing spatial and social relationships. It is in the changing spatial production of Pachigam and Los Angeles that readers may find that Rushdie does not merely talk about paradises in general but something that Rushdie and his characters have tried to retrieve behind the lost paradises.

The destruction of paradises has been an important motif in Rushdie's works. Seen as a Shangri-La existing long before the Partition, Kashmir usually represents a utopian figure in Rushdie's earlier works. However, this utopian figure of a composite India has been gradually distorted and lost its credibility[2] because of the increasing and intensifying conflicts in the 1980s and 1990s. The idea of an exclusive Hindu nation has replaced the inclusive feature of India. By retrieving the lost utopian vision of the world, many of Rushdie's novels render the hybrid ancestries of India as a fact that people once possessed and were proud of rather than a problem that needs to be solved by military force. The loss and the attempt to retrieve such a utopian figure thus recur in Rushdie's works, indicating his lament for a lost ideal and the anticipation for it in the future.

In *Midnight's Children*, Saleem begins his stories in pre-partitioned Kashmir where his grandfather Aadam Aziz, representing "the beginning of modernity in Kashmir" (Hogan 531) and the beginning of the declining spirit of Kashmiriness, unfolds a historical narrative which comes to a halt with a question in E. M. Foster's *A Passage to India*.[3] According to Patrick Colm Hogan, the chapter of Kashmir functions as a different mode of connection and transition "from what went before" to

---

[2] According to Nicole Weickgenannt Thiara, "[t]he idea of an inclusive, composite Indian nation based on tolerance and cultural synthesis was a key component of secular nationalist discourse during the 1930s and 1940s" (158).

[3] According to Jung Su, Rushdie's creation of Dr. Adam Aziz, "a westernized native intellectual tortured by a hole (the religious doubt) in the heart, a symbol of his embarrassing in-betweenness" (74-75), is a reconsideration of the question that Foster proposes in the end of *A Passage of India*: "Why can't we be friends now. . . . It's what I want. It's what you want" (316).

the "national imagination" (528) of India, because in the year of 1947, the region was getting involved in the dispute of national identities. Kashmir in *Midnight's Children* represents a lost Indian tradition of hybrid parentages before the birth of the nation, and the loss seems unable to be retrieved on account of the aggravation of the disputes.

After 1989, when Kashmir began to suffer the intensified conflicts between India and Pakistan, in the course of his hiding due to the *fatwa*, Rushdie introduced the valley of K in *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* (1990) as an "allegory from a child's perspective of the violence that has torn Kashmir apart since 1947" (Kung 86). Many literary critics regard the story as a transition of the author's artistic mode after the *fatwa*. Justyna Deszcz argues that the utopian valley of K actually provides an artistic solution to Rushdie's predicament since 1989:

> Rushdie created a world without imposed silence, in which literature, by harboring the right to free expression, functions as a guide to the dark alleys of current history. Admittedly, this vision has so far been attainable only in a fairy tale, but the book did help Rushdie ease himself out of the fatwa spell and recommence writing, the result of which was *The Moor's Last Sigh*. (28)

The valley of K, as an imagined space in Rushdie's artistic world, enables Rushdie to express his thoughts, his resistance against the threat of *fatwa*, and more importantly, his attempt "to push the boundaries as much as possible" (Rushdie, "Provoking"). It helps the author to illustrate the rights that he has been deprived of as well as what the village of K symbolizes: tolerance and freedom.

Having conceded that the paradise has been smashed, Rushdie then tries to compare what we once possessed and what we have lost in his literary world. In *The*

Moor's Last Sigh, he juxtaposes the Indian history with "a romantic myth of the plural, hybrid nation" (*The Moor's Last Sigh* 227), which represents an interrogation against the idea of an exclusive Hindu nation (Thiara 158). For Aurora, a character who tries to paint a tolerant Moorish Spain over the ugly present of India in the novel, the imaginary Mooristan is a place "where worlds collide, flow in and out of one another, and washofy away. . . . One universe, one dimension, one country, one dream, bumpo'ing into another, or being under, or on top of. Call it Palimpstine" (*The Moor's Last Sigh* 226). J. M. Coetzee in his review of *The Moor's Last Sigh* sees this as a "Palimpstine project," in which the author lays stress on "not overpainting India in the sense of blotting it out with a fantasy alternative, but laying an alternative, promised-land text or texturation over it like gauze" ("Palimpset Regained").[4] The author paints a myth of tolerant Moorish Spain over the cruel reality of India, even though the painting becomes darker and darker in the novel. The author's attempt is not to offer a fantastic world in literature for writers and readers to rest upon but to reevaluate the histories which we might have overlooked. The portrayal of a paradise lost in the past thus becomes Rushdie's humanistic response to violence and intolerance. In the conclusion of Justyna Deszcz's essay, she refers to this loss-of-paradise vision:

> [T]he hegemonic forces of intolerance in India may lead to another inquisition. No wonder Rushdie's tale has been interpreted not as a utopia but "an elegy for lost ideals, for Bombay, for India, for home, and ultimately, for Rushdie himself (Goonetilleke 147), a tale about a

[4] In his review of *The Moor's Last Sigh*, Coetzee argues that Rushdie's palimpsestual representation of Moraes over Boabdil and other parallel textual palimpsestual layers are a vigorous "novelistic, historiographical, and autobiographical device," with which the author proposes a contrast between the consequences of ethnic and religious intolerance and what might have taken place: "the Arab penetration of Iberia, like the later Iberian penetration of India, led to a creative mingling of peoples and cultures; that the victory of Christian intolerance in Spain was a tragic turn in history; and that Hindu intolerance in India bodes as ill for the world as did the sixteenth-century Inquisition in Spain."

paradise lost and a final defeat. (46)

Therefore, the representations of paradises in Rushdie's works do not refer to a process of restoration but a reinvention or reinterpretation of the loss of his home, his ideals and his faith. The author cannot and does not try to restore it or to provide a fantasy that may help ease his pain of losing the paradise. He tries to represent the historical development of its destruction to see what is missing from our contemporary realities. On the other hand, the loss is not a stable and fixed object in the past. Rather, it is an artistic reconstruction of what Rushdie has perceived, conceived, and experienced in the world, which eventually becomes the writer's direct interrogation to the world. The stories of paradise lost are not merely repetitions of the author's lost ideal; rather, they represent the process of how Rushdie relates himself to the world and to the loss in the past, the hope for the future and the challenges at present.

Echoing *The Moor's Last Sigh* but departing from its conspicuous palimpsestual metaphors, *Shalimar the Clown* turns to the spatial representations of two different forms of paradises: a fictitious village in Kashmir and a metropolis in the U.S. By teasing out the development of the two places, we can see how people project their desire to retrieve what they once possessed and their hope for the settlement in a better place onto their interaction with the changing space. The two places seem unrelated and different in many aspects at the beginning of the novel. However, in the revelation of each character's background and their observation of the places, we will see that both places share a similar landscape of paradise lost. The author intertwines the two lost paradises with his sustained efforts to counter the defined boundaries imposed by dominant political or religious discourses. In Rushdie's reinvention of Pachigam and Los Angeles as irretrievable paradises, we see not only the spatial

representations of their destruction but also the fading of Kashmiriyat that makes the two places similar and related. By depicting the deprival of Kashmiriyat, which represents Kashmiris' harmonious living experience and their pride in the manifestation of tolerance in Kashmir, both places are treated as the embodiment of Rushdie's elegy for lost ideals and his effort to resist the violence imposed on him in the global context of the last 20th century. Following Rushdie's previous works where the author represents the irretrievability of lost paradises and his artistic response to violence and changing social relations, *Shalimar the Clown* further exemplifies the prevailing influences of violence and migration of our time. When everywhere is a part of everywhere else, America, London, Kashmir (Rushdie, *Shalimar* 37), what is missing or has been ignored from our cognition of contemporary realities? What are the characters looking for during their migration from the past to the present, from their lost paradises to the new utopian vision?

To better understand how Rushdie applies spatial production of irretrievable paradises to represent his reinterpretation of lost ideals in the age of mass migration, I turn to Henri Lefebvre's triad of space. Refuting the idea that space is either a stable object or a mental concept, Lefebvre proposes a new tripartite and dialectical concept of space in *The Production of Space* (1974), suggesting that we see space as a tripartite concept, including *spatial practice*, *representations of space*, and *representational spaces*, rather than a neutral receiver or container. Lefebvre claims that we do not live in an absolute and materialist world and that individuals' experience of making use of space may provide different perspectives from what we learn from familiar dominant discourses. Furthermore, we need to consider those who will make use of space, since it is their everyday life experience that will offer new possibilities of seeing space. Even though Lefebvre's conception of space is mainly

based on his observation and research on cities, his triad of space will still provide insightful perspectives to examine Rushdie's spatial representations of the two different paradises in *Shalimar the Clown*. How do people memorize, historicize, or experience the loss of paradises and Kashmiriyat? What kind of spatial representations the characters present in their attempt to retrieve their lost paradises? It is the dialectical relations among spatial practice, representations of space and representational spaces in the spatial production of the two places that will help us understand "how this whole relational world of experience and information gets *internalized* within the particular subject" (Harvey, "Space" 128).

In light of Lefebvre's triad of space and his elaboration on the resistant force coming from representational spaces, I argue that Rushdie tries to foreground the message that there are more possibilities of interpreting our contemporary realities. By representing the gap between people's cognition and experience of space, the author attempts to resist the imposed violence that may induce or force us to believe one specific explanation of what our world is like. What messages does the author try to convey through his ongoing writing project of paradises in *Shalimar the Clown*? Why and how does Rushdie relate an assassination in Los Angeles to disturbance in a remote village in Kashmir? What can be inferred from Rushdie's parallel between a Kashmiri village and an American metropolis? Before discussing the spatial production in *Shalimar the Clown* with Lefebvre's triad of space, I shall explore the author's Kashmiri background and his cosmopolitan attitude toward changing spaces, migration and his writing. By teasing out the author's life trajectories and his all-inclusive cultural vision, it might become clearer for readers to see how two explosive changes in Rushdie's life shape his thoughts of encountering violence and how Rushdie represents the concept of Kashmiriyat in his description of two different

types of paradise.

Searching for the Lost Kashmiriyat

Salman Rushdie and His Indian/Kashmiri Background

Salman Rushdie was born in Bombay in June 1947, two months before the independence of India, a result of the partition of the Indian subcontinent after the British government's retreat from the colonial India, which led to the concomitant, endless insurgencies. Although Rushdie left the island in his adolescenthood and once stated that Bombay would no longer be the place that he wished to live in if he could have gone back to India (Haffenden 232), India's story remains hovering in his mind.[5] What he has acquired from the country has been rooted in his mind, and such perception shapes his thoughts on the image of India and adjacent area, Kashmir.

Having lived in the city of Bombay, Rushdie's family is probably more than being Muslim. The city of Bombay, being the earliest westernized and modernized city in India, drew people of different colors, languages, cultures or ethnicities to it and cultivated its own unique Bombayness in its metropolitan character, which makes cultural diversity its emblematic feature. Bombay was a "courtly, open, hilly seaside city" (Haffenden 232) in Rushdie's childhood. He was sent to England to study at Rugby School and at King's College, Cambridge since 1961. This life-long migration to different places has been mentioned in one of his many interviews: "I am an emigrant from one country (India) and a newcomer to two (England, where I lived, and Pakistan, to which my family moved against my will)" (Haffenden 232). His family moved to Karachi, Pakistan in 1964 because of the increasing hostility

[5] In "A Dream of Glorious Return," Rushdie refers to the importance of India in shaping his thoughts: "my characters have frequently flown west from India, but in the novel after novel their author's imagination has returned to it. This, perhaps, is what it means to love a country: that its shape is also yours, the shape of the way you think and feel and dream. That you can never really leave" (*Step* 195).

between India and Pakistan, and Rushdie was forced to leave the land of his birth after his father sold their house, Windsor Villa, in Bombay. Rushdie continued his studies in England, but sometimes he would visit the new home of his family in Pakistan during school holidays. Rushdie, who was a Bombayite until 17, "began to develop critical observations about his family's new homeland" (Sanga 15) and found the city "has almost no urban life because of the repressions in the culture" (Haffenden 233).

On the other hand, Rushdie's fascination about Kashmir recurs in his works. Through his fictional characters, Rushdie reminisces India and lets it recur in different forms. Like what the author usually does in his previous major novels, Rushdie "tease[s] out the roots in places long ago and far away" (Hari) in order for the readers to further understand the backdrop of *Shalimar the Clown*. In an interview with Jack Livings, Rushdie mentions his familial and literary bond with Kashmir: "My family's from Kashmir originally, and until now I've never really taken it on. The beginning of *Midnight's Children* is in Kashmir, and *Haroun and the Sea of Stories* is a fairy tale of Kashmir, but in my fiction I've never really addressed Kashmir itself." The author then finally returned to "one remaining thread of his complex cultural inheritance that he had not yet given substantial novelistic treatment" (Teverson) in *Shalimar the Clown* by setting his novel's backdrop in the place where his life story begins. For Rushdie, Kashmir was once a perfect trope of the earthly paradise with which Rushdie exhibits a humanistic vision of tolerance. The author's eclectic and tolerant attitude toward different cultures not only derives from his Europe experience but also comes from the inheritance that has been long existing in India and Kashmiri ancestry. Perhaps to Rushdie's assassins' surprise, his grandparents, Attaullah and Ameer Butt, were Kashmiri Muslims (Ahmedi 69), and his grandfather seems to have been a very devout Muslim. Rushdie describes his maternal grandfather as a man of religious

piety and tolerance:

> Unlike my father, my maternal grandfather was a devout man, who said his prayers five times a day throughout his life, and made the pilgrimage to Mecca. He was also a man of infinite sweetness, tolerance and patience, who taught his brood of grandchildren that there were to be no limits, in his presence, on what could and could not be discussed. . . . Openness: it was always openness with Dr. Butt. And we learned from that twinkle in his eyes that it was all right to push, and test, and try to open the universe a little more, even before we knew how. ("Freedom")

According to Johann Hari, Rushdie's maternal grandfather Dr. Attaullah Butt represents "an alternate Islam" that is different from the one of Khomeinist or Bin Ladenite. Openness and tolerance are the inheritance that Rushdie's Muslim grandfather taught him and what he observed in Kashmir. From his Kashmiri grandfather, he learnt Islam is "a religion of peace, not a religion of pieces" (Hari) and that Kashmir is the space of tolerance, not the space of violence. The alternate Islam and space of tolerance will become important motifs in many Rushdie's works, which suggest that there are more possibilities of imagining Islam, India, and our ways of life.

In his speech for India Today Conclave 2010, Rushdie indicates that the cultural openness that he has been pursuing throughout his life is not an imposed idea from the west but the essence of India that has long been deprived of.[6] People in India once possessed that quality, but it is diminishing with the partition of the nation. Therefore,

[6] "…the idea of cultural openness which I am here to commend to you, and which has been of such importance to me always, is an idea given to me in India, by Indians, an idea with old Indian roots, valued in every Indian community. This is no alien idea being foisted on India by outsiders. It is our heritage as Indians, integral to our own culture, and we must preserve it or lose some essential part of ourselves" ("Freedom").

the loss of paradises not only refers to the disappearance of the material part of the landscape in general but also implies the fading of the spirit that the district was proud of before. As Rushdie puts it in *Shalimar the Clown*: "To be a Kashmiri, to have received so incomparable a divine gift, was to value what was shared far more highly than what divided" (83). This perhaps becomes one of the reasons that Rushdie revisits Kashmir and tells the story of a village's destruction in the novel: to tell a Kashmiri story, in which Rushdie tells of how people from different parts of the world are eager for retrieving Kashmiriyat, the spirit of tolerance, in their search of space of tolerance.

Kashmir Conflicts and *fatwa*

Migration has long been regarded as a distinct feature in Rushdie's life and his literary works. According to Jaina Sanga, "the condition of migration usually refers to either a voluntary or involuntary displacement from one's native country, due to, among other things, war, disease, famine, or other natural disasters, or economic reasons"(14). Rushdie's life of migration can be traced back to his childhood, but the experience of fleeing from his homeland and the loss of Kashmiriyat have more to do with 1989, "the year of the real explosion in Kashmir and the year in which there was an explosion in [his] life" (Rushdie, Interview 2005). The two explosions refer to the insurgencies and intensified conflicts with bomb blasts in Kashmir since 1989 and the proclamation of *fatwa* after Rushdie's publication of *The Satanic Verses* in 1988, both of which represent the loss of a culturally and religiously harmonious life in Kashmir and Rushdie's freedom of speech. As seen in the previous discussion of his various depictions of Kashmir, the peaceful vision of Kashmir is actually a symbol of tolerance for Rushdie, while the two events in 1989 prove its inaccessibility to him

and force the writer to rethink the issue of violence and intolerance from an all-inclusive and eclectic position in his later description of Kashmir as a place that preserves the most precious part of human beings.

Kashmir conflicts have been considered an epitome of the consequences of the partition and Independence of India. Pankaj Mishra points out that "[t]he dispute over Kashmir, the biggest unfinished business of partition, committed countries with mostly poor and illiterate populations to a nuclear arms race and nourished extremists in both countries: Islamic fundamentalists in Pakistan, Hindu nationalists in India" ("Exit"). The disputed election in 1987 resulted in a rise in militancy and the return of trained militants from Pakistan. The rights and freedom of Kashmir Hindus were said to be restricted and the conflicts in Kashmir intensified.[7] Bomb blasts in Kashmir intensified militancy, which led to the dwindling population of Hindu Pandits and the migration to refugee camps in Jammu or dispersion in northern India. Though the tension between India and Pakistan has decreased after nearly two decades of conflicts in Kashmir and the disputed territory is now administered by India, Pakistan, and the People's Republic of China respectively, the troops around the territory and borders and series of protests in Jammu and Kashmir reveal the unrest in this area. The space of tolerance that Rushdie learned from his grandfather and the old Indian roots has been turned into the space of violence and arm forces. If Kashmir could have been regarded as an earthly paradise, it has been smashed into pieces and the writer cannot return to the place any more.

