

---

## Salman Rushdie and the American Empire

Uplabdhii Sangwan

---

**Abstract-** Salman Rushdie's novels till *The Moor's Last Sigh* (1995) have thematically engaged with the Indian subcontinent and particularly Bombay. This chapter looks at instances that register an ideological shift in Rushdie's oeuvre from a critique of American hegemony. The author's writings on Iraq and Kashmir register a shift towards conceding moral sanction to the expansion of the American frontier beyond the Pacific in the twentieth and twenty-first century. The legitimacy is accorded through the trope of liberty, democracy and freedom. These ideas are not novel but draw from rhetorical configurations such as a 'city upon a hill' used by the earliest Puritan settlers, 'American Exceptionalism', 'Manifest Destiny', etc.. This paper illustrates that this shift in Rushdie's negotiates with cognisance of countervailing aspect of repressiveness with regard to the American military intervention on numerous instances.

*Key Words: American imperialism, Salman Rushdie, Frontier*

The architecture of American 'imperial formations'<sup>1</sup> across Rushdie's non-fictional and fictional writings register a shift in his reactions towards the American empire. While his earlier writings engage with the theme of

deleterious impact of the American empire, the author subordinates this theme in his later writings. *The Jaguar Smile* (1987) illustrates Rushdie's critique of American intervention in Nicaragua. In *The Jaguar Smile* the author renders problematic the "US aid to la Contra, the counter-revolutionary army the CIA had invented, assembled, organised and armed...in violation of international law".<sup>2</sup> Later in 1991 Rushdie's non-fictional writings critically contemplate the dramatic contrast between America's professed self-image as the "guardian of freedom and decency" on the one hand, with the ironical denunciation by American President of "an elected government (in Nicaragua) as a tyranny, while it is conveniently forgotten that for the previous fifty years it was America who supported the real, full-blooded Somoza tyranny."<sup>3</sup> The author alludes to the role of CIA in giving the "Contras ground plans, blue prints and maps of key Nicaraguan installations, to help them with their terrorist programme."<sup>4</sup>

To conceptualise the expansionist impulse of the American foreign policy in the twentieth century, Rushdie invokes the Frontier Thesis provided by the historian F. J. Turner as a "useful lens."<sup>5</sup> Rushdie describes America as a "country born with the urge to push a frontier westward as has needed, constantly, to find new frontiers, ever since it reached the Pacific".<sup>6</sup> The idea that military interventions in sovereign states is a legitimate foreign policy is aligned to the "frontier psychology" where the "regeneration of fortunes" through "violence" became the "structuring metaphor" of the "American experience".<sup>7</sup> The idea of the Frontier has influenced "American political and historical debates since the 1890s" and was evoked through the phrase "New Frontier" by Kennedy to rally the country against Communism and the "social and economic injustices that foster it."<sup>8</sup> This phrase also shaped the "language through which the resultant wars would be understood by those who commanded and fought them."<sup>9</sup> The military intervention in the purported rogue states is one of the modus operandi used to expand the frontiers of the American empire.

By 1999 Rushdie formulates the argument against what he describes as the "anti-American sentiment."<sup>10</sup> He asserts that "freedom" exists "in greater quantity in the countries of the West than anywhere on the earth" and the United States was "the best guarantor."<sup>11</sup> He enlists "freedom" as a "universal value" along with other universals such as "international conglomerates and

the interests of super-powers.”<sup>12</sup> This is a shift in his writings from an earlier critique of the American empire in *The Jaguar Smile* and *Imaginary Homelands* mentioned above.

Salman Rushdie’s quotes from “The altered states of anti-Americanism” and “Fight the good fight” below provide a definitive evidence of a shift towards casting America through the rhetoric of ‘Empire of Liberty’.

