



Turkish Studies

Language / Literature

Volume 13/20, Summer 2018, p. 403-421

DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.13930>

ISSN: 1308-2140, ANKARA-TURKEY

Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi

Article Info/Makale Bilgisi

✍ **Received/Geliş:** Temmuz 2018

✓ **Accepted/Kabul:** Eylül 2018

✍ **Referees/Hakemler:** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi İtir GÜNEŞ – Dr. Aydan
IRGATOĞLU

This article was checked by iThenticate.

TWO CONVERGING VOICES: HYBRIDITY, INTER- TEXTUALITY, AND AUDIENCE CREATION IN ORHAN PAMUK'S AND SALMAN RUSHDIE'S FICTION

*Onur DUMAN**

ABSTRACT

This article traces the origins and development of thematic similarities between the literary careers of two critically acclaimed contemporary authors, Orhan Pamuk and Salman Rushdie, in their treatment of master narratives of Islam and certain key transnational issues such as migration, globalization, cultural hybridity, and sustaining a national culture with the cosmopolitan west. Additionally, this study delves into the field of literary production in the sense that it particularly focuses on the authors' provocative polemics in reaching out to audiences, both western and non-western alike,-- a major rhetorical technique for both Pamuk and Rushdie. By analyzing specific novels such as Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses* (1989), *Midnight's Children* (1981), and *Shame* (1983), and Pamuk's *The Black Book* (1990), *Cevdet Bey ve Oğulları* (1982) and *Snow* (2004), which are arguably part of the contemporary literary canon, I situate these authors within a literary tradition of postmodern/postcolonial comic and narratives of westernization. One of the primary questions that this study addresses is: what are the literary consequences of borrowing from the traditional religious and national lore and recreating such concepts in post/modern framework? The answer is more innovative and experimental narratives and more cultural and transnational anger and confusion. With this study I am hoping to contribute to studies of modern global or postcolonial fiction.

STRUCTURED ABSTRACT

In the last three decades, Orhan Pamuk and Salman Rushdie have become major cultural icons who have not only become critically



* Dr., El-mek: onur.duman@mail.com

acclaimed novelists, but also have acquired a voice in international politics and cross-cultural encounters. In addition to winning noteworthy literary prizes on the international level such as the Nobel Prize for Literature and the Booker Prize, their works have become a part of what has affectionately been defined as postcolonial or global literary canon. By focusing particularly on contemporary issues such as the increasingly diversifying Muslim population or the diasporic living in the West and the so-called clash of modernity and Islam, Pamuk and Rushdie have produced novels that thematize such intercultural encounters. In sum, their works transcribe and challenge their historicity in several interlocking steps:

(1) The emergence of the modern secular state in the “Third World” after the two world wars. This progressive idea is embraced by Rushdie for its tendencies to establish the cultural and political institutions of the modern nation-state in India and Pakistan; but it is questioned by Pamuk for inherently enabling nationalist politics, and oppressive rules on freedom of religious practices that strictly define the individual’s rights in the private and public sphere.

(2) The fierce response of the nation-state, nationalist domestic politics, and religious communities that subjectively interpret these texts as threats to the religious and political *status quo*. As seen by the immediate ban and outspoken criticism by the Indian, Pakistani, and Iranian regimes against the *Satanic Verses*, the book mobilized the constituencies and affirmed their political power. Similarly, Pamuk, after his critical comments on the Armenian question in World War One, has recently been both severely scolded at home yet praised by the European Union as the champion of the freedom of speech in Turkey.

(3) The propensity to a “scandalous” representation of the “Third World” in its relation to the prize industry; namely, the Booker and the Nobel. Both Rushdie’s and Pamuk’s works are defined by their response to a non-western tradition, Islam, Indianness, or Turkishness, in ways that draw from clichés that are often attributed to “Orientalist” pieces of writing.

(4) The transformation of the linguistic skills of the cosmopolitan writer who introduces unprecedented narrative combinations of non-Western languages with English. Rushdie’s fiction is fed by this constructive tension between the traditional use of English, inspired by the masters of (post)modern literature such as Joyce, Grass, and Marquez, and the cadences, allusions, rhythms, and other cultural flexibilities of Urdu and Arabic.