On the other hand, the metaphorical explosion falling on Rushdie, the proclamation of *fatwa* issued after his publication of *The Satanic Verses* in 1988, also triggered a great disturbance and threats to the writer, which totally changed his life

[7] According to the report "Seven killed in Kashmir Explosion" on *BBC NEWS*, "more than 60,000 people have been killed in Indian-administered Kashmir since 1989 when an armed insurgency began against Indian rule" and Islamist militants organized acts of ethnic cleansing.

from migratory to exilic[8]. Because of the blasphemous reference to Muhammad and Islamism in the novel, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, the political and religious leader of Iran, issued a *fatwa* against the author, which forced Rushdie to seek for asylum from the British government and began his life in hiding. The unexpected loss in the years of *fatwa* not only literally drew Rushdie from the land of his birth but culturally led him to an "in-between" position. He does not belong to the countries that offer shelter to him, either. For some critics, he is "a partial outsider to both" (Dascălu 2) and does not transcend them. That is, Rushdie chooses to stay in a detached position from either culture, telling stories in double bind situations in his own artistic space.

Reclamation and Reinvention of What Has Been Lost

Both Kashmir conflicts and the Rushdie affair expel Rushdie from his homeland and his ideal world. The geographical displacement and psychological disruption prompt Rushdie to further deliberate on his position as a cosmopolitan writer or a "cultural eclecficist"[9], who does not dwell on a stable and fixed point but embraces different cultures. The complexities of diasporic identities usually make writers like Rushdie caught in-between. After more than ten years of hiding, "the tug-of-war between 'here' and 'there'" (Rushdie, *Step* 294) has been turned into simply what the novelist himself calls the "unbelonging." "This unbelonging—I think of it as *disorientation*, loss of the East—is my artistic country now" (294). It is in that artistic country that the writer can keep writing without restraints, reclaiming his loss of or

[8] The wording of exilic here only refers to Rushdie's experience of hiding and seeking for asylum from other countries, indicating the unexpected loss of his connection with India and the Kashmiriyat spirit that he inherited from his grandfather and old Indian tradition under the threat of *fatwa*. Some critics regard Rushdie as an exilic writer because he no longer lives in India after the years of hiding, while many critics claim that Rushdie is more cosmopolitan than exilic as the author apparently enjoys the condition of belonging nowhere and pursue the space of all-inclusiveness. Therefore, the image of homeland/India in Rushdie's works is also transformed into a trope of the loss of spirits of tolerance and inclusiveness rather than a root for the writer.

[9] In Jung Su' review of *The Moor's Last Sigh*, she argues that Rushdie celebrates "cultural eclecticism," "which is mainly based on a hybrid, syncretic mixture of different cultural elements" (211).

his restoration of histories, especially when the East or the beautiful homeland is no longer accessible to the writer.

For such irremediable loss of the past and the futility of regaining it in the future, there seems to be nothing left for us to grasp at present. The present might be composed of illusion, dogma, or a great system of imposed knowledge that we find no attachment to it. What can a writer do if he finds the loss is irretrievable and the loss is considered natural? In an interview with Günter Grass, Rushdie argues that

> the fiction is telling the truth at a time in which the people who claimed to be telling the truth were making things up. You have politicians, or the media or whoever, the people who form opinion, who are, in fact, making the fictions. And it becomes the duty of the writer of fiction to start telling the truth. This is a kind of paradox which perhaps, is true of many countries now. ("Fictions" 73-74)

Even though our understanding of space, histories and the world are greatly influenced by institutions of power or knowledge, we still have our own perception of the world. The ability of an artist, or the task of an artist, is to articulate and to manifest the world from another angle of spaces and histories by foregrounding what human beings have perceived or experienced. Justyna Deszcz asserts that what Rushdie manages to present in his novels is what has been "marginalized or obliterated," and that "any tale, including official and predominant versions of history, are open to reinterpretations" (43). Rushdie's reinvention of stories is virtually the reclamation of what has been ignored in the past, present, and very probably, in the future.

In recalling "Ten Years of the Fatwa" in 1999, Rushdie proclaimed that "*I'll go on*. A writer's injuries are his strengths, and from his wounds will flow his sweetest,

most startling dreams" (*Step* 294). The experience of *fatwa* and Kashmir conflicts do not hinder his writing career; rather, they reinforce his will to go deeper to the issues of violence and intolerance, both of which have great impact on Kashmir and his life. Rushdie calls for our resistance against violence, because "[t]o appease violence only ensures that such violence will be used more frequently in the future. To surrender to the threat of violence is to damage one's own moral fibre" ("Freedom"). Refusing to surrender to violence, Rushdie suggests that the correct response is "to demonstrate that violence is counter-productive, and that when we are threatened, we are not afraid. That we can stand our ground against the men of violence and force them to retreat" ("Freedom").

The two explosive events in 1989, Kashmir conflicts and the *fatwa* affair, can be seen as the consequences of the loss of Kashmiriyat, spirit of tolerance, and the extreme of love and hatred. The beautiful and peaceful Kashmir, once India's fairyland and his belief of human beings' capacity of tolerance, now falls preys to the "successive Indian and Pakistani governments, all of them more less venal and corrupt, mouthing the self-serving hypocrisies of power while ordinary Kashmiris suffered the consequences of their posturing" (Rushdie, *Step* 305). On the other hand, even though the *fatwa* affair looks more like a personal issue, for Rushdie, it also represents a form of violence toward human rights and the freedom of a writer. The unexpected deprival of Kashmiriyat is carried within the writer and becomes Rushdie's trope of the lamentable loss of paradise. As a writer, what Rushdie can do to resist the violence that has imposed on him is reclaim and reinvent what he has been deprived of through writing.

Therefore, the perished paradise Pachigam and disillusion of cosmopolitan vision of Los Angeles that Rushdie describes in *Shalimar the Clown* can be read as an

extended project of writing paradise lost. Through the lenses of characters who are living or connected to those places, Rushdie portrays the perspectives of those who have been absent from dominant discourses on terrorism and "the visible but unseen spaces of contemporary realities" (Tygstrup 199),[10] encouraging his readers to rethink what is disappearing behind the loss of paradises and to reimagine what our world could be like without the constraints of specific discourses. Rushdie has been working on the vision of paradises or paradises lost. Perhaps, just like what the title of *Shalimar the Clown* implies, the author himself is also walking on a tight rope while he chooses to reinvent the essence of Kashmiriyat in his literary works. Because of his attempt to say something different from the dominant or hegemonic discourses on religions or politics, he has been encountered with death threats or restrictions as the punishment for his rebellious expression of thoughts. His writing project is similar to walking on the tight rope, a performance that is full of danger and risks. However, to resist violence or fabricated facts, we need to become our own guardian angels so as to unravel realities and to push the boundaries as much as we can. Dwelling in fabricated dreams will not give us the chance to retrieve what we have lost. In search of Kashmiriyat, we need to take risks to know the world outside the pre-determined boundaries and to speak for those silenced. In this way, we may be able to regain what we once possessed and to learn more possibilities of what our world should be or could be like.

***Shalimar the Clown*: A Story of Irretrievable Paradises**

[10] In his review of *Shalimar the Clown*, Federik Tygstrup argues that Rushdie has been dedicating himself to examining our present spaces by "insisting on accepting the full consequences of the way in which spaces are changing around us, something which we might intellectually acknowledge albeit without being able to actually imagine what it entail" (199). Therefore, the histories of Rushdie's fictions usually take place in spaces of radical changes, which defy our perception of the world and unfold the unseen parcels in our daily life.

> That's all gone now, and even if there's a peace treaty tomorrow it's not coming back, because the thing that was smashed, which is what I tried to write about, is the tolerant, mingled culture of Kashmir. After the way the Hindus were driven out, and the way the Muslims have been radicalized and tormented, you can't put it back together again. I wanted to say: It's not just a story about mountain people five or six thousand miles away. It's our story, too.
>
> --Salman Rushdie, Interview with Livings

When talking about the reason why he writes a story about Kashmir, Rushdie argues that Kashmir is lost even though people may have tried to alleviate the militancy there. The harmonious landscape of which Rushdie was informed by his grandfather is lost. The tolerant and multicultural community is lost. Even if someone attempts to rebuild a similar community at the original location, it is no longer the one people are looking for, because what is actually lost in the conflicts is the spirit that was shared by everyone in the district: Kashmiriyat. The loss of paradises therefore refers to the loss of that spirit. In this way, not only will people in Kashmir experience such dramatic changes in their lives, but people like us will also perceive similar landscapes in our own places. The parallel between two different types of paradises, Pachigam and Los Angeles, implies the fact that Rushdie applies a Kashmiri story of lost paradises to speak for *our* stories.

The story of *Shalimar the Clown* begins in 1990s Los Angeles with an assassination of a former American ambassador, Maximilian Ophuls, who fought in the French resistance against the Nazi during the Second World War and was appointed as an ambassador to India and an unspecified agent in American interests in Asia. Max is depicted as a representative of America's counterterrorism. The

assassination is conducted by Max's Muslim driver Shalimar from Kashmir, who is thought of as a professional terrorist related to *Jihad*. However, the assassination is later discovered a personal revenge as well as the outcome of the U.S.'s policy in the east, which draws readers back to 1965 Kashmir, a more harmonious fictitious village where Shalimar lived with his wife Boonyi. When Max served as the American ambassador to India, he met Boonyi. With Max's infatuation with her, Boonyi seized the opportunity to escape from her confining village Pachigam in Kashmir. However, Max lost his passion for Boonyi by the height of the Vietnam War, so Boonyi was sent back to Pachigam alone. Her daughter, Kashmira, was taken away by Max's wife to the UK and was renamed India.[11] Because of Boonyi's betrayal, Shalimar started his journey of revenge to kill Boonyi, Max, and their illegitimate daughter. Supported by the U.S. allies during the Cold War, Shalimar trained as a professional terrorist. The disgrace of her wife's betrayal and the destruction of his village by Indian troops make Shalimar transform himself and start the journey of revenge. The story is like a transnational epic narrative, and each chapter with one specific character's name presenting readers the story with different perspectives.

Shalimar the Clown could be regarded as the first novel that Rushdie directly and vividly describes the condition of Kashmir, and it also touches upon the issue of terrorist attacks. Published in 2005 and depicting an assassination conducted by a man related to the terrorist organization, the novel gains great attention from the public and inevitably reminds its readers of the September 11 attacks in the U.S. in 2001, even though the novel is actually not a post-9/11 fiction in terms of its setting.[12] From the

[11] Therefore, I will use India/Kashmira while talking about the Max's daughter in *Shalimar the Clown* so as to distinguish the name of the character from that of the nation.

[12] A post-9/11 fiction usually takes the September 11 terrorist attacks as its background, and there have been a great number of works trying to describe the world after the September 11 attacks. However, the year of Max's assassination falls in 1991. Even so, many critics still regard Shalimar the Clown as a post-911 fiction. Jason Cowley points out that "a celebrant of post-colonial hybridity and diversity, of

Second World War to the terrorist attacks during the 2000s, from the smash of Kashmir to the disillusion of Los Angeles dream, the story of violence and betrayal and Rushdie's portrayal of lost paradise have been situated in a broader transnational and global context. In reality, after the September 11 attacks, many governments start their wars on terrorism, including "the control of immigration, as well as the criminalization of Islam" (Morton 338). Gradually, there tends to be a binary opposition between terrorism and counter-terrorism, while Muslims or migrants are usually associated with the former. From a rather different point of view, Pei-Chen Liao finds "in representing familiar ambivalence between present and past, self-protection and self-destruction, and friend and enemy at both the political and personal levels, Rushdie deconstructs the dominant post-9/11 perception that terror comes solely from essentially evil terrorism and terrorists" (29). Instead of taking the novel as merely a story of terrorism versus anti-terrorism, Liao suggests that *Shalimar the Clown* be anchored in a broader implication of 9/11 and what the novel emphasizes is "the terrifying consequence of the existential distinction between friend and enemy and that of self-ignorance of strangers within" (77). The assassination does not result from essential differences among the characters. It is the extreme expression of love and hatred, intolerance and violence that leads to the murder and the destruction. To divide people into Muslims and non-Muslims, Americans and non-Americans can only make the country in an unending disturbing or even militancy situation. Prompted by the tension between terrorism and counter-terrorism that has been existing in many countries, Rushdie attempts to transform an American story of counter-terrorism into a Kashmiri story of intolerance, which unfolds what is

---

cultural fusion and mergings, Rushdie is here grappling imaginatively with the shock of 11 September 2001 and the wars that have followed." In "The Political is Personal," Peter Heinegg also states that *Shalimar the Clown* is an enthralling story in that the "sprawling story flashes back and forth from pre-World War II Strasbourg to present-day Los Angeles, touches at least fleetingly on every major world crisis from the Holocaust to 9/11."

happening around the assassination besides the rigid impression of a terrorist attack. The Kashmiri perspective will allow the author to stand away from those two extreme standing points and to blur the established boundaries between the two different political or religious groups.

Another important figure of the novel lies in the motif of migration. In *Shalimar the Clown*, Rushdie offers a detailed portrait of destruction of an earthly Edenic place and recounts an assassination in Los Angeles. Furthermore, while recounting the main characters' life trajectories, the story reaches England, France, Philippine, and other places around the world. Global migration plays a vital role in the novel. Since most characters in the novel possess the experience of migration, Shao-ming Kung interprets *Shalimar the Clown* as "an invocative archive of migration and globalized production of modern terrorism, which articulates the present with counter-public, minor perspective of the 1947 Partition" (84). The story presents the issues related to migration with perspectives of those who cannot dominate the power and the right to speak in dominant discourses. To look at the story from other possible perspectives will provide us opportunities to reexamine and rethink the established facts. In an interview with Rushdie, Johann Hari proposes that

> Rushdie sees his career as falling into three acts. In the first, he wrote about his lost homelands—India and Pakistan. Then he wrote about the transition from that world to Britain, the journey across water to the West. "And now I think that the third act is to say, 'All right, all that happened,'" [Rushdie] explains. "The world has become this mixed up place, the age of mass migration has taken place and we live in its aftermath - now what?"

In *Shalimar the Clown*, Rushdie deliberates on the influence of migration and

globalization. “The crossing of borders, during the twentieth century, whatever the motives, origins, and destinations, has become an extremely significant issue since more and more people are affected by it” (Sanga 14). *Shalimar the Clown* unfolds an alternative perspective on it. The novel thus becomes a story connecting the previous two acts that Rushdie worked on before, moving beyond talking about lost homelands and new lives in the west respectively but focusing on the interrelating network in the age of migration and the common experience of losing paradises shared by the rural village and the metropolis. Rushdie indicates that “I have spent a lot of my life looking positively at the consequences of migration. Now I'm being forced to see that there's a nightmare as well as a dream" (Hari). Migration can provide possibilities, but it can also bring problems or challenges. Whether the consequences of migration are good or not, we all need to respond to them, as the influence is so prevailing that we cannot escape it. *Shalimar the Clown* reveals how residents respond to the upcoming insurgencies and how immigrants relate themselves to the outside world in a globalization of violence and migration. Migration allows migratory characters to bring their historical narratives to merge into the new lands. Their spatial representations will show us the changes of space as well. To read the production of space is to see the development of social relations. Focusing on Rushdie’s mapping of the territorial relations that are inscribed in spaces, Frederik Tygstrup argues that Rushdie exemplifies the change of our spatial practice in terms of “territorial order, deterritorializing tendencies, and reterritorializing practices” (199). According to Tygstrup, the transformation of our spatial practice is “a necessary outcome of migration and migratory characters” (204). Boonyi leaves her hometown to search for more freedom and possibilities in the new place. People move from their perished paradises to the new utopian visions. India/Kashmira visits Kashmir to retrieve the

traces of her mother and her untold stories. In their migration, they all try to find something that they think may exist in their destinations. On the other hand, their migration reconfigures spatial imagination of the residents and readers, bringing more possibilities and challenges to spatial production of their living space.

Spatial representations in the novel thus become an interesting topic. Gavin Keulks suggests that spaces in *Shalimar the Clown* are endowed with more significant intensions in Rushdie's revaluation of post-modernism and postcolonialism. According to Keulks, the fictitious village Pachigam is where "the magic didn't work, the real world refused to be banished" (Rushdie, *Shalimar* 369) while Los Angeles has "no mysteries here or depth" (Rushdie, *Shalimar* 5). It is an interesting comparison between Pachigam and Los Angeles in light of Keulks' article. Perhaps the two paradises that Rushdie portrays in *Shalimar the Clown* look different in terms of their spatial practice, but both of them indicate the fact that the realities do not want to be banished or forgotten. Without knowing what actually happens around us, there will be no depth or meaning of space. Therefore, Rushdie's description of Pachigam and Los Angeles can be seen as a call to urge his readers to pay attention to what is happening in Kashmir, in Los Angeles, and in our lives.

In John Updike's review of *Shalimar the Clown*, he argues that the novel actually describes the ruination of two paradises: California and Kashmir:

> . . . the former [California] by "human bloat" in the shape of trailer parks and "the new pleasantvilles being built in the firetrap canyons to house the middle-class arrivistes" and the "less pleasantvilles in the thick of the urban sprawl…the dirty underbelly of paradise," and the latter [Kashmir] by Islamic uprising and the matched savagery of the insurgency's attempted suppression by the government of India.

In Updike's point of view, California and Kashmir represent different forms of paradise lost respectively in *Shalimar the Clown*. Kashmir is considered a pastoral paradise destroyed by the constant insurgency on the subcontinent due to political and military power struggle, while California embodies the disillusion of Pleasantville image of Los Angeles. Though they seem different in the beginning and do not receive the same attention from the world, readers will soon find similarities in the collapse of their paradisiacal images. Their memories keep getting into each other's histories. Furthermore, both Pachigam and Los Angeles are endowed with people's hope of retrieving something lost, such as the hope of regaining their harmonious multi-ethnic and multi-cultural village, the hope of living in a place with no fear of death. It is in how Rushdie intertwines his personal experience with the two paradises that we find the buried stories of those silenced.

Both Pachigam and Los Angeles are not merely settings or geographical terms of little importance in the novel. The spatial production of these two places represents our changing social relations. According to Geetha Ganapathy-Doré, "such paradises will have to become either virtual or portable images," which encourages us to "envision a new and better future by having intimations of transcendental beauty and bliss" (45). However, the author does not create a fantasy for his characters to rest upon. Instead of creating an alternative wonderful utopia in the novel, Rushdie reinvents the valley of Pachigam, a smashed paradise in militancy and a sad epitome of the lost Kashmir and Kashmiriyat. Some critics, such as Celia Wallhead, regard Kashmir as an emblem of "flawed Eden" (91). What happens in Pachigam will appear in Los Angeles as well. The two places look quite similar for some characters. Through their perspectives, we see a different imagination of the village and the city. The portrayal of intensifying agitation and conflicts in Pachigam unfolds the unending

disturbances in Kashmir, while India/Kashmira's observation of the city poses a challenge against the Pleasantville vision of Los Angeles. They are no longer paradises. By paralleling the fictitious village Pachigam with Los Angeles, Rushdie is able to foreground the issue of intolerance and the loss of Kashmiriyat hidden behind the story of terror.