“Many Kashmiris will be angry that their long-standing desire for an autonomous state is being ignored for the sake of US real politik... Apparently Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein are terrorists who matter; Hindu fanatics and Kashmiri killers aren’t.”<sup>13</sup>

“...as the anti war protests grow in size and volume... there is a strong, even unanswerable case for “regime change” in Iraq.”<sup>14</sup>

These quotes are from articles that were written by Salman Rushdie as a reaction to the US invasion of Iraq. In the first quote Salman Rushdie appears to assess the condition of human rights in Kashmir to be as dismal and as desperate as the one that existed in Iraq.<sup>15</sup> He seems to insinuate a need for an intervention of the kind undertaken by America in Iraq. The tacit moral sanction to military intervention in the first quote appears to be reiterated in the second quote. The author distinguishes the military intervention in Iraq as a legitimate exercise and urges that “the world must stop sitting on its hands and join the Americans and British” in effecting the regime change in Iraq.<sup>16</sup>

Even as the author contemplates American military imperial intervention as a legitimate act to purportedly uphold the idea of liberty in context of Iraq and Kashmir; the author also registers cognisance of countervailing aspect of repressiveness with regard to the American military intervention on numerous instances. Rushdie describes such interventions as “a highly selective pursuit of American vendettas.”<sup>17</sup> This admission is reiterated in his subsequent article “Fight the good fight” from which the second quote above has been taken. The military interventions reflect “preemptive, unilateralist instincts” that appear as “bullying.”<sup>18</sup> The pro-imperial ideological shift illustrated above

therefore interact with these contrasting perspectives. These interactions in the fictional writings entail narrative strategies that ultimately seek to emphasise the fundamental values of liberty and freedom that the empire is claimed to fortify. For instance the immigrants who are drawn to America in anticipation of freedom from poverty and repression are a crucial leitmotif in *Shalimar the Clown*. They regulate the image of America as a space that upholds human rights, freedom and civil liberties. In *Shalimar the Clown*, the U.S is a sanctuary for the persecuted, those fleeing repressive regimes, or looking for opportunities. The novel depicts immigrants from the Philippines, Central and East European countries speaking "strange tongues" who "might have been Georgian, Croatian, Uzbek...the Baltic, from the Balkans, from the vast Mongolian plains."<sup>19</sup> Other immigrants who receive sanctuary in America include the two key characters i.e. Max Ophulus, the Jewish French resistance fighter; and India, the illegitimate daughter of Boonyi, the Kashmiri girl Max seduces as the US Ambassador in India. Even Rushdie's own experience in *Joseph Anton*, depicts that America made possible his access to freedom post the oppressiveness of years of living in hiding due to the fatwa. He sought to relocate to America as the country gave Rushdie's family "a taste of...freedom."<sup>20</sup> The narrative later provides an account of New York where "his life was in his own hands."<sup>21</sup>

When confronted by his detractors who interpreted these writings as reflecting a pro-American neo-imperialist stance, Rushdie proffered a rebuttal in "No fondness for the Pentagon's politics" and emphasized his participation in anti-war events and his vocal criticism of the Iraq war.<sup>22</sup> In spite of his rebuttal the author appears to participate in the discursive practice is premised on a preexisting rhetorical identification of the West as the site of fundamental universal values such as liberty and freedom; and conversely with their crises in the rest of the world. The works of Samuel Huntington, Benjamin Barber, Robert Kaplan, Niall Ferguson etc. epitomise this discursive practice. In 2004 Robert Kaplan proposed "In Defense of Empire" that the value of American empire resembles that of those historically provided by empires.<sup>23</sup> This value is described as a constructive role performed by empires by providing "the most benign form of order for thousands of years, keeping the anarchy of ethnic, tribal, and sectarian war bands to a reasonable minimum."<sup>24</sup> Kaplan proceeds to describe the American role in Kosovo and Bosnia as such an instance. This

very logic under girds Rushdie's mandate to military intervention as a legitimate response albeit under the rubric of "a broad international coalition" to safeguard ideals of liberty.<sup>25</sup> This military aspect of the imperial formation is conversely accompanied by the fact that the US borders are more "closely policed" and "their porosity" is a function of "who (or what) is going through, and in what direction, in or out."<sup>26</sup> This scenario is contrary to the claims of a "decentered" and "deterritorializing" order of the "Empire" which Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri argue is accompanied by a decline of the idea of the nation state.<sup>27</sup>