(5) The increasing effect of new communication forms and western-produced devices of popular culture, the novel, the movies, video, radio, and television, on the psyches and collective memories of non-western societies. Thus, *The Satanic Verses* and *The Black Book* are narratives that portray the technologies of new communication forms as being detrimental to the individual and institutional memories of the “Third World.”

Keywords: Orhan Pamuk, Salman Rushdie, Hybridity, Third World Literature, Postcolonial Literature, the Great Britain, India, Turkey, Migration, Globalization, Westernization

**BİRLEŞEN İKİ SES: ORHAN PAMUK VE SALMAN RUSHDIE
ROMANLARINDAKİ MELEZLİK, METİNLERARASILIK VE
OKUYUCU İNŞAASI**

ÖZET

Bu makale önemli iki çağdaş romancı Orhan Pamuk ve Salman Rushdie'nin kariyerlerindeki İslam, göçmenlik, küreselleşme, çok kültürlülük ve batı büyük şehirlerinde ulusal kimliğin muhafaza edilmesi gibi uluslararası önem taşıyan bazı tematik benzerliklerin kökenini ve gelişimini incelemektedir. Buna ilaveten, uluslararası akademik çevrelerce ilgiyle takip edilen bu iki yazarın da kışkırtıcı polemiği, okuyuculara ulaşmada retorik bir teknik olarak kullanması ve bunun Batıdaki edebi metin oluşturma endüstrisindeki önemi incelenmektedir. Orhan Pamuk'un *Cevdet Bey ve Oğulları* (1982), *Kara Kitap* (1990), ve *Kar* (2004) romanları ve Salman Rushdie'nin *Gece Yarısı Çocukları* (1981), *Utanc* (1983), ve *Şeytan Ayetleri* (1989) romanlarını postmodern ve postkolonyel gelenek içerisinde değerlendirerek batılılaşma edebiyatı olarak adlandırabileceğim romanlar olarak değerlendirmekteyim. Hem Pamuk hem de Rushdie romanlarında dini metinlerin ve klasik edebi metinlerinin günümüzün hızlıca kozmopolitleşen dünyasında yeniden gözden geçirilip ve yeniden yazılması yönünde bir eğilim vardır. Bu yüzden de bu çalışmanın cevapladığı temel sorunlardan bir tanesi şudur: geleneksel dini ve ulusal gelenekten esinlenerek ve ödünç alarak postmodern çerçevede üretilen eserlerin edebi ve siyasi sonuçları nelerdir? Buna cevap olarak ise böyle yenilikçi ve deneysel romanların, kültürel ve kültürlerarası öfke ve kafa karışıklığı yarattığını öne sürmekteyim. Böylece edebiyat, siyaset bilimi, popüler kültür ve bilinç inşası, ve çok kültürlülükle ilgilenen araştırmacılar için yardımcı olacak bir makale olduğunu ümit etmekteyim.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Orhan Pamuk ve Salman Rushdie
Romanlarındaki Melezlik,
Metinlerarasılık ve Okuyucu İnşası

1. Introduction

Aside from being brilliantly experimental and revisionary authors, Anglo-Indian novelist Salman Rushdie and Turkish 2006 Nobel Laureate Orhan Pamuk have become major literary figures that have followed a similar process of literary production. On the one hand, their works perform numerous critical functions in re-envisioning national representation, reconsidering classical pieces of Islamic lore, and they ultimately challenge stern belief and authority structures in the Middle East and the Indian Subcontinent. They illustrate and illuminate contemporary social and transnational issues, politics of globalization, migration, cosmopolitan diversity; and, above all, allegorize the national politics in states such as Iran, Turkey, India, and Pakistan—countries that have seriously struggled to attain nationhood and battled to sustain social harmony between contending ideals of secularism and strong religious faith. By drawing heavily on master narratives of Islam, their works force readers to seriously reconsider the Islamic cultural heritage within the postcolonial and postmodern context. So long as there are such readers, the novels will have potential for being world-transforming.