Anchoring my research in Henri Lefebvre's triad of space, I read Rushdie's parallelism of Pachigam and Los Angeles as an emblem of lost paradises and the disappearing space of tolerance. By examining representational spaces of inhabitants, I attempt to find out the elements that make both places irretrievable paradises and the relation between two different representations of paradises. In this way, we may have a clearer picture of what Rushdie actually tries to articulate in his portrayal of lost paradises. Therefore, my thesis will be divided into the following parts. In chapter two, I try to investigate into Lefebvre's triad of space and his elaboration on resistance force from representational spaces. In chapter three, I will focus on spatial representations of the fictitious village in Kashmir, Pachigam, in order to examine its transformation from a harmonious village into a smashed paradise in terror and to tease out how people experience and memorize its destruction. In chapter four, I turn to its counterpart, Los Angeles, to see how migration brings alternate narratives into the city of angels and how India/Kashmira's documentary project exemplifies her efforts to resist imposed knowledge and violence. In the final concluding chapter of the thesis, I would like to tease out the common features shared by the two places and examine Rushdie's intention of writing lost paradises and his reflection on encountering violence in *Shalimar the Clown*.

Chapter Two

Resistant Force of Representational Spaces

> Spaces can be real and imagined. Spaces can tell stories and unfold histories. Spaces can be interrupted, appropriated, and transformed through artistic and literary practice.
>
> —bell hooks, *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics* 152

Henri Lefebvre's Triad of Space

In the 1970s, seeing space as a product in *The Production of Space*, Henri Lefebvre devises a triad of space: spatial practice, representations of space, and representational spaces and argues that "if space is a product, our knowledge of it must be expected to reproduce and expound the process of production" (Lefebvre 36). According to Stuart Elden, "[b]y production, Lefebvre means both the strictly economic production of things, but also the larger philosophical concept, the production of *oeuvres*, the production of knowledge, of institutions, of all that constitutes society" (94). If we meditate on space in terms of production, we may find out that we are actually investigate into a complex aggregation of our daily activities, knowledge, power, relationships and many other things that are connected with our interaction and imagination of life and our social relations.

In Lefebvre's triad of space, he attempts to break the rigid binary opposition between mind and body. Being considered a product, space embodies multiple relationships. Lefebvre puts more emphasis on the relation between our everyday activities and space. According to Lefebvre, "space embodies social relationships" (27) and it is said to "embrace a multitude of intersections" (33). In Lefebvre's conception of space, it is fundamental that space is socially produced in a specific context. The three levels of space are dialectical and interrelated. Space is "a production process

that takes place in terms of three dialectically interlinked dimensions" (Schmid 40), so "a social space includes not only a concrete materiality but a thought concept and a feeling—an 'experience'" (41). In other words, Lefebvre's conception of production of space is a three-dimensional dialectical unity, and each dimension cannot exist without the others. For example, the experience with which representational spaces are strongly connected comes from "the materiality of the body on which it is based" and "the thought that structures and expresses it" (41). I would elaborate the idea of three dimensions of space in the following paragraphs.

Firstly, spatial practice is perceived space, which will be and "can only be evaluated empirically" "through the deciphering of its space" (Lefebvre 38). People can perceive the material space by their senses, which is not confined to physical objects but everything "that presents itself to the senses; not only seeing but hearing, smelling, touching, tasting" (Schmid 39). Therefore, spatial practice is related to "the everyday social/spatial patterns of people in particular spaces" (Liggett 249). In other words, spatial practice refers to activities, interactions, and patterns that people perceive empirically in their daily life, "the system resulting from articulation and connection of elements or activities" (Schmid 36).

Secondly, representations of space can be seen as conceived space which is conceptualized and established by people or institutions of power and knowledge such as "scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers, as of a certain type of artist with a scientific bent" (Lefebvre 38). Usually, maps, administrative planning and "production of knowledge" (Schmid 41) will be denoted as representations of space.

Thirdly, representational spaces are considered "directly *lived* through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of 'inhabitants' and 'users', but

also of some artists and perhaps of those, such as a few writers and philosophers, who *describe* and aspire to do no more than describe" (39). Instead of obeying the rules of consistency and cohesive, representational spaces, as lived space, embody the space that people live with "their source in history—in the history of a people as well as in the history of each individual belonging to that people" (41). For Lefebvre, "the user's space is *lived*" (362). Compared with conceived space (space of architects, scientists, or any other experts), it is more subjective. "As a space of 'subjects' rather than of calculations, as a representational space, it has an origin, and that origin is childhood, with its hardships, its achievements, and its lacks" (362). Therefore, representational spaces are always linked to the user's own source of histories and memories, which will bear resistance to the institutionalized system.

Though the title of *The Production of Space* might mislead readers into thinking that Lefebvre seems to put more emphasis on "space" alone, Lefebvre himself does not overlook the significance of time and historicity. In fact, he proposes that there would be a new perspective on looking history while seeing space as a product. "History would have to take in not only the genesis of these spaces but also, and especially, their interconnections, distortions, displacements, mutual interactions, and their links with the spatial practice of the particular society or mode of production under consideration" (Lefebvre 42). Apparently, time plays a significant role in shaping our production of space. Lefebvre's triad of space should not be simply taken as a plane consisting of three different points; instead, history intervenes in our spatial production. The historicity of space will influence how the space is perceived, conceived and experienced. Frederik Tygstup, echoing Lefebvre's triad of space, indicates that

> the historicity of space is expressed through the stratifications that give

> it its individual form: the way it is built, the ways it is conceived of and conceptualized, the ways it is experienced. The experience of space and the appropriation of space will inevitably have to come about as a negotiation with one's predecessors over how this space was used and was made to be used. (202)

In different historical periods, we will present different forms of spatial practice and come up with varied representations of space on the basis of different stories or histories that lie in or converge at the place. The place is endowed with the historical traces or characteristics of its time at the moment, and we will have our own interpretations and ways of experiencing the place. As time goes by, the stratifications formed in different historical periods will construct the layers of space that people perceive, conceive and live. Our interaction with the place becomes a continuous dialogue with the past, whether it is of the place or of our own. We negotiate with what the space was supposed to become and how ancestors actually made use of it. Each of us has our own practice, understanding and interpretation of the space in our time. Users of the place express and experience the space with their own imagination. Space is materially, emotively, and affectively lived (Harvey 131) with people's own sources of histories, memories and experiences. Therefore, space is not just a container to be filled with metaphors. Space itself is a product and a historical result of our social relations, thoughts, ways of life, and expressions. Therefore, one's experience of space comes along with how space was/is actually used and how it was planned to be used. The three different stratifications of space may not always be consistent with each other, but they shape the production of space. Therefore, Lefebvre's triad of space should not be considered a theory that only puts emphasis on space. Instead, we find time and historicity play an essential role in the production of

space.

There have been many researchers inspired by Lefebvre's spatial theories and coming up with more detailed discussions on space-time relationship. In David Harvey's spatial researches, he follows up Lefebvre's conception of space and divides Lefebvre's each dimension of spatial production into three more subtle categories so as to see how time and space influence each other in Lefebvre's theory of spatial production, which will help us further understand how Lefebvre's spatial theory can be applied into the formation of collective memories. In "Space as a Key Word," Harvey elaborates on a tripartite division of space: *absolute space*, *relative space*, and *relational space*. Harvey's concept is generally supposed to complement Lefebvre's triad of space, giving more examples and details about each dimension of Lefebvre's triad of space. In this way, he forms a matrix of spatial categories and provides more possibilities of spatial imaginations.

According to Harvey, *absolute space* refers to "the space of Newton and Descartes and it is usually represented as a pre-existing and immovable grid amenable to standardized measurement and open to calculation" ("Space" 321); streets and urban planning will be taken into consideration here. *Relative space* suggests space of Einstein and non-Euclidean, which is mainly connected with spatio-temporal frameworks, the relativization of time, space and observers, such as flow of capital, thematic maps, and anxiety of getting late. The space of relative concept is usually associated with distances, measurement of time, and relationships between objects. The third spatial concept, *relational space*, that Harvey proposes is "embedded in or internal to process" (123), space of Leibniz. According to Harvey, "there is no such thing as space or time outside of the processes that define them" (123). That is, "external influences get internalized in specific processes or things through time"

(124). Even though the material space seems fixed and stable, it actually embodies all the events, objects, relations, and processes through time, which gives the space meanings. Space entails relational presence in the world, and the presence bears different meanings to different people. Therefore, the world cannot be understood only at one specific point.

In Harvey's matrix of space, he puts much attention to relational space, with which he attempts to understand political, economic and environmental forces of spaces, especially "the political role of collective memories in urban processes" (125). In fact, relational space can be seen as a detailed elaboration on Lefebvre's conception of time-space relationship. Since relational space puts emphasis on how external factors are being internalized in things through time, it bears the weight of histories and memories. According to Lefebvre, space should not be merely regarded as a frame that contains architectures, activities, and people but as a subject that is composed of spatial practice and life forms, patterns and knowledge, and symbols and imaginations. Space has a relational presence in the world, whether it is perceived, conceived, or lived. Different from absolute and relative space, a relational perspective on space will see space as a congealment of threads of time-space. "A wide variety of disparate influences swirling over space in past, present and future concentrate and congeal at a certain point to define the nature of that point" (Harvey, "Space" 124).

Individuals bring experiences, affections or ideas of their life trajectories into the space they are using, producing their own spatial experience. What makes conceived space and lived space different is each individual user's reconstruction of what they have perceived and conceived in their everyday experience. Lefebvre proposes that users of space have their own feelings or interpretations of the space, and Harvey

divides the inhabitants' experience of the space into three categories. The sense of security or the thrill of getting into an unknown place would be regarded as absolute or relative since they are mainly related to the standpoint of the user. In his matrix of spatialities, Harvey puts memories, dreams, fantasies, utopian dreams and desire in the column of combination of representational spaces and relational space, which contains affections or thoughts nurtured by the user's past, present and future simultaneously. Here, the past, present and future are not confined to the space that is being used. They might be also related to places far away. In other words, time and space from different sources are congealed in space.

Harvey takes "Ground Zero" for example. He suggests that if we only understand "Ground Zero" from absolute or relative points of view, we might merely have a glimpse of how engineering calculations and aesthetic measurement help reconstruct the material space to produce emotive effects. However, "[w]hatever is built at this site has to say something about history and memory" (137), and families of those killed at the place or citizens involved in the event might also have their personal interpretations of this site, the event, and the community. They might have something to tell about their future and probably about the possibilities in their life. In other words, they do not merely historicize or memorialize the site but memorize it, making all the things in relation to the site internalized in their process of producing spaces through time. Harvey indicates that

> there are all manner of relationalities to be explored. What will we know about those who attacked and how far will we connect? The site is and will have a relational presence in the world no matter what is built there and it is important to reflect on how this presencing works: will it be lived as a symbol of US arrogance or as a sign of global

> compassion and understanding? Taking up such matters requires that we embrace a relational conception of space-time. (137)

Therefore, "Ground Zero" will definitely bear more than one version of interpretation of the place. The attack and the monument erected after the event do not exist there in isolation. There could be many things connected to the attack, which leads to different interpretations of the event or the place. If we only focus on absolute and relative perspectives, we are likely to impose a fixed narrative on what happened at this site, which might "foreclose on future possibilities and interpretations" (137). If we reexamine our world through a relational perspective, we will be able to reveal new possibilities in the process of producing meanings, as those visible but unseen spaces in the dominant discourses might be able to come present in our rescaling of the boundaries. This is how historicity works in the production of space.

The conception of space now becomes more complicated because we are getting involved in different aspects of contemporary realities. Lefebvre's representational spaces[13] urge us to shift our attention to the question "how is it that different human practices create and make use of different conceptualizations of space?" (Harvey, *Social* 13). Thinking through different perspectives can give us more opportunities to probe into disputed issues and more alternative possibilities. A relational thinking on space invites us to reconsider why people have such feelings or affections toward their spatial experience so that we can further investigate into what has been internalized within the inhabitants during their life trajectories. Their visions, desires, frustrations, dreams, or memories are threads of representational spaces. It is the experience of space-time collected in their life trajectories that influences how these people respond to spatial practice and representations of space at present.

[13] It is worth noting that neither of Lefebvre and Harvey treat their triad of spaces hierarchically or foreground specific aspects. Concepts in each set of tripartite division of space entails a dialectical tension with each other.

Historicizing things or sites seems to measure our living experiences in relative terms and make them fixed narratives, while remembering makes them in a relational and fluid status and allows unpredictable narratives to be collected in our lived space, which may offer possible resistance force against existing discourses.

Resistant Force of Representational Spaces

The distinction between representations of space and representational spaces that need to be clarified is "what intervenes, what occupies the interstices between representations of space and representational spaces" (Lefebvre 43). According to Lefebvre, "producers of space have always acted in accordance with a representation, while the 'users' passively experienced whatever was imposed upon them inasmuch as it was more or less thoroughly inserted into, or justified by, their representational spaces" (43-44). Since users of the space will bring their own source of histories to the space and form their own spatial practice, their production of representational spaces may not be the same as the conceived space established by institutions of knowledge. As Lefebvre indicates, knowledge treats "the effects of power" as real (358). It is in the gap between "intact space" where everything seems to be naturally arranged and "space broken up" where the landscape of our life changes that we may find how knowledge and power work in shaping our cognition of the place. While dominated or conceived space is usually supposed to be real and natural, representational spaces suggest another version of interpretation of what life is like from the perspective of users. It becomes clearer that descriptions, feelings, artistic creations, imaginations that are endowed with individuals' or certain groups' own sources of histories and memories could be considered reconstructions of what people have perceived and conceived. "The users' space is *lived*—not represented (or

conceived)" (Lefebvre 362). Inhabitants or users of the space have their own interpretation of space through their spatial practice in their everyday life, and their spatial experience presents more dimensions of space apart from institutionalized ones.

Through investigating into representational spaces, we might be able to see how inhabitants experience space so that we can step across existing boundaries of political and cultural imagination. The confrontation between representations of space and representational spaces enables users to increase their power of articulation "by shifting the frontiers between dominant and dominated spaces" (Prigge 54). As Lefebvre points out, there is always something left in representational spaces, *lived space*, against the system:

> Lived space bears the stamp of the conflict between an inevitable, if long and difficult, maturation process and a failure to mature that leaves particular original resources and reserves untouched. It is in this space that the 'private' realm asserts itself, albeit more or less vigorously, and always in a conflictual way, against the public one. (Lefebvre 362)

Conceived space tends to map out things as natural and may prohibit the expression of conflicts or contradictions. "For conflicts to be voiced, they must first be perceived, and this without subscribing to representations of space as generally conceived" (Lefebvre 365). In other words, in the course of producing representational spaces, people reconstruct what they perceive without being restricted to how the place is generally considered so that they probably can articulate the contradiction or conflicts in space through their own production of meaning. According to Schmid, there is always a tension between how users perceive the world and how the production of

knowledge has imposed on them. Users can foreground the contradiction in their "production of meaning," *lived space* (Schmid 40). In this light, we are able to find alternative perspectives of what our society is like or to imagine how our past, present, and future are intertwined through representational spaces.

Furthermore, the resistant force that lies in representational spaces not only comes from the interstices between conceived space and lived space but also from the stories that are revealed when we try to tease out how memories, fantasies, dreams are connected wo our lived space. Memories or histories serving as a part of users' representational spaces will become a comparison or a counterpart of the institutionalized knowledge, offering more relational perspectives to certain events or places. By comparing the differences of people's representational spaces of different historical periods, such as memories of the past, their perception and cognition of the present, and their expected vision of the future, we can see the development of spatial production of certain places. Memories of the past occupy a place in our present and keep reminding us that there is another way of using and imaging the place. Expectation of the future will reveal what we have desired and searched for, which implies the fact that we have not found it or we are unable to retrieve it now. Our way of living and experiencing the place at this moment becomes an everlasting process of negotiating with our own temporal movement from the past to the future. Our imagination of the place at this moment is not only influenced by the external forces of our surroundings at present but also affected by the internalized traces collected in trajectories of our lives, which offers possible alternatives of looking at the place. This is the resistance force that may come from representational spaces as well: the comparison between how we once experienced or memorized a place and what we have been searching for in different landscapes. While most people tend to believe

this is what the world should be like from their present perception and cognition of space, the interstices left by representational spaces of different periods of time will remind us of the possibilities of imaging the space. Instead of creating a new subject in our cognition of the place, the past and our expectation for the future have already occupied parts of it. Even though their presence may sometimes be made absent, they are still there for people who try to retrieve them to discover.

Migration and Representational Spaces

It seems that representational spaces allow personal interpretations of histories to emerge since lived space of inhabitants and users will lead us to a different way of understanding our world. The resistance may come from the gap between conceived space and lived space or from the transformation of one's representational spaces, both of which pose questions against the predefined boundaries of our cognition. In many researches on space, migration and immigration become an interesting topic for residents' imagination of place. The movement from one place to another undoubtedly entails new elements for the production of space. Immigrants, who carry histories of their homelands and their life trajectories with them, will make the production of space more complicated and intricate. According to Stephen Castles and Mark Miller, migration is "described as a process involving the movement of both people and their social, cultural, and political ideals from their countries of birth to other countries" (qtd. in Sanga 14). Therefore, migration not only involves the physical movement of human beings but also contains the exchange of cultural and social imaginations. People migrate, or immigrate, for different reasons and with different expectations of the future.

On the other hand, what immigrants perceive and experience in their new living

space is the comparison between the past and the present, between their homelands and their new promised lands. They observe transformation of space from the past to the present. They experience expectations and frustrations along the way from their homelands to their new residences. They see differences and gaps. Some of them become "a conscious antagonist disrupting it [the world system], proposing claims, advancing arguments that dispute the totalitarian compulsions of the world market" (Said 406). Therefore, the displacement of immigrants' life not only encourages a more transnational and planetary text but also provides a possible force of transformation and production through the interstices in the course of traveling and migration. The interstices, which might be considered hollow, unpresentable, or unrepresentable, are now (re)presented from another angle of the clashing cultures or living spaces. The forces of production come right from those interstices.