Rushdie's shift towards the discursive practice described above has had serious ramifications as America has in recent decades invaded legitimate national territories in the ostensible pursuit of liberty. This includes for instance war on Iraq mentioned above. In contrast to Rushdie's mandate to American military interventions, Noam Chomsky charges that the "pretexts for the invasion of Iraq" have suffered a collapse as "no weapons of mass destruction, no Al Qaeda tie to Iraq, no connection between Iraq and 9/11" were discovered.<sup>28</sup> As a result "Bush's speechwriters had to conjure up something new... conjured up his messianic vision to bring democracy to the Middle East."<sup>29</sup> Chomsky cites yet another commentator David Ignatius who irrespective of the lack of discovery of the WMD described the invasion of Iraq as "the most idealistic war" as it "toppled a tyrant and created the possibility of a democratic future."<sup>30</sup> The disastrous consequences of occupation of another nation by the US unleashed horrific conditions for the residents. Chomsky describes the US siege of Fallujah by drawing a comparison with the genocide in Srebrenica in 1995. For instance during the siege the military age civilian men fleeing Falluja were turned back to their certain deaths. "The only difference is the United States bombed the Iraqis out of the city, they didn't truck them out."<sup>31</sup> Chomsky draws attention to the use of the term "genocide, when the Serbs do it. When we do it, it's liberation."<sup>32</sup> Rushdie's shifting position towards American war in Iraq has been a subject of controversy given his assertion in the *Step Across This Line* that "the authority of the United States were the best current guarantor of that "freedom".<sup>33</sup> This mandate, despite assertions to lack of "fondness for the Pentagon's politics" hinges on selections and deletions. These include disregard of preceding acts of strategic alliance formed by the US administration with Osama bin Laden<sup>34</sup> and Saddam Hussein.<sup>35</sup>

The moral sanction that Rushdie grants to the American military interventions in the purported rogue states circulate in conjunction with his attempts to draw attention to violations of human rights<sup>36</sup> in Kashmir.<sup>37</sup> Stephen Morton comments that Rushdie's recent writings express a "resignation to, and even at times a tacit approval for, America's unilateralist foreign policy."<sup>38</sup> Rushdie's reactions to the modus operandi of American imperialism unmask the dissimilitude in the parameters of legitimacy accorded to the expansion of the American frontier beyond the Pacific in the twenty-first century on one hand, and the illegitimacy accorded to the Indian sovereign territory on the other hand. *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) is shaped by such an uneven logic.<sup>39</sup> The two dissimilar gauges are configured to view America as a benevolent neoliberal state that asserts its "hegemony"<sup>40</sup> and in contrast the latter i.e. India is charged as an illegitimate occupier of Kashmir.<sup>41</sup> The peripheral reference to American hegemony circulates in the novel through allusions to military interventions in Philippines, Vietnam, and Afghanistan. These references are instances of firstly a narrative strategy that subordinate the impact of the empire; and secondly the continued tension between attempts to depict American military imperial intervention as legitimate even as the very consciousness of these historical moments registers the countervailing aspect of the ruptures and repressiveness produced by them. These attitudes suggest affiliations to the official narrative of the Office of the Historian de-emphasizes the imperial character of America through descriptors such as 'U.S. Involvement'.<sup>42</sup> The expansion of America has been naturalised through rhetorical configurations such as a 'city upon a hill' used by the earliest Puritan settlers, 'American Exceptionalism', 'Manifest Destiny', etc.. American military interventions in Vietnam, Afghanistan, and Philippines historically are entrenched in this logic. A delinking of these historic events from the legacy of expansion of the American frontier and its simultaneous defence from communism and Islam renders abstruse the assessment that these historical moments are derived from a long legacy of imperialistic foreign policy. Paul Dukes observes in his *The Superpowers: A Short History* that the "US foreign policy since 1945 had same foundations as before 1945: from the Pilgrim Fathers through to the Founding Fathers to Woodrow Wilson via the Monroe Doctrine and the frontier."<sup>43</sup> *Shalimar the Clown* appears to delink the imperial moments in American history it refers to from this legacy. Even though the novel is