On the other hand, the controversies that surround Rushdie and Pamuk are particularly fascinating in the way they generate differentiated audiences who have lived through and now fiercely respond to the issues that their novels describe. More specifically, there is a striking resemblance between Rushdie and Pamuk as authorial figures whose careers have been both stamped and fostered by what James English defines as “mock scandal” (112), a type of cultural phenomenon that seriously resonates on the transnational level. The infamous death edict (the *fatwa*) issued against Rushdie by Ayatullah Khomeini in 1989, after the publication of *The Satanic Verses*, and the attempts to try Pamuk in Turkey for insulting “Turkishness” after his 2005 comments about the Armenian claims of World War One have become the pivotal incidents in their careers. As highly charged social texts, their works explore the roots of national cultures in India, Turkey, Pakistan, and even England, and draw particular attention to cultural class-warfare within the Muslim world between the secular intelligentsia and their religious counterpart. By dwelling upon such grey areas between the Occident and the Orient, Humanities and strong piety, locality and mobility, Rushdie and Pamuk ultimately allegorize the dialectical interchange between opposing streams of ideologies and belief systems during the formation of nation-states in post-Partition India and post-Ottoman Turkey.

The primary difference between Rushdie and Pamuk, however, is their attitude in thematizing such intercultural encounters. While Rushdie’s jaundiced characters are satirical of the immediate consequences occasioned by “clashing” cultures, Pamuk’s reflective fiction emphasizes a melancholy attitude that allows its characters to engage this clash dialectically. Unlike the representation of émigré lives in Rushdie’s fiction, Pamuk’s novels highlight that “westernization” is not necessarily a result of postcolonial migration, but a long, historically determined process.

2. The Rushdie Affair

Rushdie’s *The Satanic Verses* (1988), especially, is a prime example of the type of literature that thematizes the contemporary cultural hybridity. Readers of this novel may remember a famous scene in the novel’s first chapter. In “The Angel Gibreel,” Saladin Chamcha, one of the main characters of the novel, confronts his father Changez Chamchawala. With biblical imageries such as the loss of the Garden of Eden, the human detachment from its “Godly” origin, and the Father and Son dialectic, the scene demonstrates the enigmatic experience of Saladin as an émigré to the West. His in-between character must constantly reevaluate the cultural parameters of the Anglo-Saxon, Indian, and Islamic discourses. The result is Chamcha’s tendency to develop contemptuous, as well as highly satirical, thoughts on all the cultures with which he is familiar. Like many characters in Rushdie’s fiction who live through a process of westernization, Chamcha returns to India from England with a critical eye, yet convicted for having successfully adopted the English identity he had yearned for during the five years spent there as a student. He now finds his homeland a nation of utter disorganization, dirtiness, and disease. As Chamcha unleashes his diatribe, the reader realizes that Chamcha’s disappointment is directed primarily at trivial aspects of Indian daily life: its fattening cuisine, top-floor balconies, overgrown gardens, coarse movies, and “jungle” people (*Satanic Verses* 44). Chamcha’s sarcastic and sorrowful mother Nasreen remarks, “[a]bout everything he has such big criticisms...he really got an education, husband, our little Sallu, England-returned, and talking so fine and all” (44). Disappointed at the cultural metamorphosis of his son, who now seems to have distanced himself from Indian and Islamic cultural codes, father Changez says, ““Tell your Son...Nasreen...that if he went abroad to learn contempt for his own kind, then his own kind can feel nothing but scorn for him” (45).