The discontinuity of historical and spatial realities signifies, to borrow from Homi Bhabha's idea, "the interstitial passages and processes of cultural difference that are inscribed in the 'in-between', in the temporal break-up that weaves the 'global' text" (217; emphasis in original). The space produced from the interstices offers an opportunity and possibility to see the relations and everyday experience of space. It is right "through a structure of splitting and displacement……that the architecture of the new historical subject emerges at the limits of representation itself, 'to enable a situational representation on the part of the individual to that vast and *unrepresentable* totality which is the ensemble of society's structures as a whole'" (Bhabha 217). The representation on the part of the individual can be read as representational spaces, which pluralizes our conception of our living space. If conceived space has been defined already, lived space or representational spaces might enable us to push the boundaries a little bit outward. As Rushdie indicates,

> …to push against boundaries, and to increase, by some small amount, the sum total of what it is possible to imagine, to think, to know, to feel, and therefore, finally, to become and be. The point is that you can't push against boundaries by remaining in the safe middle ground: you have to go to the frontier and shove. (Rushdie, "Freedom")

The boundaries that surround us are usually disguised as natural and narrow our interest to one specific city, country, or culture. Representational spaces coming from the interstices harbor a standpoint to represent those untold stories or unseen space in our lives, and this is where the resistant force may appear.

Chapter Three

Pachigam: Perspective from the Lost Paradise

The whole story of *Shalimar the Clown* mainly starts from the assassination in Los Angeles, but Pachigam keeps intervening in its characters' lives in different forms of representation, which later lead readers back to the remote imaginary village in Kashmir. The Kashmiri paradise appears as the characters' memories, fantasies, embodiment of love and hatred, and especially the disappearance of a tolerant and eclectic ideal. It is the memory of Pachigam and the description of how a pastoral paradise is destroyed by the constant insurgency on the subcontinent that make a novel about an assassination in the U.S. different from what it is usually being historicized. On one hand, it questions the legitimacy of an American version of the assassination and reveals how the assassination could be related to other parts of the world. On the other hand, the story of Pachigam tries to represent the experience of how people understand and remember Pachigam and its destruction. With India/Kashmira's doubt about her obscure past and the narrator's accounts about the days before and after this earthly Eden perished, we are drawn back to the destroyed paradise. The story of Pachigam manifests how people in Kashmir might have perceived the turbulence and destruction of their village. It demonstrates how they lose the spirit of Kashmiriyat. It also represents how people remember and live in fear after the day of its destruction. India/Kashmira's desire to know and to return to the village reveals how the past could intervene in our present life. In addition, the section of Pachigam is about how people interpret and remember the loss of Pachigam and Kashmiriyat. In this light, this chapter aims to focus on the story of Pachigam from two perspectives: how the buried past influences the minds in Los Angeles and how people experience and remember the changes of Pachigam.

The Buried Past

In Lefebvre's conception of representational spaces, we see the importance of users' experience of space, which is not only influenced by their perception and cognition of the place but also by their memories and dreams of lived space. The relation between time and space plays an important role in the production of space. In *Shalimar the Clown*, which is seen as an archive of migratory narratives, readers can not only see how users of space perceive, conceive, and experience space in different periods of time but also how memories and histories influence their perception, cognition and expression of space. We have stories of both the past and the present in different places in *Shalimar the Clown*, and each of them influences each other through migration.

In Jason Cowly's review of *Shalimar the Clown*, he argues that "[t]he novel is nearly all backstory." Most parts of the novel are made up of flashbacks, telling backgrounds of different characters who are involved in the assassination in Los Angeles. If we only focus on the assassination itself, the time scale of the novel will seem much smaller: a few days before the assassination and the confrontation between India/Kashmira and Shalimar after the assassination. However, flashbacks and recurrences of past memories, especially those of Pachigam, keep intervening in the main characters' life in Los Angeles, shaping their viewpoints of the city. As Stephen Morton indicates, "*Shalimar the Clown* shifts the focus away from the transformative potential of migration in the west to a focus on the way in which political events in Kashmir during the latter half of the twentieth century have impacted on the lives and transnational mobility of people" (340). In other words, *Shalimar the Clown* is mainly about two paradises, from whose inhabitants'

perspectives we know the transformation and disappearance of paradise on one hand. On the other hand, the first example of lost paradise, Pachigam, representing other smashed paradises around the world, will affect the spatial production of Los Angeles. It is the intervention of the past that influences users' perception of their present lives, and it is also the influence from the past that urges people to uncover the buried past so as to understand their present and future.

With each character's revelation about their relations with the remote village Pachigam and their different interpretations of the attack, the assassination, originally considered a terrorist attack with political attempts by most people, turns out to be an act of revenge due to the betrayal in Pachigam and a consequence of political turbulence in Kashmir. Instead of treating the attack as a binary opposition of two different political or religious groups as many discourses on terrorist attacks might do, such as India and Pakistan, Christians and Muslims, what the novel proposes is a relational perspective on the production of space, bringing more unknown facts from a remote village of Kashmir and other parts of the world to the point of convergence in California. This will make clear what has long been concealed or ignored in recent discussions about the U.S. and terrorism. As what will be exemplified in India/Kashmira's attitude toward her past in Kashmir and the present Los Angeles, Rushdie's emphasis of relating Kashmir to Los Angeles lies in making the unknown facts emerge while encountering violence. In this way, not only will the tension between terrorism and counter-terrorism be taken into consideration, but the past, the memories of a certain community and the history of a remote area will also show up to speak for their stories. By incorporating the story of Pachigam into a murder case in Los Angeles, perhaps Rushdie is asking the same questions that Harvey proposes in his discussion of "Ground Zero": "What will we know about those who attacked?

How far will we connect?" (137), and those flashbacks in the novel become possible answers to the above questions.

The assassination is undoubtedly the most apparent and concrete example of how our hidden past grasps the opportunity to manifest its influence on the present. The story of Pachigam turns a Muslim man into an avenger, who migrates to the U.S. and disguises himself as Max's driver. However, before the arrival of Shalimar, the past of Pachigam has already haunted the city. India/Kashmira, the illegitimate child of Boonyi and Max that Shalimar has waited to revenge, has been influenced by the past for a long time. Before the story of Pachigam is unveiled, the portrayal of India/Kashmira's life in Los Angeles shows how she desperately wants to know her past and how the past will be categorized and memorized (or not memorized), which greatly influences her imagination of Los Angeles that will be discussed in chapter four. India/Kashmira can see and hear some extraordinary scenes or sounds, but she tries to "keep the strangeness of seeing under control, the sudden otherness of vision that came and went" (Rushdie, *Shalimar* 6) and pretends as if she were not affected by the *otherness*. The otherness comes from her unknown mother and the past, both of which allude to the rural village in Kashmir, Pachigam.

In *Shalimar the Clown*, Pachigam not only exists in remote Kashmir but also metaphorically appears in Los Angeles. It firstly appears in the novel as an unknown intruder to India/Kashmira's sleep and is connected to her feeling of emptiness and incompatibility with her life in Los Angeles. She wakes up frequently while sleeping, thinking that there is an intruder. However, the intruder does not have a concrete form and might only be perceptible to India/Kashmira. "There was no intruder. The intruder was an absence, a negative space in darkness. She had no mother. Her mother had died giving her birth: the ambassador's wife had told her this much, and the

ambassador, her father, had confirmed it" (4). According to the passage, the absence of something past occupies a place in India/Kashmira's life. New experiences may cover parts of it, but they cannot erase all the traces the past has left. In fact, our life is not only constructed by presence of things. Sometimes, our cognition of space will be based on the absence of what we had, what we should have, or what we could have. The loss of something and the desire for retrieving it will become the traces of that absence. Therefore, the uneasiness aroused by the absence reveals India/Kashmira's desire for retrieving the loss of her mother, her Kashmiri past, and a more profound eagerness at the bottom of her heart: Kashmiriyat.

India/Kashmira's expression about both Kashmir and Los Angeles lies greatly in the inconsistency between presence and absence of some facts in her living space. She knows her Kashmiri mother, but she has no further clues to her. She does some researches on the expedition history of the city of angels, but she also sees people swarming into the city and lying like broken dolls under the cliff without angels' protection. The absence of her mother and angels of the city in the stories of Kashmir and Los Angeles soon becomes the incentive for her to fly back to the village and prepare for the documentary project. Therefore, India/Kashmira's quest for her Kashmir story leads us back to Pachigam before and after the destruction, while her project of finding the unseen space or realities invites us to take a closer look at the cityscape of Los Angeles.

Even though India/Kashmira has few chances to familiarize herself with Pachigam before her father's death, the place has always held a special position in her mind. She is named India, but she feels quite awkward to be *India*. She comes from Pachigam, a Kashmiri village where her mother that she has never seen is buried. In the beginning, she has no idea either about her mother or about her Kashmiri

background. All she has acquired from her ambassador father is her name "India," which she dislikes and has a strong desire to replace. "People were never called Australia, were they, or Uganda or Ingushetia or Peru" (5). In the passage that India/Kashmira describes how she feels when she is awaken by the intruder of the unknown, she regards the intruder as an absence and soon thinks of her mother, making readers inevitably compare the intruder to her absent mother, about whom she has been prohibited from knowing more. "Her mother had been a Kashmiri, and was lost to her, like paradise, like Kashmir, in a time before memory. (That the terms Kashmir and paradise were synonymous was one of her axioms, which everyone knew her had to accept)" (4). In this passage, India/Kashmira's lacking knowledge of her mother gradually parallels the history of Kashmir, both of which remain silent and absent from people's, especially India/Kashmira's, perception or cognition of the world. For India/Kashmira, her Kashmiri mother and her Kashmiri background have been compelled to be thrown away from her memories before she could have ever known, remembered or even memorized them. Whether it is about her Kashmiri background or her Kashmiri mother, they both seem to have been eliminated from her life.

However, "[t]he truth was still the truth" (3). The truth that might have been erased or have been lost will still exist in the world in a subtle form waiting for its recurrence. India/Kashmira wants to know the truth. Her perception of the way of life in Los Angeles and her ambition to make a documentary reveal how eager she is for truths. Therefore, the buried past shapes how India/Kashmira recognizes and experiences the two different forms of paradise: one is space of the unknown past, Pachigam, and the other is space of immigrants, Los Angeles. They are both considered irretrievable paradises in the novel as they only exist in memory,

imagination or fallacy. India/Kashmira's relations with Pachigam and her observation of Los Angeles unfold the gap between representations of space and representational spaces and reveal the changes of each place. However, experiences and interpretations of space vary from person to person. They bear different significance to different people. For example, India/Kashmira's strong will to know her mother makes a big contrast to Max's ambiguous attitude toward his past: pride in his feats and reluctance to talk about India/Kashmira's birth story, which makes him conceal Kashmir from India/Kashmira's life.

When India/Kashmira meditates on the traces that her mother has left in the world, she proposes a theory of how the dead or the vanished will be remembered in the world's memory. She divides the dead into three different categories:

> Everywhere you went a few of the dead were studied and remembered and these were the best of the dead, the least dead, living in the world's memory. The less celebrated, less advantaged dead were content to be kept alive within a few loving (or even hating) breasts, even in a single human heart, ……The deadness of India's mother, however, was of the worst and deadest kind. The ambassador had entombed her memory under a pyramid of silence. (18)

There seem to be some criteria determining what should be remembered and what should be not. For Max, his affair with Boonyi is something that should have been buried with her death, and for residents in Pachigam, Boonyi was dead right after her leaving the village and her husband for the disgraceful relationship with Max. For them, it seems that Boonyi's existence will damage their ideal images. "People among whom her mother [Boonyi] had grown up treated her like a ghost and murdered her with signatures and seals" and "in another country the woman [Max's wife] killed her

with a lie when she was still alive, and her father joined the lie so he was her killer too" (367). Before her physical death, Boonyi has been treated dead by Max and residents in Pachigam. Therefore, India/Kashmira's impression of her mother is actually constructed by her ambassador father and his wife, the representation of powers in world politics. However, "[t]he deadly dead woman her mother had become was lost in the ambassador's silence, had been erased by it" (18). For India/Kashmira, her past and living space are constructed by others. Instead of being recognized Kashmira, she is renamed India to memorize her father's feat in the mission to India rather than to remind him of his private affairs with a Kashmiri woman. It seems that to maintain certain order of a place or to conform to one's cognition of the world, some persons and events are worth being remembered while some are not. Her mother belongs to the latter, and so does her Kashmiri story. Like her mother's death being considered the worst kind, India/Kashmira's past, the story of Pachigam, has been rendered silent and absent.

However, the fact that India/Kashmira cannot sleep well reveals her uneasiness of living in the imposed unreality. The resistance emerging from the past shows it does not want to be forgotten. She has expressed her reluctance to accept the name and the seemly fabricated, or at least obscure, story of what her life should be like from time to time. Sometimes she feels that the "exoticist, colonial" name "India" just does not fit her (5). Sometimes she desperately wants to "inhabit facts, not dreams" (12). She wants her mother, the woman that is buried in the past along with the story of Pachigam. "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" (12). Gradually, her desire to know more about her mother is combined with her strong will to discover truths under the surface and her anticipation to retrieve

something lost. Even though it seems absent, the remote perished paradise actually presents its influence on people who have been involved in or related to its story.

The intervention of Pachigam in Los Angeles exemplifies how the past can affect our ways of life, shape our perspectives, and even threaten our lives. It not only shows how the past will be remembered but also reminds those who have forgotten it to re-examine its consequence and development. One of the ways to resist violence is to know what has happened. The past and memories are inscribed in space, and to understand one's past is to inspect the production of space. Only when India/Kashmira recovers her lost story in Pachigam and knows more about Pachigam and Los Angeles can she live in reality and feel the weight of life. When India finally gets her original name and renames herself Kashmira after realizing what happened in Pachigam, she actually shifts the story from an American story to a Kashmiri one, the one embedded in what was once thought of as space of tolerance. She wants to remember the changes of Pachigam from space of tolerance to space of violence. The narrator brings us back to the days when Pachigam was confronted with catastrophic transformation of its spatial relationship through the villagers' perspectives. Then we have the story of what India/Kashmira and immigrants in Los Angeles are trying retrieve: the loss of Kashmiriyat.

Destruction of Pachigam: The Loss of Kashmiriyat

As mentioned at the beginning of this thesis, Rushdie's portrayal of an idealized place can be seen as an ongoing project of writing the loss of human beings' innate virtue of tolerance and clarifying his position of standing in between so as to push the boundaries as much as he can. Through his depiction of the characters' spatial practice, cognition and experience of their living space, Rushdie attempts to present his readers

a vision of how a multicultural and eclectic village in Kashmir has been altered and destroyed. Besides how its inhabitants experience such a drastic change, Rushdie also portrays how this earthly paradise is being remembered, ignored, or manipulated by different people or powers. In the sections of Pachigam, Rushdie portrays the destruction of Kashmir and the loss of Kashmiriyat from the perspective of its residents.

Instead of treating "Rushdie's portrayal of Kashmir as a stand-in for the multicultural Bombay of his past," Annabella Pitkin suggests that "Rushdie's Kashmir is a proxy for the new partitioned subcontinent itself" (258), seeing Kashmir an epitome of the consequences of the independence of the nation. *Shalimar the Clown*, as the first novel that Rushdie directly mentions the conflicts in Kashmir, reveals the author's attempt at disclosing the world's ignorance of Kashmir crisis and his effort to retrieve the loss ideal. According to Stephen Morton, with the support of Pakistan against terror, it is likely that the terrorism in Kashmir, which is related to Pakistan, will be ignored, and "it is against this political context of the sideling of the crisis in Kashmir by the Bush administration that Rushdie makes the 'political-ridden' present of Kashmir the central focus of his novel *Shalimar the Clown*" (Morton 341).

In sections of Pachigam in *Shalimar the Clown*, Rushdie represents what has happened to Kashmir from the perspectives of Kashmiris, which prevents the author from "taking sides with either Indian or Pakistani versions of Kashmir history and the origins of the conflict" (Morton 347). On the other hand, unlike reports or records telling the figures or estimates of changes in Kashmir, what Rushdie tries to reveal in his novel is how people in the fictional Kashmir village perceive and experience the turbulence in their lives, which are not described in official guidebooks or historical records of Kashmir. To describe the spatial production of changing Pachigam, he

employs elements such as the idealized image of Kashmir, the disputes between tribes and the rumors of the impending violence and damage. Through his portrayal of people's perceived, conceived and lived space of Pachigam, we might be able to have a glimpse of our irretrievable loss of Kashmiriyat and what pre-partitioned and post-partitioned Kashmir would be like.

In sections of Pachigam, Rushdie envisions a tolerant, harmonious and cosmopolitan spatial practice of pre-partitioned Kashmir. For people living there, they are convinced that "Kashmiris were connected by deeper ties than those [blood or faith]" (Rushdie, *Shalimar* 47), even though they may come from different backgrounds. Such virtue of Kashmir shapes how people think of their social relations, even after the partition. Before the invasion of the troops, people believe that Pachigam is a place of tolerance rather than a place of division, though there have been slight changes of their spatial practice gradually. When young Shalimar thinks of his lover Boonyi and their future, he still holds the belief that "[t]he words *Hindu* and *Muslim* have no place in their story" as they are "merely descriptions, not divisions" (57). This is how Shalimar and other inhabitants imagine Pachigam: a tolerant and harmonious village. They assume that Kashmir is a cosmopolitan place, embodying hybrid cultural features of human beings. Therefore, Hindu and Muslim do not represent difference and violence nor division and estrangement; instead, "the frontiers between the words, their hard edges, had grown smudged and blurred" and "this is how things had to be" (57). In spite of their different ethnic, social and cultural backgrounds, they believe that it is their bond with Kashmir that makes Pachigam an eclectic community. The idea and practice of such a harmonious and tolerant culture is prevailing in Pachigam before the invasions of troops. At the festival banquet in the Shalimar garden, for example, Pandit Pyarelal Kaul proudly praises the hybrid culture

of Kashmir:

> Today our Muslim village, in the service of our Hindu maharaja, will cook and act in a Mughal—that is to say Muslim—garden, to celebrate the anniversary of the day on which Ram marched against Ravan to rescue Sita. ..... Who tonight are the Hindus? Who are the Muslims? Here in Kashmir, our stories sit happily side by side on the same double bill, we eat from the same dishes, we laugh at the same jokes. (71)

This harmonious scene represents an idealized image of Pachigam, which seems "more tolerant and cosmopolitan under the semi-autonomous rule of the Hindu maharaja than after India's independence and partition" (Kung 87). With the portrayal of spatial practice of Pachigam, a cognition and a common experience shared by people living there is foregrounded and valued: *Kashmiriyat*.