conscious of the extent and reach of the American power, the narrative eschews labelling it as an empire and rather uses the term "hegemony."<sup>44</sup> The American national space is forged in the novel by using what Amy Kaplan calls the "paradigm of denial" of the American empire.<sup>45</sup> This exclusionary model denies "traumas, exclusions, violence enacted centuries ago" that might still linger in "contemporary identity formations."<sup>46</sup> The delinking and deemphasis of the empire from the legacy of expansion produces explanations that interpret U. S. imperialism as an "aberration" or ascribes the motivations of the "fleeting episode" of imperialism to "momentary psychological lapse" causally linked to "misguided "moral idealism" of foreign policy elites, "public opinion" ... "mass hysteria" etc..<sup>47</sup> This exclusionary model in fact helps effectuate a thematic focus on India as an illegitimate occupier of Kashmir in the novel *Shalimar the Clown*. Stephen Morton also observes that Rushdie "subordinates" the "allegory of American imperialism to an elegy of Kashmir."<sup>48</sup> Thus a scathing critique of "Vietnamese children's bodies" being burnt with "unquenchable napalm fire" is accompanied by reparative voices from within America.<sup>49</sup> These voices are led in the novel by Martin Luther King who marched against the Vietnam War to the United Nations in 1967.

The second instance of reference to the expansionist US foreign policy is of engagement with the mujahid so as to counter the threat of "its own great enemy" i.e. the USSR.<sup>50</sup> The policy of defending the U.S. frontier from a perceived threat of Soviet Union entailed giving "weapons, blankets and cash" to Afghans and the mujahid.<sup>51</sup> In the novel, Abdurajak Janjalani, a Filipino terrorist at the forward terrorist base camp called FC22 informs Shalimar that Max Ophulus visited "the base to give weapons and support".<sup>52</sup> Later during Shalimar's trial after his infiltration into the U.S. and assassination of Max Ophulus, the narrative refers to 1993 WTC bombings and the contemporary possibility of "mind-controlled automata walking amongst us, ready to commit murder" following instructions from "voice on the phone."<sup>53</sup> The novel possibly hints at but does not make overt the connection between nature of U.S. role in Afghanistan and Janjalani's information on one hand; with the sense of unease regarding the acts of terror and actions of "automata". The text also simultaneously glosses over the nature and source of motives of the terrorists. This narrative strategy is distinctly at variance from a clear denunciation of the Indian Army for having "poured" the "military hardware"

into the valley that eventually transformed into the "iron mullah" that had "human form" and preached "resistance and revenge."<sup>54</sup> American imperialism constructed the "Soviet Union as a state fanatically associated with communism" and "chose to fight one kind of fanaticism with another as represented by Islamic radicals."<sup>55</sup>