Indeed, the tension between a “postcolonial” subject’s contempt for a formerly colonized homeland and the scorn that arises from the “natives” as a reaction is a recurrent pattern in Rushdie’s *oeuvre*. *Satanic Verses* especially highlights the abyss separating the various types of diasporic emigre living in London. In this respect, *Satanic Verses* gives voice to the unrepresented voices in Great Britain and focuses on the polemics between the “insiders” and “outsiders” of India and Islam

as well as the conflicts, misunderstandings, and cultural conversions within the respective metropolitan centers of England and India. On the one hand, the book is a humorous postcolonial novel about the politics of immigration; it explores the situation of the middle and working classes that Great Britain called people of “color,” and of cultural and epistemic translation triggered by massive labor recruitments from India since 1948. On the other, it challenges that master narrative of Islam, the Qu’ran, by pitting the grammatically liberal reading of it against the traditional and rhetorical interpretations of the sacred text that Muslims have taken to be the faith. *Satanic Verses*, thus, has been a defining novel in the last two decades in that it has projected the infamous controversy of the clash of civilizations, explored the increasingly diversifying urban centers in the West. In particular, it focused on the sources of psychic fixations of Muslims who grew up in religious non-Western households who must live in secular environments. With its deliberately irreverent and unusual treatment of Islamic lore and the representatives of political Islam, the novel forces its readers to reconsider the origination of the Islamic faith in the Arabian Peninsula of the seventh-century and calmly critique the authoritarian ideology produced through the Iranian Revolution of the 1980s.

The so-called Rushdie affair that accompanied the publication of *Satanic Verses* led its audiences to further enact the political agendas, quarrels, and protests the novel itself highlighted.¹ The novel thus contributes to the confusion of the pluralized global world and demonstrates a unique way of cultural production in contemporary late capitalism. By generating particular audiences’ responses to the text in politically charged ways, Rushdie illustrates the central problem that hides within the narratives of westernization: such novels are more than mere pieces of literary flourish or effusion.

Characterized by anti-institutional themes and kinds of political and religious narrative techniques, such novels challenge the inherent structures of authority by provoking subcultural communities or radical “anti-western” political structures and thought systems.

3. Pamuk and the “West”

A similar process of encountering the West is seen in Orhan Pamuk’s *The Black Book* (1990). This novel, however, demonstrates its main character experiencing the Turkish westernization inwardly, as he tries to overcome his anxiety of decoding the “European” cultural parameters of the mythical stories Turks have invented about Europe. As opposed to Chamcha and Farishta, the main characters of *Satanic Verses*, Galip, Pamuk’s protagonist, witnesses his cultural transformation at home and presents a chaotic view of Istanbul, wherein clashing historical trajectories and cultural discourses coexist without any remedies. Similar to the Rushdie text, *The Black Book* draws on the political mood of early 1980s, the military coup in Turkey, as well as the politics of cultural class-warfare. It investigates the clash between the secular state and mystical Islamic cults as seen in the novel’s fruitful references to Sufism and the Hurufi sect. Both Rushdie and Pamuk draw from the classical pieces of Islamic literature and treat them as *worldly* accounts that built an Islamic tradition. Through Galip’s allegorical search for Ruya (Dream), his lost wife, the reader witnesses the story of a “Third World” country that replaced its *ancien regime* with a secular modern nation-state. Galip’s

¹ The publication of the book raised immediate controversies. The first protest that received international media coverage occurred on 14 January, 1989, in Bradford, England. Later that month, a large crowd in London protested against the Penguin publishing house and called for the cessation of the publication of the book in Hyde Park. One month later, five people were killed in a riot in Islamabad, Pakistan, while one person was killed and more than one hundred people were injured during protests in Kashmir, India. Subsequent protests followed all around the world. A 1989 *Observer* report quotes Hesham El Assawi, chairman of the Islamic society for the Promotion of Religious Tolerance, who warns the British public about the upcoming protests and violence: “I would like to invite you to take some kind of corrective stand before the monster that you have so heedlessly created grows, as it will do worldwide, into something uncontrollable” (Appignanesi and Maitland 44).

search, similar to those of Farishta and Chamcha, is characterized by a feeling of transformation: becoming someone else, as events force him to reconsider his own tradition. In this respect, the novel is the story of the Turkish intellectual elite's attempt to conform to the cultural codes of Europe. This is symbolized in the novel's intertextuality with classical literary works of the west, a staging of a lost Ottoman history from the perspective of modern Turkey.