It is Kashmiriyat, "the belief that at the heart of Kashmiri culture there was a common bond that transcends all other differences" (Rushdie, *Shalimar* 110), that allows Shalimar and Boonyi, a Muslim and a Hindu, to get married. According to Abdullah Noman, though most bhand villages are Musilim, Pachigam is a mixture. During the wedding, Abdullah Noman appeals to the villagers to value and to preserve their faith.

> So we have not only Kashmiriness to protect but Pachigamness as well. We are all brothers and sisters here. There is no Hindu-Muslim issue. Two Kashmiri—two Pachigami—youngsters wish two 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)

Shalimar and Boonyi's wedding not only reveals a cross-ethnic relationship among

people living in Pachigam but also represents an ideal community that transcends national, religious and cultural boundaries. Therefore, as Pyarelal says, "to defend their love is to defend what is finest in ourselves" (110). Kashmiris' cognition of Kashmiriyat and their imagination of Pachigam are exemplified through Shalimar and Boonyi's wedding ceremony. Such an image of cosmopolitan Pachigam is constructed by putting the essence of Kashmiriyat into practice in their wedding. It seems that their perception and living experience are consistent with their cognition of living space in terms of Boonyi and Shalimar's wedding.

Nevertheless, underneath the seemly peaceful surface of Pachigam cosmopolitan vision, we see the gradual changes of the community and the increasing influence of foreign powers on the village threatening the preservation of Kashmiriyat. The residents in Pachigam gradually lose the consistency between their cognition and their actual experience of Kashmiriyat. The spatial practice of Pachigam and its cognition of Kashmiriyat are gradually manipulated and altered by imposed powers. Even though most of them still hold the belief of Kashmiriyat, their way of life gradually changes, resulting in the upcoming transformation of their spatial/social relations and their changing attitudes toward Pachigam.

For example, the radical changes in Pachigam's lifestyle cause dispute between Pachigam and Shirmal, a village of cooks specialized in doing the Thirty-Six-Courses-Minimum banquet. Although there are dissident voices against Abdullah's decision to turn Pachigam from a village of actors to a village that is trained both for entertainment and cooking, the policy of learning cookery still takes effect and is proven a great success. Undoubtedly, the success of Pachigam's ambition to "provide a rounded service which offered both sustenance for the body and pleasure for the soul" (62) soon arouses the leading cookery village of Shirmal's

discontent. The men of Shirmal try to steal the performing techniques from Pachigam and even make a raid on Pachigam. The raid is called *pot war,* in which the Pachigam men defeat the men of Shirmal, "sending them home crying with broken heads" (62).

In spite of their victory over Shirmal, "the pot war horrified everyone in Pachigam" (62). Even though they win the war, they know their lives have been changed, and so have their thoughts of their living space. Their imagination of Pachigam as a peaceful and harmonious place is being shattered because of the pot war, since "nobody has imagined that so outrageous a breach of the peace is possible that Kashmiris would attack other Kashmiris driven by such crummy motivations as envy, malice and greed " (62). The pot war is like a trigger that fires up and discloses the changing spatial practice and relations in Kashmir. The spirit of Kashmiriyat which they take pride in seems futile concerning the competition among themselves. Before the pot war, people firmly believe that they are bound together with each other regardless of their ethnicities or religions. They believe that their living experience in Pachigam will reflect and resonate with their cognition of Pachigam and Kashmiriyat. However, once the supposed role of Pachigam is overthrown, their spatial practice and living experience in the village will inevitably change. The production of space is in a dynamic state. The representations of space, which is supposed to reflect the planners' and the governors' thoughts, may determine the patterns of people living there. However, users who perceive and live the space will also express their own thoughts of the space. The production of space is actually a negotiation process of expectations and users' experience. The pot war leads to a series of impacts on their community and degrades their traditional value of life, making people living in Pachigam soon perceive the change and its results.

Villagers in Pachigam have different interpretations of the pot war. Even though

Abdullah bears strong confidence that "his people would continue to defend themselves successfully against any further attacks," he himself is also "saddened by the estrangement," which actually results from his ambition to "break the Shirmal's local monopoly of the banquet market" (69). His perception and imagination of the relations with the outside world have changed. He feels bad about the aftermath of the pot war and the harm to his friendship with the Shirmal's head chief. The change of their life style causes the alteration of their relationship with other Kashmiris. On the other hand, the ageless Gujar tribal woman and prophetess Nazarébaddoor, who is believed to have been the most optimistic prophet, is sunk in gloom after the pot war. After the war, "her vision darkened" (63). For her, the pot war is like "the first pebble that starts the avalanche" (63), so she retires from divination, thinking that "the age of prophecy is at an end because what's coming is so terrible that no prophet will have the words to foretell it" (68). Their bond of Kashmiriyat is challenged by the series of disputes and changing patterns of their lives.

The imminent turbulence of Pachigam is so conspicuous that almost everyone in Pachigam could perceive it, even though some people try to pretend that nothing has been affected.

> After the pot war, contact between the two village headmen came to an acrimonious end, until messengers from the maharaja himself arrived in both Pachigam and Shirmal, demanding that to augment the staff of the palace kitchens they set aside their quarrels and pool their resources to provide food (and theatrical entertainment) at a grand Dassehra festival banquet in the Shalimar Garden, a feast conceived on a scale not seen in the valley since the time of the Mughal emperor Jehangr. (70-71)

The grand Dassehra festival banquet in the Shalimar Garden becomes an ironic presentation of Kashmiriyat. The spirit of tolerance is performed for the banquet at someone's request. Villagers in Pachigam have not reconciled themselves with people in Shirmal yet. Kashmiriyat cannot alleviate the quarrels and arguments. Though Pandit Pyarelal Kaul proudly praises the hybrid culture of Kashmir during the banquet, it is obvious that they set aside their quarrels and animosity to *perform* being a Kashmiri for the maharaja's demand. To carry out the demand and perhaps to fulfill their image of being cosmopolitan, Kashmiriyat gradually departs from its original role and loses its significance to Pachigam. The pot war reveals that there is a gap between how people imagine Pachigam and what they actually experience there, and the banquet manifests the fading and changing role of Kashmiriyat. The bureaucratic system's order makes the banquet and the harmony a merely superficial entertaining object. The villagers of Pachigam still seem to live in the same way of life, while their perception and experience of Pachigam have been gradually changed, foretelling the future havoc in Kashmir. When Firdaus Noman, who acquires a little of Nazarébaddoor's prophetic ability, knows about the demand, she says "bad trouble is on the way" (71).

Before the invasions of troops arrive at Pachigam, its inhabitants have gradually perceived the impending storm. According to Stephen Morton, "the prophetic and proleptic powers that the narrator attributes to Firdaus serve to place the history of India's partition and the subsequent conflict in Kashmir within the non-secular, oral historical world-view of the villagers" (348). In other words, it is through the world-view of the villagers of Pachigam that Rushdie tries to tell what has been destroyed and what has happened in/after the conflicts of Kashmir. There may not be many statistics or historical records of each conflict or invasion but rumors and panic

from the villagers to unfold the terror. In this way, rumors, something that villagers will receive from different sources, become an important medium of transmitting messages about social turbulence and insurgency. Besides, the prophecy and rumors show the emotive effects that the impending turbulence arouses, revealing something more than a guidebook or a historical record can involve.

Rumors in *Shalimar the Clown* "portend the terror of political violence of Kashmir" (Morton 349). Unlike what people can receive from the representations of space, rumors representing inhabitants' viewpoint convey a mixture with some truths, some hearsay, and some feelings. No matter what they are, the rumors terrify people in Pachigam, since "death, most present of absences, has entered the garden, and from that moment on the absences multiplied" (Rushdie, *Shalimar* 84). As the narrator says, there seems to be a social hierarchy among rumors, making them look like

> … a new species of living things, and evolved according to the laws laid down by Darwin, mutating randomly and being subjected to the amoral winnowing processes of natural selection. The fittest rumors survived, and began to make themselves heard above the general hubbub. ……It was a new word, with which few people in the Shalimar Bagh were familiar, but it terrified anyway. (85)

Through the expressions of rumors, readers gradually experience the imminent terror that the villagers perceive as well. "An army of Kabailis from Pakistan has crossed the border, looting, raping, burning, killing, and it is nearing the outskirts of the city" (85). Even with just a few words, the rumor expresses dreadful scenes of Kashmir conflicts and the fear that people in Pachigam feel for the approaching trouble. When the narrator says that these rumors are like a new species of living things, he not only attempts to describe the rises and declines of each rumor but also implies the latent

catastrophe of Kashmir that is waiting at the corner for the perfect moment to land on the village. It is approaching, moving "across the frontier from the shadow-world of rumors into the 'real'" and "many rumors clamored at once" (86). The miserable and horrible scenes of the conflicts are represented by the spreading rumors.

> "Five hundred thousand tribals are attacking us, with Pak army soldiers in disguise commanding them!"—"They are only ten miles away!"—"Five miles away!"—"Two!"—"Five thousand women raped and murdered on the Jammu border!"—"Twenty thousand Hindus and Sikhs slaughtered!"—"In Muzaffarabad, Muslim soldiers mutinied and killed their Hindu counterparts and the officer in charge as well!"…… "The maharaja has taken his advice and opted for India!"—"The Indian army is coming to save us!" (86)

In the above passage, "Rushdie transforms the rumors of escalating violence in Kashmir into a subject of direct speech", which reveals "the perspective of the Kashmiri people, who are caught in the middle of these contending rumors" (Morton 348-49). The terror that the rumors create is so manifest that "panic grippes the people in the Shalimar garden" (Rushdie, *Shalimar* 87). Rumors from different sources spread in the district at the same time, and it is hard to tell which one is true and which one is not. However, all of them indicate the fact that the demon in on the way and reveal how flustered the villagers feel. With each rumor telling about the approaching troops and the number of victims, we can perceive people's increasing fear of the attacks.

Furthermore, these rumors clamoring at the same time also represent various historical narratives of Kashmir conflicts. Different people or communities have their own description of what has happened in Kashmir. If Colonel Kachhwaha's dismissal

of the belief of “Kashmir for the Kashmiris” as a “moronic idea” and his ambition “to descend on Pachigam in force” (101) represent the military power against the spirit of Kashmiriness, Rushdie’s portrayal of Kashmiris’ attitude toward the troops’ invasion is aiming to emphasize the value of tolerating different political, religious and ethnic backgrounds from the inhabitants’ point of view. The rumors and the narration are used to reflect the view of the Kashmiri people instead of that of the group of people who own power and influence to historicize things, which may later call the destruction a feat of their expedition.

The rumors spreading among inhabitants are blended with facts, lies, and feelings. There is resistance of representational spaces from the residents’ points of view, showing subversive forces against the accomplished facts. To Colonel Kachhwaha, the villagers of Pachigam are “naturally subversive” that need to be come down hard (98). Even though “the de facto line of partition exists and so has to be adhered and the question of whether it should exist or not is not a question,” “there are Kashmiris on both sides who treat the line with contempt and walk across the mountains whenever they so choose” (97). The residents of Pachigam do not want to accept the established fact of the division line. Their previous cognition of what Kashmir should be like reminds them of other possibilities of spatial production of Pachigam. Their previous imagination of Pachigam shows the existence of Kashmiriyat, of which they have been proud of. They want to retrieve that spirit of Kashmir. The imposed line of division means regulation and separation, turning the village to space of intolerance and violence The small village still wants to have its own freedom and control its own fate, posing resistance against the established fact. “A tiny village of no more than five million souls, landlocked, preindustrial, resource rich but cash poor, perched thousands of feet up in the mountains like a tasty green

sweetmeat caught in a giant's teeth, wanted to be free" (253). For them, they do not care about the division line that separates them. They have come to a conclusion that "they didn't much like India and didn't care for the sound of Pakistan" (253).

For the liberation front in *Shalimar the Clown*, all they want is freedom:

> freedom to be meat-eating Brahmins or saint-worshipping Muslims, to make pilgrimages to the ice-lingam high in the unmelting snows or to bow down before the prophet's hair in a lakeside mosque, to listen to the santoor [an ancient string musical instrument in Jammu and Kashmir] and drink salty tea, to dream of Alexander's army and to choose never to see an army again, to make honey and carve walnut into animal and boat shapes and to watch the mountains push their way, inch by inch, century by century, further up into the sky. Freedom to choose folly over greatness but to be nobody's fools. *Azadi*! [Freedom!] Paradise wanted to be free! (253)

For them, the paradise wants to be freed from the demand for division. Ironically, the picture or imagination of a harmonious and tolerant village embedded with cultures from various sources is, however, actually on the basis of what their life was like before. Just like what Rushdie does in *The Moor's Last Sigh*, the author does not want to create a new utopia for his characters to rest upon. He just lets what the place might have been like appear, posing contrast to its current landscape. The vision proposed by the residents is not a mere fantasy. In their way of life before the partition, different religions and cultures can peacefully and harmoniously coexist and share the beauty of the land. This is the landscape of Pachigam before the invasion, and this is the alternate Islam that Rushdie acquires from his grandfather. However, the landscape is no longer to be seen. Pachigam ceases to exist.

Even though the narrator tries to talk about the destruction of Pachigam, the lost paradise and the disappearance of Kashmiriyat cannot be fully and adequately described. The changes of the place are so terrifying that it is hard to go into detail. All the narrator and the villagers can do is ask questions, question about *why* and *who*. It is through their questions that we can have a glimpse of what they might have experienced and felt. In addition, it is through the questions and their memory of a beautiful paradise that we see how people try to resist and question the de facto situation of the catastrophic changes. The first question is "why" in a long passage asking why was that and why was that:

> There were six hundred thousand Indian troops in Kashmir but the pogrom of the pandits was not prevented, why was that. Three and a half lakhs of human beings arrived in Jammu as displaced persons and for many months the government did not provide shelters or relief or even register their names, why was that. When the government finally built camps it only allowed for six thousand families to remain in the state, dispersing the others around the country where they would be invisible and impotent, why was that. ……and thousands of the displaced died because of inadequate food and shelter why was that maybe five thousand deaths because of intense heat and humidity because of snake bites and gastroenteritis and dengue fever and stress diabetes and kidney ailments and tuberculosis and psychoneurosis and there was not a single health survey conducted by the government why was that and the pandits of Kashmir were left to rot in their slum camps, to rot while the army and the insurgency fought over the bloodied and broken valley, to dream of return, to die while dreaming

> of return, to die after the dream of return died so that they could not even die dreaming of it, why was that why was that why was that why was that why was that. (296-97)

This long passage shows the ridiculousness of the whole situation and people's incapability of solving the problem. They can do nothing but ask questions. They ask questions not for the purpose of finding answers or solutions as there seems to be no way out from the misery. They ask questions without question marks as they are actually posing suspicions and remonstrance against the government and the dismal situation they are suffering. They have no other choices. They have no dreams and they cannot even dream. The speed and tone of the speech become faster and faster, more and more vehement so as to describe how desperate the villagers feel when they even do not possess the ability to dream of returning to the valley before it becomes bloody and broken. Before they die, they have already seen the death of their village and their faith.

The second question is about "who":

> Who lit the fire? Who burned that orchard? Who shot those brothers who laugh their whole lives long? Who killed the sarpanch? Who broke his hands? Who broke his arms? Who broke his ancient neck? Who shackled those men? Who made those men disappear? Who shot those boys? Who shot those girls? Who smashed that house? Who smashed *that* house? Who smashed *that* house? ……Who raped the woman again? Who raped that woman again? Who raped that dead woman? Who raped that dead woman again? (308)

Such questions reveal the villagers and the narrator's response toward political turbulence and ethnic cleansing of the village. There will not be any answers to the

questions. However, these questions revealing inhabitants' representational spaces of Pachigam and the author's outrage against the political events actually pose two important appeals.

> In the first place, the very act of posing the question, of bearing witness to atrocity, constitutes a potent political gesture: a demand for attention and a demand for redress. In the second place Rushdie's question-asking also functions as a plea to moderate Muslims to seek to reform their religion, and a plea to European and North American politicians to create a global political context that helps rather than hinders their progress. (Teverson)

In other words, even though it seems futile for the villagers or the narrator to ask these questions, the questions themselves serve as an imploring request for the public's attention to what has happened or is happening in Kashmir. The truth wants to be remembered. The obliteration of Pachigam in Kashmir is envisioned through the perspectives of Kashmiris. It is not just a story happening in a remote village. It is not just a reconfiguration of political territories or wrestling among ethno-religious powers that we may see on historical records. It is real life. It is about human beings' lives. It is the direct message from people living there that has long been obliterated. As the narrator says, "What happened that day in Pachigam need not be set down here in full detail, because brutality is brutality and excess is excess and that's all there is to it. There are things that must be looked them in the face, like the fire of the sun" (Rushdie, *Shalimar* 309). We do not need a detailed description of the calamity in Pachigam, as the questions they pose demonstrate their hopelessness and their counter-narrative against political or religious discourses on what Kashmir should be like. We must look the problem in the eye, as it might become what Rushdie quotes

from Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* in the epigraph of *Shalimar the Clown*: "a plague on both your houses." The destruction of Pachigam is not only confined to Kashmir district but has its impact on people living in Los Angeles or other places around the world. For people living in Los Angeles, the story of Pachigam possesses a relational presence. It bears different significance to different characters, even though it has been obliterated. When the story of Pachigam flashes into the minds of some characters in Los Angeles, it actually changes something and reminds us of its presence.

Return to Pachigam

After being bothered by the intruder of absent memories for a long time, India/Kashmira finally recovers her Kashmiri story and her original name, Kashmira, which is given by her Kashmiri mother. She has been endeavoring to piece the traces of Kashmir, including the spirit of Kashmiriyat and the destruction of Kashmir, together so as to get closer to the place and her mother. When she eventually jumps out of fabricated facts in Los Angeles and regains her stories of Pachigam, she feels as if "the weight of her body has suddenly doubled" and wants to go back to Pachigam as soon as she can (354). This is the weight of histories, making India/Kashmira able to know herself and to prepare herself for future challenges. However, India/Kashmira's return to Pachigam does not offer readers a vision of paradise that is never changed. The place has inevitably changed, and the upheaval has not ended in Kashmir, even though the peace treaty has been made. People warn her that "things are worse than ever, the killings are at an all-time high and foreign backpackers are showing up headless on the hillsides and there is fury in the air" (356). When India/Kashmira gets the opportunity to go to Pachigam, people caution her that "This

isn't journalism. It's personal. Forget about the camera and sound equipment. You want to get in? We'll get you in. As to safety, however, it's at your own risk" (356-57). The Kashmir issue should not be regarded as a talk-show topic only for broadcasting programs that will be "supervised and cut" (29) just as Max's interview has been treated and distorted. It should be seen directly since it is happening among a group of people in Kashmir and perhaps will happen in everywhere around the world soon. The turbulence of Kashmir is not only an epitome of the result of post-partitioned India but also a manifestation of extreme hatred and love, violence and intolerance. The spirit of Kashmiriyat that transcends the ethnic or religious difference has been smashed, and this could happen around the world in different forms of representation. "Everywhere is a mirror of everywhere else," and "Los Angeles is beginning to look like wartime Strasbourg; like Kashmir" (355).