The novel depicts the act of political expediency of the US foreign policy where the alliance with the Muslim mujahids in Afghanistan is accompanied by policy support of Christians against the Muslims in Philippines. Philippines figures in Shalimar the Clown as yet another site ravaged by the Western imperial powers- firstly Spain and later in the twentieth century, America. The narrative of Mr. Khadaffy Andang, a Filipino neighbor of India describes "his home province of Basilan" which once had a "legendary ruler there, he said, Sultan Kudarat, but then the Spanish came and overthrew him, and the Jesuits came too, just like the discovery of California...a peaceful place but now there was trouble between Muslims and Christians."<sup>56</sup> A second reference in the novel of the impact of the expansion of American frontier is made by Janjalani. Janjalani trains along with Shalimar in the Forward Base Camp 22 and harbours an intense antipathy towards the U.S. As part of its imperial intervention in Philippines, the U.S provided support to the Catholics "against the wishes of the Muslims in Mindanao."<sup>57</sup> The local Muslims such as Janjalani deeply resented this and react by joining jihadi groups. Mindanao is, according to Encyclopedia Britannica, a Muslim outpost in the predominantly Roman Catholic Philippines. The Encyclopedia describes it as possessing the largest concentration of ethnic minorities in the Philippines. "They include the Magindanao, Maranao, Ilanun, and Sangil; all are Muslim groups sometimes collectively called the Moro."<sup>58</sup> According to Janjalani the "Christians controlled the economy" while the Muslims were "kept poor."<sup>59</sup> As a result a breakdown of the social order in the Basilan "gun law had begun to rule" and in the seventies "one hundred thousand, hundred twenty thousand" people died in it.<sup>60</sup> The significance of Philippines in religious context of American frontier is alluded to by Timothy Marr in his essay "Out of This World": Islamic Irruptions in the Literary Americas". Marr notes that

"Islam stands as one of the primary exclusions upon which both national and hemispheric exceptionalisms in the Americas have been constructed. The diverse world of Islam (dar-ul-Islam) is



the most formidable frontier of alien difference embracing the breadth of the continents that are not American. Since before the settlement of the Americas by Europeans, the Islamic world has encircled its intertropical African and Asian rims, ranging on the Atlantic shore from the Arab Moors of the Maghreb (ironically a word that means “west,” referring to the North African territories of Islam west of Arabia) to the Muslim groups further south in the Senegambia region of West Africa (Mandes, Fulbes, Wolofs) and on the Pacific shore to the Moros of Mindanao.”<sup>61</sup>

Human Rights Watch uses the image of the frontier in *Bad Blood: Militia Abuses in Mindanao, the Philippines* to express that the “Christian settlers can be seen as Nebraska homesteaders” and the “Muslims ... as the Indians.”<sup>62</sup> The role of religious fundamentalism in this incidence is not new but has according to Tariq Ali played a powerful role in the very settlement of America.

Denial, de-emphasis and delinking of continuities of these American imperial practices in the twentieth century in the novel is epitomised in the wistful rumination of Max Ophulus. Ophulus envisions an “America, free of the need to remain permanently at battle stations.”<sup>63</sup> That Max who has been depicted as a “representative” of “US imperialism, Western theft and destruction, racial dominance, and essentially an extension of the neocolonial pattern that has had such an impact on India, Pakistan and... Kashmir” envision this image is logically incongruous.<sup>64</sup>

To conclude, the fictional and non-fictional writings of Rushdie register a shift towards American empire. The shift is not uncomplicated but fraught with complex interactions between contrary impulses. Even as the author contemplates American military imperial intervention as a legitimate act that purportedly uphold the idea of liberty such as in context of Iraq and Kashmir; the author also registers cognisance of countervailing aspect of repressiveness with regard to the American military intervention on numerous instances. Narrative strategies subordinate and deemphasise the deleterious impact of the empire to negotiate with these contradictions.

## Notes

- 1 Stoler, Ann Laura. “On Degrees of Imperial Sovereignty”, 128.