There is light shedding on the village, but it just cannot whisk the terror off the village. When India/Kashmira arrives at Pachigam, it is spring. "Kashmir in spring, the leaves budding on the chinars, the swaying poplars, the blossom on the fruit trees, the cradling mountains circle all around" (361). It looks like a normal rural community at the first sight. "Even in its time of darkness it is still a place of light" (361), making some people think that people in Pachigam have recovered from the trauma of the war. However, the real life proves that such an impression is wrong. "How easy it is, at first, to avert the gaze from the burned-out houses, the tanks, the fear in everyone in every woman's eye, the different terror in the eyes of the men. But slowly the spell of Sardar Harbans Singh's garden wears off" (361). Through India/Kashmira's perspective, we know that the peace treaty or the seemly stable condition of Kashmir is like the magic that deceives us into believing that things have been restored. The landscape of Pachigam is changed, including people's perception

of their material structure or ways of life in the village, their cognition of Kashmir and their expression of living in Pachigam. Even though Yuvraj tries to tell India/Kashmira the story of Pachigam with "euphemisms," it cannot conceal the brutality that happens in the village, as "*this is real life*" (361).

The spatial practice of Pachigam has been changed. Even though India/Kashmira does not directly witness the invasion in person, she realizes what has been left in the village through her observation of how those villagers respond to the surroundings. They do not live in the way of life that can tolerate various cultures anymore. The eyes do not reflect delight and hope but terror and militancy. The place where Boonyi dances and Shalimar the clown walks the tightropes has disappeared. Poverty and fear have stricken the villages in the valley. They are "double epidemic wiping out the old way of life" (364). "This place is finished. Places get smashed and then they are no longer the places they were. This is how things are" (363). Women begin to veil, which they dismissed all their lives. When an old lady gives India/Kashmira a hot glass of traditional Kashmiri salty tea, she says "I am sorry that you see us in this condition. Once we were proud but now even that has been taken from us" (365). This is real life and this is how Pachigam and *Kashmiriyat* have been obliterated.

Imaginary Homeland

Pachigam, a fictitious village based on the overlooked truth about militancy and conflicts of Kashmir, represents frustrations of losing our immanent spirit of tolerance. It consists of the author's most precious memories of peaceful and harmonious Kashmir and the lament for its destruction. Through the portrayal of Boonyi's betrayal and Shalimar's transformation, Rushdie imagines how an earthly paradise was devastated after the partition and independence of India by rewriting an American

story of terrorist attacks as a Kashmiri story. Kung suggests that "Rushdie offers an ethical re-configuration of violence and identity" (99) through "Kashmiriyat," which helps Rushdie "re-imagine spatial possibilities of conviviality to 'step across' the cultural, geopolitical lines between India, Pakistan and America" (81).

Kashmir, which is usually regarded as a lost ideal in reality, has been transformed and reconfigured as a literary space that consists of Rushdie's migratory experiences and his characters' irreversible past. In that space, Rushdie reminisces a tolerant world and denounces the atrocities that have been done on the region. In the course of making the literary space, Rushdie averts his lens from disputes on terrorism and counter-terrorism. Instead, by foregrounding the shared humanistic spirit of tolerance embedded in his imagination of a perished paradise, Pachigam, Rushdie steps across the geographical and political boundaries that stop him from voicing the unnoticed changes of our contemporary spatial practice. In addition, through portraying India/Kashmira's search for the traces about her mother and the lost Kashmiri story, the narrator poses questions about how world powers deal with Kashmir issue and how people around the world will think of the destruction of Pachigam.

The destruction of Pachigam refers to the transformation of each dimension of its spatial production. However, the narrator says visitors can still find its traces on some official records or guidebooks.

> The village of Pachigam still exists on the official maps of Kashmir, due south of Srinagar and west of Shirmal near the Anantnag road. In such public records as are still available for inspection its population is given as three hundred and fifty, and in a few guides for the benefits of visitors there are passing references to the bhand pather, a dying folk

> art, and to the dwindling number of dedicated troupes that seek to preserve it. (Rushdie, *Shalimar* 308)

That is how India/Kashmira might have known of Pachigam before her return to it. On official records or guidebooks, Pachigam seems to still exist. With these official documents, we have clear instructions of where it is. We have the number of its residents, and we even know its traditional art, though both of them are fading and dwindling away. It seems that we can have a general idea of what this rural village is like from these official records, but in fact we do not know what has happened and is actually happening here. The difference between what these guidebooks say to us and what people live in Pachigam reveal to us parallels that between conceived space and lived space, or between representations of space and representational spaces. The specific information about its position and population can be considered a part of representations of spaces of Pachigam as it shows how planners, architects, governments may conceive or map out this place. On the other hand, how residents in Pachigam experience and imagine their living space and the turbulence in Kashmir will be seen as representational spaces, which is strongly related to users' space. Through the eyes of villagers in Pachigam, we know that both Pachigam and Kashmiriyat have been destroyed. Pachigam ceases to exist.

For people who live or once lived in the village, this Pachigam is no longer that Pachigam they know. What exists in the world is an official recognition or memorial of Pachigam.

> This official existence, this paper self is its only memorial, for where Pachigam once stood by the blithe Muskadoon, where its little street ran along from the pandit's house to the sarpanch's, where Abdullah roared, and Boonyi danced and Shivshankar sang and Shalimar the

> clown walked the tightrope as if treading upon air, nothing resembling a human habitation remains. (308-9)

What people experience is not confined to physical objects nor institutions' blueprints of space. It is an interaction among what people perceive, conceive, experience and represent that space. Therefore, for people who once experienced and praised the beauty and preciousness of Pachigam, Pachigam is gone. Pachigam does not refer to physical objects, conceptual planning, living experience or imagination respectively. It is an embodiment of all these factors. Its production consists of users' perception, cognition, experience and expression of the place. To define whether Pachigam exists or not can be interpreted from different perspectives. For people living there, everything changes in Pachigam. Pachigam always holds a different place in these residents' minds. They do not define the place merely by calculations, geography or historical significance. Instead, they comprehend the place with their interactions with people or surroundings, with everyday spatial practice of people living there, with activities and patterns that they perceive empirically in their daily life. They imagine the place as a harmonious and cosmopolitan community, where they present human beings' precious inherent spirit of tolerance. Therefore, when the division wreaks dreadful havoc on the village, it also destroys the spirit of Kashmir, Kashmiriyat, making it no longer the place Kashmiris once owned and experienced. Through the portrayal of spreading rumors, the imposed power demanding their performance of Kashmiriyat and the brutality happening in Pachigam, we see how inhabitants in Pachigam experience the changes of their village and loss of Kashmiriyat. After the long passage of asking "who do this brutal things," the narrator affirms that it is no longer the place that will tolerate different ethnicities, religions or cultures. When India/Kashmira arrives at the village, she can only feel terror in the villagers' eyes.

Therefore, “there was no Pachigam anymore. Pachigam was destroyed. Imagine it for yourself” (309).

For different people, Pachigam has different meanings to them. For the narrator, whether Pachigam exists or not depends on how you think of Pachigam. “The village of Pachigam still exists on maps of Kashmir, but that day it ceased to exist anywhere else, except in memory” (309). Perhaps there are two different ways of how Pachigam exists in the world: one is on the official maps, and the other is in memory of Kashmir people. The gap between representations of space and representational spaces in Pachigam encourages people to readdress the Kashmir issue and to envision the spirit of Pachigam. As the narrator says, “Third and final attempt: The beautiful village of Pachigam still exists” (309). The past and the truth resist to be forgotten. There is resistance force in the gap between how people remember Pachigam and how political powers historicize the day in Pachigam. It is the resistance force from the villagers’ and users’ points of view and memories that reminds us of the cosmopolitan vision of life and our loss of it. The imaginary homeland allows us to visualize what Pachigam or our living space could be if it had not been destroyed. The imaginary homeland invites us to rethink what makes the paradise irretrievable. Pachigam still exists in our memories and our imagination, from which we try to push the boundaries against what has been defined, though the place and the memory might have been obliterated and mad silent before.

Chapter Four

Los Angeles: A City with No Angels

"A plague on both your houses," one of the novel's two epigraphs, foretells Rushdie's intention to write the destruction of two paradises: Pachigam and Los Angeles. The two places are intertwined and compared in the novel. They seem different but will later be discovered that they share many things in common. The former represents the smashed past, where characters were forced to leave, while the latter is considered a promised land where they come to find possibilities of transformations. Both of them are endowed with people's quest for a utopian vision of our life, but their spatial representations will reveal the inaccessibility of such a dream.

Having suffered from the loss of their homelands and coming with different expectations of the city, those migratory characters in the novel add disparate perspectives to the spatial production of Los Angeles and pose alternate vision of Los Angeles. In the novel, we can compare representational spaces proposed by different residents for the city accommodates manifold narratives from different parts and different periods of the world. Some praise the cityscape, while some are still trapped in the past without paying too much attention to the development of the city. Some pursue the illusion of the city, while some aim at something more real to life. In his description of Los Angeles, Rushdie presents "visible but unseen spaces of contemporary reality" (Tygstrup 199) and the influence of migration to his readers. This chapter aims to focus on representational spaces of Los Angeles from the perspectives of different immigrants to see how unseen space actually change our imagination of the city and reveal the common features shared by Pachigam and Los Angeles. Besides, I will also investigate how India/Kashmira's project of filming a

documentary makes her the unique character between the past and the present, between Pachigam and Los Angeles and allows her to counter violence.

Spatial Representations of Los Angeles

For researchers who are interested in space, city is usually an interesting subject worth their attention and investigation. Compared with rural villages, the city accommodates more people from numerous places and with manifold backgrounds. It usually embodies modern features and traces of its historical development in its structure, architecture, and ways of living. It accommodates people of different backgrounds or features. It demonstrates the governments' urban planning and manifests its residents' living experiences. Space is a material, conceptual, empirical and expressional existence, so the city is changed not only by external forces but also with its interaction with time and its users. To understand the city is to discover the relations between things and people because the cityscape is constructed by stratifications of relations, memories and expectations of different periods of time. Different relations will arouse various responses and consequences, and its users' memories and expectations always influence the everyday life of each person. The city are used by people of different genders, ethnicities, religions, classes, occupations, etc., and they have their own interpretations, imagination, and expressions of the city. Sometimes, it is in the collection of different interpretations and imaginations of the city that we can see alternate visions of the city. In other words, the city is like an archive of manifold narratives of different times and from different places. The city congeals so many things in its manifestation of what a city is like that it usually attracts people's attention. Therefore, the landscape of a city is constructed by stratifications formed in different times and by different communities. Traits of

different historical times will be found in the city, telling stories that might have happened long ago or far away. However, not only are these traits reminiscences of the old times, but they also indicate how the place was lived and was supposed to be lived, in which we see the development of the city.

Unlike the city planners who may see the city from an overall point of view at a certain distance, users of the city are more likely to perceive, conceive and live the city with their own perspectives from a closer and reflective point. As previous discussion on Lefebvre's representational spaces points out, there is always subversive force from users' space against the established conceptualization of space. Endowed with users' everyday experiences, representational spaces are bound up with "the lived space of sensations, the imagination, emotions, and meanings incorporated into how we live day by day" (Harvey "space" 130). Instead of directly manipulating or changing the space, users express the discrepancy between the institutionalized knowledge and their everyday life experience. On the other hand, time shapes how we think of the city. The same building will bear manifold significances to different persons because of what we have experienced before individually. Time influences our perception and expression of space, so we have "visions, fantasies, desires, frustrations, memories, dreams and various psychic states" (135) of certain space. Representational spaces consist of expressions of our current feelings and congeal the past, the present and the future in itself.

According to David Harvey, the figure of a city and the image of utopia have long been intertwined together (*Space* 156). To some degree, the emergence of cities symbolizes human beings' efforts or development in gathering things and people so as to efficiently exchange goods and information. It gradually becomes space of progresses and the paradigm of modernity, where people are able to see materials or

concepts that are supported by new technology and embodiment of advanced ideas. In this way, for many people, the city represents the projection of human beings' futile efforts in the past and their anticipation for the future. Since the city accommodates so many things, people tend to believe that the city will have some space for them. The image of utopia has overlapped the vision of the city, where they are able to turn a new leaf. In *Shalimar the Clown*, Los Angeles can be interpreted as a counterpart of Pachigam, both of which seem to have opposite features to the other. One is a metropolis in the west while the other is a rural community in the east. However, they share the vision of utopia or paradise. For residents in Pachigam, their paradise has disappeared in two aspects: the smashed landscape of the Kashmiri village destroyed by the Indian troops and the faded spirit of Kashmiriyat after the partition and the pot war. For immigrants in Los Angeles, their paradise is the one they long for. However, while crossing *the ocean* to escape from dislocation, poverty, oppression, armies, etc., some of them lose their hope for regaining paradise on the way. The ocean may refer to the sea that separates continents or the barriers that prohibit them from dreaming.

Even though Pachigam and Los Angeles lie in different parts of the world, they find their stories shinning in the other's histories. Pachigam, which we have examined how it loses its precious landscape and spirit in the previous chapter, actually represents places that have suffered conflicts, wars or terror around the world, and Los Angeles accommodates people from different *Pachigams*. They are bound with the impact of migration. It is the decision made in Los Angeles that may alter a man in the remote country, and it is the past in these Pachigams that will get involved in their life in Los Angeles. *Shalimar the Clown* not only describes the destruction of Rushdie's lost and imaginary homeland, Kashmir, but also puts emphasis on what happens after

the migration to another paradise, a significant issue of the twentieth century. While the sections of Pachigam show us the vision of lost paradise, Los Angeles in the eyes of immigrants discloses the disillusion of the city of angels. Both of them reveal the people's quest for something disappearing.

In the novel, Los Angeles is portrayed as a capital city "of the billion-dollar industries of film, television and recorded music" (Rushdie, *Shalimar* 24). It is a city of entertainment, famous for how it *produces* and *promotes* images and grasps the audience's attention around the world. Rushdie employs the well-known features of Los Angeles' entertainment industries to unravel how this cosmopolitan metropolis is constructed, perceived and experienced. Max's interview on the talk show is one of the examples. When Max begins his vehement diatribe on the Kashmir issue, the talk-show host only worries about the fact that something outside his living reality will influence the audience rating of his program.

> The talk-show host had the feeling that he was watching the drowning of one reality, the reality in which he lived, by a sudden flood from the other side of the world, an alien deluge in response to which his beloved viewers would form a flood of their own, pouring over in the midnight hour of the show's transmission to the channel where his bitter rival, the other talk-show host, the tall bony gap-toothed from New York, would be dancing in the rain of gold. (27-28)

For the host, Kashmir is only a political issue with no benefits to his audience rating. There are floods of information and stories coming into the city in a day, but the Kashmir one does not suit the talk show. The talk-show host wants the ambassador's anecdotes about his stories with many celebrities. "He thanked Max for his fascinating views, guided him courteously to the exit, and then personally supervised

the editing of the Ophuls interview; which he cut, to shreds, to the bone" (28-29). For the audience rating, the host only picks up materials that will interest and entertain his audience so as to make his audience feel comfortable and satisfied despite the fact that the editing may distort the ambassador's original intention. This is how people edit messages in order to provide comfortable messages. To marginalize or to fabricate how things are actually presented is a way to make all the things seem coherent and comfortable for viewers, especially for those who only prepare to see what they have believed in. To make people firmly believe in the knowledge they produce, some production of meaning must be erased or edited. Therefore, for some people, Rushdie's words about Islam are the ones that need to be supervised.

In the same way, to produce and promote a positive image of the city, there will also be editing, cutting, zooming in and out, focusing on the materials that will catch people's attention and deceive the audience's perception so that we can reinforce the order that people believe it is how we generally live. However, floods from other parts of the world do not just come into the talk show where the host or the producer can do editing. The floods have already arrived and dwelled in the city. Floods of people from those remote lands have blended themselves with the city and have posed challenges or threats to the city. However, in the city which is adroit at producing and representing people's dreams, people like the host will tend to ignore and manufacture facts, fearing that the reality that they have been used to will be drowned. However, to resist imposed violence or knowledge, we need to rescale our understanding of our living space. As an archive of immigrant stories, Los Angeles in *Shalimar the Clown* offers a new perspective to look at the spatial representations of the city.

For India/Kashmira, Los Angeles is the city of display and deception, for what she perceives from the city is different from what the city claims to be. The city is no

longer the city of angels since she does not see any angels save people from being trapped in the past and futile efforts. She does not see any guardian spirits appear to save her father from being killed. Her father is assassinated in broad daylight in the so-called city of angels, with maximum security system. His death soon becomes the headlines, one of the memorable events, a potential topic for talk shows, a subject for daily gossips, and then something buried underneath the city's ground before another striking news comes out. This is Los Angeles. Everything passes so fast and life goes on and on to maintain its supposed order without thinking how the city becomes the one we are living in.

In fact, India/Kashmira's attitude toward Los Angeles has a lot to do with the loss of her own story. She only possesses scraps of information about her birth land and her Kashmiri mother. She feels that she only has parts of herself. Therefore, she tends to live her life at a certain distance occupied by the absence of her own story and her own will. Unlike her ambassador father, who praises the advances and modern life in Los Angeles, India/Kashmira is like a detached observer and a critic of the city. She is not that close to the city. She does not feel that she fits the city in any aspect, including the weather. She is a woman who "hates good weather, but most of the year the city offers little else" (4). For her, "the long monotonous months of shadowless sunshine and dry, skin-cracking heat" (4) does not provide her with senses of warmness or security. Without much ideas about herself, she can only be India, being forced to leave Kashmir to London and then Los Angeles. When she is merely India, her Kashmiri story, whether in London or in Los Angeles, is silenced and absent. She would be just India if she had no opportunity to connect her past with the present, just like other immigrants from different corners of the world dwelling in the city without being noticed.

In the novel, India/Kashmira pays much attention to the gap between what people think the city should be like and how the city is actually experienced. This city tries to maintain its order and its image as a liberal and cosmopolitan city through foregrounding what is important for such an image of a progressive metropolis and marginalizing what is not. “The dishonest nursery blue of the sky that makes the world look childlike and pure” (5). It is the ostentatious pureness that makes people unable to perceive the illusion fabricated by the city and willing to accept the status quo. People take things happening here for granted. Its residents become part of the promotion of such a bright and transparent image of the city.

> In such a city there could be no grey areas, or so it seemed. Things were what they were and nothing else, unambiguous, lacking the subtleties of drizzle, shade and chill. Under the scrutiny of such a sun there no place to hide. People were everywhere on display, their bodies shining in the sunlight, scantily clothed, reminding her of *advertisements*. No mysteries here or depths; only surfaces and revelations. (5; italics added)

Resonating with the weather of Los Angeles, people’s first impression of it will be bright and sunny. It seems that there will be no secret hidden or concealed in the city. However, as the narrator ends the section of Shalimar the Clown, “there are things that must be looked indirectly because they would blind you if you looked them in the face, like the fire of the sun” (309). The brightness of Los Angeles might prevent us from paying attention to the darker corners of the city. Everyone here seems to present the openness and the unanimity of the city unconsciously (or some users pretend to be unconscious about it). They are parts of the advertisements to promote the city’s well-known features: a city of no shadows or secrets and a metropolis welcoming or

attracting people to come to search for liberty, freedom and opportunity. The new life does not always turn out to be a good one. Many people come here to work as "bellhops, bar hostesses, garbage collectors and maids" (10) no matter what they were before. "The city was a cliff and they were its stampeding lemmings. At the foot of the cliff was the valley of the broken dolls" (10). Only very few people can live a prosperous or hopeful life here. People might escape from conflicts or restrictions in their homelands but soon need to be confronted with challenges and barriers in the city. The city is not always as clear and pure as it claims to be. It does not provide opportunities for all the residents living here. The sunlight attracts us but it also deceives us.

> [T]o learn the city was to discover this banal city was an illusion. The city was all treachery, all deception, a quick-change, quicksand metropolis, hiding its nature, guarded and secret in spite of all its apparent nakedness. In such a place even the forces of destruction no longer needed the shelter of the dark. They burned out of the morning's brightness, dazzling the eye, and stabbed at you with sharp and fatal light. (5)

The brightness of the city does not protect India/Kashmira's father from being killed. The brightness does not fill the loss of one's expectations. The brightness does not shed light on all of its residents' future. The brightness of the city does not make everything clear. Instead, the brightness of the city is such that it may stop us from looking at the city more directly. In Los Angeles, India/Kashmira finds no belongingness and no facts. She sees not only the triumphant of "a democratic city of the future" (21) made by erecting monuments of expedition but also the marginalization of some people's everyday life there. For most immigrants that

India/Kashmira observes in the city, they are living like her. Some of them are dwelling in the past or trapped in the ocean that they crossed even though they have actually immigrated into the city for a long time. Some of them are pursuing dreams and hopes that the city itself claims to provide. India/Kashmira observes their lives and knows all of them, including herself, are searching for something lost.

The women gathering in the balconies of India/Kashmira's apartment building are the ones who are still trapped in the past. In the evenings, the widows will sing their childhood songs "from the Baltic, from the Balkans, from the vast Mongolian plains" (8). They are from old Central and East Europe, with strange tongues "that might have been Georgian, Croatian, Uzbek" (8). For them, the city is like a "shadowless lotus-land" (8), which attracts them, arouses their desire for the metropolis and gives them hope. They come to the city across the ocean for dislocation, for survival, or for "the lure of the West" (10) only to find out that the dream of elsewhere is an illusion. They are still trapped in the ocean, across which they believe there will be something better than their homelands. Therefore, the "exhibitionist and desirous" old immigrant women can only flirt "the lurking and spiteful single men" (8), sleeping, gossiping and complaining. That is all about their new life, and "India *saw* it all" (8, italics added). She observes the apartment, which is like an agglomeration of sad stories of the time, accumulating their memories and futile expectations. She collects traces of lived space from different people so as to come up with her production of meaning of Los Angeles.

Olga Simeonovna, the Russian super of the apartment, represents the one who is still trapped in between the present and the past. She is said to have been "the last surviving descendant of the legendary potato witches of Astrakhan" and "the object of men's admiration and fear" (9). However, now she lives in the city as a super of the

apartment because of her love of a sailor. She turns her potato magic into skills of changing light bulbs and collecting monthly rents of the apartment. When she tells the ambassador about her situation, she says

> I live today neither in this world nor the last, neither in America nor Astrakhan. Also I would add neither in this world nor the next. a woman like me, she lives in someplace 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. This is our fate. Once I felt everything was okay. This I now don't feel. Consequently however I have no fear of death. (9)

To escape the fear of the death and to pursue love, the woman chooses to live in Los Angeles only to find out life here is not as comfortable, reliable and hopeful as she expected. Even though she has spent years in Los Angeles, she can only live on memories and the daily routine for the apartment. The city has lost its attraction to Olga Simeonovna. She cannot project her hope onto the city anymore. Her twin daughters leave her and are addicted to debauchery part of the city life. They pose for saucy pictures against their mother's moral code, live in Vegas flea-pits, damage their health and bodies by cheap plastic surgery, and lose all the money they have accumulated because of men (328). Their story sounds like a typical plot of young girls pursuing wealth, fame or love in Hollywood films, and their desires reveal the darkness part of Los Angeles. The city lures them but does not guarantee them their success. They believe in the myth of the city and get lost in the myth. Their mother can only curse her daughters' names day by day, though having forgiven and missed them inside her heart. Life in Los Angeles for Olga Simeonovna is never okay but a sigh of disappointment. She runs away from the death threat, but only memories and

daily chores accompany her in Los Angeles.

Olga Simeonovna's daughters represent the ones who are attracted by the city of fabricated images and dreams. Their imagination and experience of Los Angeles turn out to be disillusion of the city of angels. They are like the broken dolls lying at the bottom of the cliff. When India/Kashmira looks at the surroundings of her residence, she thinks that the city is very skillful at making things look available and hopeful. "The road where she lived, leafy, bohemian, moved through the indolent light, dawdling, taking its time" (38). Everything looks full of possibility and availability. However, she thinks that "the city's greatest illusion was of sufficiency, of space, of time, of possibility" (38). There are many persons in the city who are living like the sisters, striving for the manufactured dreams. The man who calls himself The Emperor of Ice Cream usually wakes the street up with his ice-cream melodies. The Indian hottest box-office movie star who has a relationship with Max comes to America where nobody knows her to find her freedom. She sees so many people looking for something in the city, but the city does not want to know their stories and may not give what they want. For India/Kashmira, the city of films and entertainment has no depth, or it does, but people refuse to go deeper into it for fear that there would be floods of reality threatening their current reality.

Mr. Khadaffy Andang is one of the key characters that get involved in the assassination. He is a silver-haired Filipino gentleman living in the building longer than anyone else. He usually leaves his door ajar, hoping his wife will come back some day. Even though his wife has found her own comfort zone from another man several years ago, he still keeps the door open. "The city sang its love songs, deluding him, making him hope" (39). When India/Kashmira talks to him in the predawn hour, she finds that he is actually a natty person: "silk-dressing-gown, the cigarette holder,

the perfume, the slicked-back hair" (38). Occasionally, they have some opportunities to chat with each other. They talk about the Philippines, about his hometown and how the Jesuits went there and settled down, about its conflicts between Muslims and Christians. They talk about what forces him and his wife to come to the U.S. They talk about his life in Los Angeles. They share each other's stories. For many people, Mr. Khadaffy Andang remains ordinary and inconspicuous, but for India/Kashmira, the conversation with a Filipino gentleman is like to read a chapter of Filipino immigrants' history in the archive of stories in Los Angeles. Unlike Olga Simeonovna, he thinks life in America is *la dolce vita*, the sweet life. He is satisfied with his current life which is far away from his combat zone in Philippines and accepts his fate of living here.

However, the changes of world politics, which lead these unnoticed immigrants to the city, have also demonstrated its influence in the city through the swoop of the silenced and obscure presence in the city. It eventually turns out that Mr. Khadaffy Andang is the *sleeper* lurking in the shadows waiting for the command. "The word sleeper was frightening" (328), and it frightens the residents much since they cannot imagine that one day there will be a murder on their doorstep. How can the division between friend and enemy become so fragile? Such a thought frightens the residents. People start to question whether Mr. Khadaffy Andang's open door policy is really for his wife or he is just pretending and waiting for a better chance to carry out his mission. People's cognition of the apartment and the community suddenly shatters because of the assassination happening just around their houses. The security system and guards which ensure their sense of security look fragile now. The change in their living experience causes the transformation of their cognition and feeling of the community. The representation of the apartment has been changed. Some of them

choose to move out, and some of them hope India/Kashmira to move out. The building they have lived for a long time no longer makes them feel secure.

When being caught, Mr. Khadaffy Andang tries to convince India/Kashmira that he does not buzz the assassin in to attack her, which makes India/Kashmira wonders the life and the fate of the *sleeper*. She thinks it is because she listens to his story and his tales of his homeland that he does not buzz Shalimar in. Perhaps he just wants to be a sleeper who dwells in the *la dolce vita* and is not willing to be awake because the sleeper business and the world conflicts scare him, too. India/Kashmira begins to wonder how many untold stories in the big city will have the connection with his father's assassination, his feats in Asia, and the wrestling of world powers. Do the terrorist attacks always come from outside?

People come to the city for different reasons, such as love, success, freedom, command, but they share one positive belief that life here will be better than before, at least they can get rid of fear of death. For those who strive to find a better life, they seem to be trapped in the past or the bottom of the cliff; for those who do not want to be awake, they are hoping the past would not come to the present. However, for India/Kashmira, only people like the man whose name India/Kashmira will never correctly remember can really succeed in the manufactured dreams of Los Angeles. The corn-fed white boy has flaxen hair and innocent eyes. His face which seems "free from history or pain" usually wears the attractive goofy smile. He is the super-average style that fit in with the ideal of boy-nextdoorness and caters to the "city dedicated to idealization" (35). People can see his image "on the billboards everywhere in the city" (35), advertising himself and the ideals of the city simultaneously. India/Kashmira looks at the boy with innocent smile, thinking that he will soon move to Fountain Avenue apartment, then into the Los Feliz mansion, the Bel Air palazzo, the

thousand-acre Colorado ranch, and that is how a super star advances in Hollywood. The moving of one's residence indicates his/her position in the society. He is the one that has more chance to be seen in the cityscape, while Olga Simeonovna's girls can only dwell in the flea-pits.

The city's interests and efforts in carrying out its idealization can also be seen from Max's perception and attitude toward the cityscape. He praises the city, which alludes to his feats and efforts in the past. For him, to praise the city is to "celebrate the genius of human beings, their ability to populate the earth with their imaginings, to bring water to the wildness and bustle to the void" (22). However, from India/Kashmira's perspective, she thinks her father has surrendered to "the utopian fallacy, to the myth of the perfectibility of man" (20). Max wants to see the world that his generation helps to construct will be better than before and persuades himself to believe that the ending of his age will be good. When driving on the freeway, Max begins his long soliloquy of his reflection on the metropolis, through which India/Kashmira knows her father has lost in his compliment on the city.

> When he claimed to admire the city's powerful gangs for the thrilling casual potency of their violence and the tag artists for their transient encrypted graffiti; when he praised the earthquakes for their majesty and the landslides for their reproof to human vanity; when with no apparent irony he celebrated the junk food of America and waxed lyrical about the new banality of diet cola; when he admired the strip malls for their neon and the chain stored for their ubiquity; when he declined to criticize the produce on sale in the farmers' markets, the visually delightful apples that tasted like cotton puffs, the bananas made of purpled paper, the odourless flowers, calling them symbols of

> the inevitable triumph of illusion over reality that was the single most obvious truth about the history of the human race…… .(22)

Through India/Kashmira's observation, we know her father loses the ability to make moral judgments when he starts to praise and admit to the corrupt city and culture. The brightness of the city has allured his father so much that he eventually becomes incapable of seeing it objectively. He admires the illusions and fabricated truths. He chooses to surrender himself to the disillusion of the city, accepting all the scenes happening in the city without introspection. He is the one who manufactures and promotes the dream, and now he becomes the one believing in the manufactured dream of the city. He is so absorbed in his glorious past that he cannot detach himself from the institutionalized fallacy of the city and cannot see the transformation of the city. He has surrendered to the production of knowledge made by someone else. He is lost in the city.

India/Kashmira's Documentary Project

The stratifications formed in different historical times will not be easily obliterated. As time goes by, the experience of a certain period of time will be perceived, discovered and responded to by people who are living in the city. Sometimes, they become perfect materials for people to reexamine the current cityscape. Likewise, the footsteps left by the newcomers from different places will not always remain absent or unseen. They contribute to the cityscape, which consists of spatial practice, representations of space and representational spaces. In Los Angeles, through India/Kashmira's perspective, we see a group of people who are living like her: dwelling in the past or pursuing the unknown. However, India/Kashmira is both of them, which enables her to observe the city from a detached point and deal with the

past from a reflective position. She does not dwell in the past for the rest of her life, and neither does she seek for the fabricated hope and myth of Los Angeles. She wants to inhabit truths, not only about her Kashmiri background but also about the place she chooses to stay in. From the beginning of the novel, she keeps questioning the image that the city has long been conceived and tries to acquire more details about her Kashmiri mother. She is the only character being given the ability to perceive what has been considered absent or silent in the city, to move between the past (Pachigam) and the present (Los Angeles), and to express her thoughts of the gap between the vision and the actual experience of living in the city. The capability of responding to the stratifications of the space, making her a reflective character in the story.

The setting of Los Angeles as the center of the whole story allows the author to adopt elements of film industry to describe the contrast between fantasy and reality and to shape India/Kashmira's role as an observer and a critic of the city. India/Kashmira's ambition to make a documentary makes her a unique and important character in the novel. Her interest in making a documentary can be traced back to her strong enthusiasm for history, biography and fact-based films while living in the house on Mulholland Drive. She travels to London to study British documentary film movement of the thirties and forties and does some documentary research. During her research, she discovers that only "frustratingly patchy newspaper records of the events surrounding her birth" (352) are the clues to her Kashmiri mother and background. Pachigam not only loses its village and spirit but also the voice. When she returns to Los Angeles, she has great interest in the British documentarists John Gierson and Jill Craigie and is determined to "make a career in the world of the nonfictional, to make films that insisted on the absolute paramountcy of the truth" (353). Through the lenses, she might be able to see the *real life* and to record the untold stories. "She wants to

inhabit facts, not dreams" (12). For her, "*this is real life*" (353).

For India/Kashmira, the untold stories of immigrants and her Kashmiri past are important, as they reveal the changing spatial production of Los Angeles and the common problem of our present world. To resist authorized and institutionalized knowledge of space, she must familiarize herself with the different meanings of space and to come up with her own interpretation of the place. That is a way to resist imposed violence. Even though her ambassador father, representing the powerful authority regulating her understanding of the world, chooses to give in to the fantasy and does not want to tell more details about her Kashmiri mother, India/Kashmira still wants to inhabit the facts so as to have the abilities to push the boundaries that have confined her understanding of the world. She needs to see, to listen to, and to know the untold stories by herself first and then tries to produce her own alternate version of the story regardless of the truths that she has been told by other people.

She plans to make a documentary called *Camino Real*, which means the royal road in Spanish and refers to the historical trail of Spanish missions in California. There are quite a few memorial spots related to Spanish colonization of the Pacific Coast along the trail. The title of the documentary project refers to the road which connected Spanish missions during the eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. The title undoubtedly reminds people of the history of Spanish colonization and expedition in California. To find materials for her documentary project, India/Kashmira travels up and down U.S. Route 101, which approximates the old trail of Spanish missions to delineate the landscape of Los Angeles. However, she does not focus on the traces left by the Spanish colonization. She looks for something present. She does not pick up the scenes of the progressive metropolis nor does she film the memorial sites of the Spanish missions. She plans to film the present based on the

traces left by the past so that she can compare both through her lenses. The way that India/Kashmira tries to find materials shows that she is interested in comparing dreams and realities. Following "the trail of the first European land expedition, from San Diego to San Francisco," India/Kashmira aims to "examine the contemporary life of California" (333). Instead of reasserting the accomplishments along the trail, she seeks for the "now stuff", such as "the dirty underbelly of paradise, the broken harp-strings, the cracked haloes, the narcotic bliss, the human bloat, the truth" (333) along the trail, from which she can find materials to *re*-present the spatial representations of their everyday life.

The documentary project itself becomes a comparison of the city's development. On the historical trail of the origin of the city, India/Kashmira recognizes the gap between expectations and realities, between what people think of the city and how the city is being lived, between where the name of the city derives and where new immigrants live. While shedding the light of the past memories onto the present experiences, the name of the city becomes ironic. When the Portola expedition reached what is now called Elysian Park and made camp on Buena Vista Hill, they named the river of the beautiful valley after the name of St Francis's church, the angels of Assisi, which reminded the expeditionists of the "joyous and everlasting life" (334). The place was later named after the river and was called the Town of Our Lady the Queen of the Angels of the Very Small Plot of Land. The expedition and colonization history of California represent the angels' blessings and people's expectations for the settlements. This is what the city is known for and as: the city of angels.

However, India/Kashmira's documentary project aims at other parts of the city. Besides the historical and memorial sites of the settlements of Spanish missions,

which will reinforce the positive image of the city, the city also possesses similar landscapes that we may see in Kashmir. Migration does not always come along with positive effects or outcomes. People's lived space serves as a subversive against the expectations and the idealization of the city. Right on the trail of Spanish expedition lies the new immigrants' everyday life, such as "the changing gang culture of the barrios, the trailer-park families in the shadow of the freeways, the swarming immigrant armies that fed the housing boom, the new pleasantvilles being built in the firetrap canyons to house the middle-class arrivistes, the less-pleasantvilles in the thick of the urban sprawl filling up with the Koreans, the Indians, the illegals" (333). The histories of angels only become a part of the monumental records of the city's development. It is definitely no longer a small plot of land now, and it is also not the land they knew, either. The angels who had lain in the expeditionists' memories and in the crosses hung on their chests along the journey were once believed to protect people, but now they seem to be far away. India/Kashmira is more interested in the immigrants, people from the remote areas like her obscure birth land. These people do not live as what the missionaries or expeditionists expected when they saw the beautiful valley. They live in the weakest or darkest part of the paradise. People of different classes or communities live in different areas that fit their social backgrounds. There are swarms of immigrants coming to the city to find their pleasantville away from the conflicts, threats, and diseases only to find there are different classes of pleasantville, and the utopian vision will eventually turn out to be a fabricated dream of harmony and tolerance.