- 2 Rushdie, Salman (2007). *The Jaguar Smile: A Nicaraguan Journey*. London: Vintage, p.5.
- 3 Rushdie, Salman (2010). *Imaginary Homelands*. London:Vintage, p.392.
- 4 Rushdie, *Imaginary* 364.
- 5 Rushdie, *Imaginary* 390.
- 6 Rushdie, *Imaginary* 390.
- 7 Slotkin, Richard (1973). *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier 1600-1860*. Norman:University of Oklahoma Press, p.5.
- 8 Slotkin, Richard (1998). *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth-century America*. New York: University of Oklahoma Press, p.3.
- 9 Slotkin, *Gunfighter* 3.
- 10 Rushdie, Salman (2003). *Step Across this Line*. London:Vintage, p. 296.
- 11 Rushdie, *Step* 297.
- 12 Rushdie, *Step* 297.
- 13 Salman Rushdie, "The altered states of anti-Americanism,"*The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media Limited, 31 Aug.2002. Web. 27 July 2016. n.pag.
- 14 Salman Rushdie, "Fight the good fight." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media Limited, 2 Nov 2002. Web. 27July 2016. n.pag.
- 15 The 12 volume Chilcot Report (2016) refutes this idea in its findings.
- 16 Rushdie, "Fight the good fight" n.pag.
- 17 Rushdie, "The altered states of anti-Americanism" n.pag.
- 18 Rushdie, "Fight the good fight" n.pag.
- 19 Rushdie, Salman (2005). *Shalimar the Clown*. London:Jonathan Cape, p. 8.
- 20 Rushdie, Salman (2012). *Joseph Anton/ Salman Rushdie: amemoir*. London: Jonathan Cape. p 485.
- 21 Rushdie, *Joseph Anton* 557.
- 22 Rushdie n.pag.
- 23 Rushdie n.pag.

- 24 Robert D. Kaplan, "In Defense of Empire." *The Atlantic*. The Atlantic Monthly Group, April 2014. Web. 20 Aug. 2016.n.pag.
- 25 Salman Rushdie, "No fondness for the Pentagon's politics." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media Limited, 9 July2007. Web. 27 July 2016.n.pag.
- 26 Dirlik, Arif (2004). "American Studies in the Time of Empire". *Comparative American Studies*, 2(3) 289.
- 27 Hardt, Antonio and Michael Antonio (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p.xii.
- 28 Chomsky, Noam (2005). *Imperial Ambitions: conversations on the post-9/11 world*. Interviews with David Barsamian. London: Hamish Hamilton, p.116.
- 29 Chomsky, *Imperial* 116.
- 30 Chomsky *Imperial* 116.
- 31 Chomsky *Imperial* 127.
- 32 Chomsky *Imperial* 127.
- 33 Rushdie, Salman (2003). *Step Across this Line*. London: Vintage, p. 269)
- 34 Ali, Tariq (2003). *The Clash of Fundamentalisms: Crusades, Jihads and Modernity*. London: Verso, 2003. Tariq Ali refersto "President Carter's National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski giving open support to jihad" at the Pakistan border (323).
- 35 See Tariq Ali who writes that in the conflict with Tehran "The West had not favoured a direct military intervention...It turned to an unfriendly neighbour. Saddam Hussain ...had helped to wipe out the Iraqi Communist Party and marginalised the more radical elements in the Ba'ath...Since the fall of the shah he had begun to receive most-favoured-nation treatment from Washington and London" (138).
- 36 The charges of extra judicial killings, disappearances, torture, and rape made by Salman Rushdie have been made repeatedly by various groups. One such civil group formed in response to these allegations is Jammu and Kashmir Coalition of Civil Societies (JKCCS) which describes itself on its website as "an amalgam of various non-funded, non-profit, campaign, research and advocacy organizations based in Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir." Apparatus used by JKCCS to "speak truth" include "reports, programmes, systematic

documentation, litigation or other engagements in Jammu and Kashmir and outside." Its constituents are Association of Parents of Disappeared Persons (APDP); Public Commission on Human Rights (PCHR); and International Peoples' Tribunal on Human Rights and Justice in Indian-administered Kashmir (IPTK). JKCCS is involved, for instance in work towards addressing violations such as for instance the 1991-Kunan-Poshpora mass rape case. Similarly its constituent Association of Parents of Disappeared persons seek justice in Macchil fake encounter case of 2010.

- 37 Rushdie visited Kashmir numerous times as the roots of his family can be traced to it. This connection explicates his preoccupation with Kashmir.
- 38 Morton, Stephen (2008). "Fury and Shalimar the Clown." *Salman Rushdie: Fictions of Postcolonial Modernity*. New York: Palgrave, p.117.
- 39 Daniel Philpott discusses territoriality as an "ingredient" of sovereignty. He describes sovereignty as supreme authority within a territory.
- 40 In the influential essay published in 1953 titled "Imperialism of free trade", the authors John Gallagher and Ronald Robinson upturned conventional wisdom to expound on the role of the "informal empire". The essay has been written in context of British empire in the nineteenth century and discusses the informal controls that gave impetus to free trade which led to relentless imperialism. The insights of the term "informal empire" has been used to interrogate American empire. In the novel the term "hegemony" has been used to interpret American aid regime and military interventions. This choice of term excludes various other descriptors such as anomaly, aberration, empire etc.. It is a conscious choice of term by the author from the linguistic and scholarly apparatus.
- 41 Rushdie, Shalimar 20.
- 42 Office of the Historian "U.S. Involvement in the Vietnam War: the Gulf of Tonkin and Escalation, 1964" <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1961-1968/gulf-of-tonkin> and also "Ending the Vietnam War, 1969–1973" at <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1969-1976/ending-vietnam>.
- 43 Dukes, Paul (2000). *The Superpowers : A Short History*. New York : Routledge. Google Book Search. Web. 20 Aug. 2016.p.117
- 44 Rushdie, Shalimar 20.

- 45 Kaplan, Amy (1993). "'Left alone with America': The Absence of Empire in the Study of American Culture." *Cultures of United States Imperialism*. (eds Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease) London: Duke University Press. p.13.
- 46 Loomba, Ania, Subir Kaul, Matti Bunzi, Antoinette Burton, and Jed Esty (2005). "Beyond What? An Introduction". Introduction. *Post colonial Studies and Beyond*. Ed. Ania Loomba, Subir Kaul, Matti Bunzi, Antoinette Burton, and Jed Esty. London: Duke University Press. p.25.
- 47 Kaplan, *Cultures* 13.
- 48 Morton, *Fictions* 138.
- 49 Rushdie, *Shalimar* 198.
- 50 Rushdie, *Shalimar* 270.
- 51 Rushdie, *Shalimar* 271.
- 52 Rushdie, *Shalimar* 269. Tariq Ali cites an interview in *LeNouvel Observateur* of 15-21 January 1988 in which Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Jimmy Carter's National Security Adviser acknowledges American role in starting jihad in the twentieth century.
- 53 Rushdie, *Shalimar* 384.
- 54 Rushdie, *Shalimar* 115.
- 55 Harshe, Rajan (2008). "Unveiling the ties between U.S. Imperialism and Al Qaida." *Economic and Political Weekly* 43.51 (2008): 67-92. EPW. Web. 7 July 2016. p. 69.
- 56 Rushdie, *Shalimar* 38.
- 57 Rushdie, *Shalimar* 269.
- 58 "Mindanao". *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*. Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., 2016. Web. 22 May 2016. n.pag.
- 59 Rushdie *Shalimar* 269.
- 60 Rushdie *Shalimar* 269.
- 61 Marr, T.. "Out of This World": Islamic Irruptions in the Literary Americas." *American Literary History* 18.3 (2006):521-549. Project MUSE. Web. 23 May. 2016. p. 523.

- 62 "Mindanao: A Laboratory of Counter Insurgency." *Bad Blood: Militia Abuses in Mindanao, the Philippines*. Ed. Human Rights Watch. New York: Human Rights Watch, 1992. 17-19. Google Book Search. Web. 31 July 2016. p.17.
- 63 Rushdie Shalimar 20.
- 64 Murphy, Neil (2008). "The Literalisation of Allegory in Salman Rushdie's Shalimar the Clown." *British Asian Fiction: Framing the Contemporary*. Ed. Neil Murphy and , Wai-chew Sim. Amherst, N.Y.: Cambria Press, 354.