The vision of pleasantville represents the new immigrants' eagerness for finding space of tolerance and hope. Their different spatial representations of Los Angeles symbolize the process of their quest. Before their arrival in Los Angeles, they believe

the city will guarantee them the life they have been deprived of in the homelands. People come to the city and play the supposed roles in the cityscape. Life here can be *la dolce vita*, a sweet and good life, if we do not pay attention to the dark corners of the city. It can be a cosmopolitan city if we ignore the disappearance of tolerance in the community. It can be a dream city that attracts people to pursue fame and wealth if we do not see the techniques the city of filming industries uses to promote its success stories.

India/Kashmira's documentary project of filming pleasantvilles built along the expedition routes makes an interesting parallel with the comic film *Pleasantville* (1998), which portrays the story of a brother and his sister accidentally appearing in the world of a black and white 1958 sitcom *Pleasantville*, the carefree utopian life of which the brother has thirsted for. The sitcom describes a harmonious and monotonous happy life, where people live happily and everyone performs the predestined role of themselves without posing any questions or objections. Nice weather, warm smiles and salutation, balanced diet and sufficient resources, perfect accent of English and the value of family, and all the other elements in the sitcom promote an image of pleasant living space. Every resident conforms to the name of the sitcom and the rules of the space, playing the role that someone mightier may have planned. However, the arrival of the brother and the sister transforms the ordinary spatial practice of *Pleasantville* and challenges residents' cognition of their living space. Because of their intervention, residents gradually know that there are other possibilities of what their living space is like and how their life can be. The invariable happiness is a utopian illusion. Only when people there start to perceive their world empirically instead of accepting the settled facts imposed by the unknown power can they really change their life, express their thoughts of the world and pursue their

dreams rather than live in dreams.

Like the invariable village described in the movie, Los Angeles at the beginning of *Shalimar the Clown* is considered a changeless city from India/Kashmira's perspective. Everyone is like an advertisement, trying to fit in with the idealization of the city. For India/Kashmira, everything looks great but it lacks depth and vitality. Just like what she gets from her observation of her neighborhood and the supper, daily routines fill their lives, though some of them are just gossiping all day long. Their ways of life actually represent their loss of hope for the city. This is why India/Kashmira chooses to start her documentary project from the trail. When driving along the highway US route 10, which is regarded as a symbol of American culture and lifestyle, India/Kashmira sees Fray Juan Crespi's memories, the histories of early expeditions and the contemporary experience of immigrants. The city is full of its users' expectations, experiences and memories. Everyone writes down their own expectation of the city, they perceive the changes of the city and the transformation of their life and then they leave memories shining in other people's histories. The residents' perception of life pose questions to the general cognition of the metropolis as a cosmopolitan new utopia. They have expectations and then frustrations, both of which should be taken into consideration when we talk about lived space of Los Angeles. India/Kashmira wants to record the production of space, from city of angels to city with no angels, and to see what is lost during the transformation.

India/Kashmira's return to Pachigam and to the historical trail of Spanish missions indicates her attempt to find the real life in both places. Since India/Kashmira is the only character that can move between Pachigam and Los Angeles and is also the only character that wants to see what is underneath the Los Angeles fallacy of angels and her birth story in the novel, she is given the

responsibility and power to portray how Los Angeles is experienced and what Pachigam is like now. She is Olga Simeonovna, who is strongly influenced by the past, but she is also the young girls who try to find possibilities for their new lives. She is both of them, trying to retrieve her lost past in Pachigam and to find possibility of the present in Los Angeles. Her documentary project wants to provide different angles of looking at the city to see whether there is possibility of paradises regained. She uses the landscape she sees during her research on the trail to exemplify the loss of Kashmiriyat in Los Angeles, which relates Los Angeles to remote Pachigam. The loss of Kashmiriyat does not only exist in Pachigam but also in Los Angeles. There is no angel watching the new immigrants. Their lives along the trail exemplify the irretrievability of paradise in Los Angeles. They may escape from the death threats, but they do not find space of tolerance in Los Angeles. India/Kashmira's project to film a documentary can be seen as an advanced step of expressing her representational spaces out to the world. She knows there is no angel in the city, and she does not want someone to rescue her from the misery. She herself needs to become the mightier protector in the combat zone, waiting for the avenger from the past or the violence to come. Her desire for Pachigam and her documentary project of Los Angeles are representational spaces of lost paradises. She tries to retrieve what is missing in the historical records of both places, and this is probably what Rushdie has been trying to retrieve as well: space of tolerance and the power to resist violence.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

Literature has paved the way for Rushdie to reevaluate our social relations so that he can push the boundaries as much as he can. Rushdie's elegies of paradises lost become a long journey in which he describes the loss of Kashmiriyat and reexamines the collided worlds through the perspectives of those unknown and unseen in our contemporary realities. To directly address to the concerns that he has been dedicated to, it is inevitable that Rushdie returns to Kashmir and readdresses the issues of migration and violence. By linking the two places mentioned in the characters' migration, Rushdie is able to talk about the paradise that he lost long time ago, even though the paradise here does not refer to paradise in general. In fact, the lost paradises in *Shalimar the Clown* refer to something more profound in the author's mind and something embedded in the author's representations of paradises. Based on the expression from the inhabitants' perspectives, this thesis hopes to find out how representational spaces help us see the transformation of space and what makes Pachigam and Los Angeles connected in terms of lost paradises.

Migratory characters in *Shalimar the Clown* possess similar features: most of them come from smashed paradises like Pachigam and leave for a new life in Los Angeles. Even though Pachigam and Los Angeles are described in different ways, both of them exemplify the irretrievability of paradises. People in Pachigam and in Los Angeles are all looking for something, including India/Kashmira. They are looking for something that no longer exists, something that may transcend their differences in the community whether in Pachigam or in Los Angeles. They are looking for the space of tolerance. Therefore, the spatial representations of Pachigam and Los Angeles are actually an emblem of lost paradises, which is connected with

the loss of Kashmiriyat, the spirit of tolerance.

Rushdie does not restore the loss of paradises. His description of Pachigam and Los Angeles tries to represent something behind the destruction or the disillusion of paradises. For Rushdie, he has been encountered with the death threats since *fatwa*, and the alternate Islam that his grandfather taught him seems to be nowhere to be seen in our contemporary understanding of people's discourses on terrorism. To resist the violence that has stopped him from proposing different ideas and to promote the idea he has learned from his grandfather and his Kashmiri background, Rushdie uses spatial representations of Pachigam and Los Angeles in *Shalimar the Clown* to exemplify what is actually disappearing in his life and our world: the loss of Kashmiriyat. What actually makes the village and the city look similar in the novel is the disappearing space of tolerance.

In Pachigam, the residents of the village reveal their panic of the after-partitioned world of Kashmir through different expressions, such as feelings of the new policy of art performance, prophecy of the impending trouble, and rumor about the invading troops. Rushdie does not depict the details of what happens on the day of the troops' invasion; instead, he chooses to describe the days before and after the invasion. Before the day of invasion, people has already sensed the disappearance of Kashmiriyat from their daily life. What bonds people in Kashmir together is lost. Hatred and terror replace their love and tolerance. After the day, the landscape of Kashmir can no longer represent a harmonious community. The landscape not only refers to the material objects India/Kashmira observes but also the expressions of fear and the atmosphere of a dying community. Through the portrayal from inhabitants' perspectives, Rushdie manifests both the material and spiritual transformation of Kashmir in the endless militancy: the harmonious imagery of Shalimar's homeland

and the disappearance of the belief that makes people bond together.

In Los Angeles, it is through the immigrants' perspectives that we see disillusion of a Pleasantville vision. A pleasantville is supposed to be somewhere that is full of happiness and hope. However, when immigrants from smashed paradises arrive in the city of angels, they find out the pleasantville image is mapped out by their false impression and cognition of the city. They project their loss of ideal community in the past and their expectation of retrieving that into their lived space of Los Angeles. From their perspectives, we see a different landscape of Los Angeles which gradually becomes similar to that of Pachigam.

In both depictions of irretrievable paradises, there is a gap between inhabitants' cognition and everyday experience of space. What occupies the interstices between conceived space and lived space, representations of space and representational spaces, is the process of representation and reinterpretation from different points of view that derive from users' own memories and experience. It is through the interstices that resistance appears, not only the resistance against the existing system of knowledge but also the resistance against being forgotten. The past does not want to and will not be easily obliterated from our present histories. The unseen space and untold stories refuse to be forgotten.

Just like India/Kashmira's filming project, Rushdie tries to turn a story of an American ambassador's assassination into a relational thinking of people and places related to the incident, through which Rushdie suggests two more possible ways of interpreting the attack: one is the world politics and conflicts exemplified in the devastation of remote Pachigam and the other is the issue of immigration in the age of mass migration, both of which are representations of loss of tolerance and the impact of violence. This is the paradise that Rushdie tries to describe. He manages to portray

how each place is transformed from space of hope and tolerance to space of intolerance and violence. He wants to disclose the fact that what discourages or threatens him is also the thing that destroys Kashmir and Los Angeles. He wants to remind his readers that to resist violence is to resist the imposed boundaries. The existing political or cultural boundaries narrow how we look at ourselves and our worlds, which might spoil "conceptions of space that tend to form in dream, in imaginings, in utopias or in science fiction" (Lefebvre 357).

In the interview by John Preston, Rushdie indicates:

> The truth, of course, is that we're not just one thing, or another; we're all these little clouds of contradictions. And if you can accept that, then not only are you being truthful about yourself, but you're also likely to find you have things in common with other people. Also, that gives you a way of constructing a society that on the whole works. ("Provoking")

Rushdie here is trying to deconstruct social boundaries and to emphasize there is always something that we can acquire from other places and something we will relate ourselves to, as we have shared more and more things with other communities and have been influenced by activities around the world. We need to rescale our world. The limits of political and territorial boundaries are likely to be resolved or at least to be challenged through our representational spaces, from which we can reconfigure the space-time structure and representations of space. Though personal interpretation of the assassination may not be able to reconcile with the international politics and conflicts or change anything, at least it provides us possibilities of moving beyond the defined boundaries and the established knowledge. This is not a transcendental resolution of spatial and territorial conflicts; rather, it implies a rescaling of thinking

who we are and discloses the need to re-examine the overlooked spaces of our contemporary realities. For Rushdie, this will help him represent the alternate Islam and reassert the significance of Kashmiriyat. This is how he tries to resist violence and retrieve Kashmiriyat in *Shalimar the Clown*: to push against the defined boundaries between Pachigam and Los Angeles a little more.

Works Cited

Ahmedi, Mohamed Arshade. *Rushdie: Haunted by His Unholy Ghosts*. Surry: AuthorHouse, 2007. Print.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Coetzee, J. M. "Palimpsest Regained." *New York Review of Books* 43.5 (1996): 13-16. *New York Review of Books*. Web. 10 May 2013.

Cowley, Jason. "From Here to Kashmir." Rev. of *Shalimar the Clown*. *Observer Review*11 Sep 2005. Web. 1 Apr 2011.

Dascălu, Cristina Eanuela. *Imaginary Homelands of Writers in Exile: Salman Rushdie, Bharati Mukjerjee, and V. S. Naipaul*. New York: Cambria Press, 2007. 1-36. Print.

Deszcz, Justyna. "Salman Rushdie's Magical Kingdom: *The Moor's Last Sigh* and Fairy-Tale Utopia." *Marvels & Tales* 18.1 (2004): 28-52. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 May 2013.

Elden, Stuart. "Between Marx and Heidegger: Politics, Philosophy and Lefebvre's *The Production of Space*." *Antipode* 36.1 (2004): 86-105. *Wiley Online Library*. Web. 2 December 2013.

Ganapathy-Doré, Geetha. "Kashmir by Way of London and New York." Eds. Helga Ramsey-Kurz and Geetha Ganapathy-Doré. *Projections of Paradise: Ideal Elsewheres in Postcolonial Migrant Literature*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011. 29-47. Print.

Haffenden, John C. R. *Novelists in Interview: Martin Amis, Malcolm Bradbury, Anita Brookner... [et Al.]*. London: Methuen, 1985. Print.

Hari, Johann. "Salman Rushdie: His Life, his work and his religion." *Independent* 13 October 2006. Web. 10 April 2013.

Harvey, David. “Space as a Key Word.” *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*. London and New York: Verso, 2006. 117-48. Print.

---. *Space of Hope*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000. Print.

---. *Social Justice and the City*. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1993. Print.

Heinegg, Peter. “The Political is Personal.” Rev. of *Shalimar the Clown*. *America* 13 Feb 2006. Web. 12 Jan 2013.

Hogan, Patrick Colm. “*Midnight's Children*: Kashmir and the Politics of Identity.” *Twentieth Century Literature* 47.4 (Winter, 2001): 510-44. *JSTOR* Web. 20 May 2013.

hooks, bell. *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End, 1990. Print.

Keulks, Gavin. “New York, Los Angeles, and Other Toxicities: Revisiting Postmodernism in Rushdie's *Fury* and *Shalimar the Clown*.” *The Mourning After: Attending the Wake of Postmodernism*. Eds. Neil Brooks and Josh Toth. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2007. 143-68.

Kung, Shao-ming. “Paradise Lost: Narratives of Violence and Terror(ism) in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*.” *Tamkang Review* 34. 2 (June 2010): 79-103. Print.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Simth. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995. Trans. of Production de l'espace. 1974. Print.

Liao, Pei-Chen. “Of Violence and Identity: ‘Post’-9/11 South Asian British Fiction.” Diss. National Taiwan University. 2009. Print.

Liggett, Helen. “City Sights/Sites of Memories and Dreams.” *Spatial Practices: Critical Explorations in Social/Spatial Theory*. Eds. Helen Liggett and David C.

Perry. London: Sage, 1995: 243-73. Print.

Mishra, Pankaj. “The End of Innocent.” *The Guardian* 19 May 2007. Web. July 16 2012.

---. “Exit Wounds. The Legacy of Indian Partition.” *The New Yorker* 13 Aug 2007. Web. July 15 2012.

Morton, Stephen. “‘There Were Collisions and Explosions. The World was No Longer Calm.’ Terror and Precarious Life in Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown*.” *Textual Practice* 22.2 (2008): 337-55. Print.

Pitkin, Annabella. “Salman Rushdie Loses his Cheerfulness: Geopolitics, Terrorism and Adultery.” *Journal of International Affairs* 61.1 (Fall/Winter 2007): 257-62. Print.

Prigge, Walter. “Reading The Urban Revolution: Space and Representation.” Trans. Bandulasena Goonewardena. *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*. Kanishka Goonewardena, Stefan Kipfer, Richard Milgrom, Christian Schmid. New York: Routledge, 2008. 46-61. Print.

Rushdie, Salman. “Freedom and Dissent.” India Today Conclave 2010. 12 March 2010. Lecture. (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E5v8NP3kqHE)

---. “Provoking People Is in My DNA.” Interview by John Preston. *The Telegraph*. 29 Dec. 2008. Web. 6 August 2013.

---. Interview with Jack Livings. “Salman Rushdie: The Art of Fiction No. 186.” *Paris Review* 174 (2005): 107-43. *Paris Review.* Web. 10 April 2012.

---. *Shalimar the Clown: A Novel*. New York: Random House, 2005. Print.

---. *Step Across This Line: Collected Non-Fiction 1992-2002*. London: Vintage, 2003. Print.

---. *The Moor's Last Sigh*. New York: Vintage Books, 1995. Print.

---. *The Satanic Verses*. New York: The Viking Press, 1988. Print.

---. Interview with Günter Grass. “Fictions Are Lies That Tell the Truth: Salman Rushdie and Günter Grass: In Conversation.” *Conversations with Salman Rushdie*. Ed. Michael Reder. Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi 2000. 72-78. Print.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage, 1993. Print.

Sanga, Jaina C.. *Salman Rushdie's Postcolonial Metaphors: Migration, Translation, Hybridity, Blasphemy, and Globalization*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001. Print.

Schmid, Christian. “Henri Lefebvre’s Theory of the Production of Space: Towards a Three-Dimensional Dialectic.” *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*. Eds. Kanishka Goonewardena, Stefan Kipfer, Richard Milgrom, Christian Schmid. New York: Routledge, 2008. 27-45. Print.

Schofield, Victoria. “Kashmir: The Origins of the Dispute.” *BBC NEWS*. BBC, 16 January, 2002. Web. 7 December 2013.

“Seven killed in Kashmir Explosion.” *BBC NEWS*. BBC, 11 October, 2007. Web. 15 April 2013.

Su, Jung. “Inscribing the Palimpsest: Politics of Hybridity in *The Moor’s Last Sigh*.” *Concentric: Studies in English Literature and Linguistics* 29.1 (January 2003): 199-226. Print.

---. “Saleem’s Quest for Origin: Authenticity and Nation in *Midnight’s Children*.” *Proceedings of the National Science Council-Part C* 10.1 (Jan 2000): 60-78. Print.

Teverson, Andrew. "Rushdie's Last Lost Homeland: Kashmir in *Shalimar the Clown*." *The Literary Magazine*. 1 December 2005. Web. 5 Apr. 2013.

Thiara, Nicole Weickgenannt. “The Idea of a Hybrid India.” *Salman Rushdie and Indian Historiography*: *Writing the Nation into Being*. Hampshire: Palgrave

Tygstrup, Frederik. “Changing Spaces: Salman Rushdie's Mapping of Post-Colonial Territories.” *Literary Landscapes: from Modernism to Postcolonialism.* Ed. Attie De Lange, Gail Fincham, Jeremy Hawthorn, Jakob Lothe. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. 198-213. Print.

Updike, John. “Paradise Lost.” Rev. of *Shalimar the Clown*. *The New Yorker* 5 Sep 2005. Web. 7 June 2012.

Wallhead, Celia. “Two Takes on Terrorism: Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown* and Justine Hardy’s *The Wonder House*.” *Trans/forming Utopia: The Small Thin Story* vol 2. Ed. Elizabeth Russell. Oxford; New York: Peter Lang, 2008. 91-100. Print.