4. The Literature of Westernization

These satirical and melancholy representations of the "Third World" constitute the dual character of the literature of westernization. On one hand, there is a tradition of portraying Islam and the "Third World" contemptuously, as seen in literary works such as Voltaire's play *Mahomet* (1741) and Richard Grenier's novel *The Marrakesh One-Two* (1983). This type of literature is no less "blasphemous" than *Satanic Verses* in their portrayal of historical figures deemed sacred to Islam. Additionally, there has been, in the Orientalist discourse, the impact of John Wansbrough's philological study of the sacred text, *Quranic Studies* (1977). This scholarly analysis argues that the compilation of the Qu'ran was not done immediately within the twenty-three years, in the Four Caliph period, but took three and a half-centuries and, therefore, actually was written by human beings. Aside from that secular claim, *Satanic Verses* borrows openly from such postmodern comic novels as those of Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Günter Grass, James Joyce. For his part, Pamuk engages the modernist tradition in the Islamic novel, whose best examples can be seen in the works of Iranian novelists Sadeq Hedayat, Bozorg Alavi, Jamalzadeh, Gholam Hosain Sa'edi, Sadeq Chubak, Jalal Al-e Ahmad, Simin Daneshvar; of Egyptian practitioners such as Taha Husain, Tawfiq al-Hakim, Naguib Mahfuz, Nawal Sadaawi; of Syria, writers such as of Nizar Qabbani and Ali Ahmad Said Asbar (Adonis); and many others in Africa, Turkey, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and the Middle East.²

Pamuk's fiction benefits highly from the melancholy portrayal of the "Orient," as seen in the great writers of nineteenth-century French Orientalism such as Theophile Gautier, Gerard de Nerval, Pierre Loti, Alphonse de Lamartine, and Gustave Flaubert, whose works portray the Near East as a sensuous realm of "loss," unable to speak for its history, tradition, and languages without the Western apparatuses of representation. Although they wrote specifically on the peoples of the Ottoman Empire, the influence of these great artists on twentieth-century Turkish literature is that it created a melancholy tradition that influenced the works of great poets such as Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Yahya Kemal, from whom Pamuk heavily draws. These authors represent the region in relation to a historical process of Western influence and dominion, but they nevertheless insist that it has contributed to universal cultural attempts in the Novel, Poetry, and the Arts. Pamuk's works essentially thematize the struggle of the modern secular Turkish individual who sadly reflects upon its cultural history and tries to find an existential meaning in a country Pamuk would call in-between Europe and the East. Pamuk's memoir, *Istanbul: Memories and the City* (2003) and his novel *Museum of Innocence* (2008), rework the concept of *hüzün*, melancholy, in the contemporary Turkish culture and literature.

Rushdie and Pamuk are representatives of these sociologically distinct streams of cultural production aiming to represent the Third World. The difference in their portrayal of westernization is closely relevant to the respective historical experiences of Indian and Turkish cultures with the imperial past of Europe, and the colonization of the Third World. That is, while the Rushdie texts clearly draw from the English colonial experience in India, the emerging of Pakistan after the partition, and the diasporic working-class Muslim communities in India and England, Pamuk's works

² For further discussion of such negotiation, see Fischer and Abedi's 1990 essay entitled "Bombay Talkies, the Word and the World: Salman Rushdie's *Satanic Verses*, an essay that elucidates the text and the controversy around it from the standpoint of cultural anthropology and psychoanalysis. It can be considered as the first scholarly work that analyzed the Rushdie affair in such erudition and contextualization.

highlight a more epistemic transformation at the level of consciousness. Since there has been no active presence of the British Empire in Turkey and the Turkish literature typically thematizes the “west” in relation to globalization or westernization theory, one must distinguish between postcolonial theory and the politics of globalization. As Revathi Krishnaswamy states, postcolonial theory focuses primarily on a (Eurocentric) colonial past and studies how subaltern practices and productions in the non-Western peripheries respond to Western domination, while globalization theory concentrates mainly on an (Americentric) post/neocolonial present and examines how contemporary Western practices and productions affect the rest of the world... both theoretical paradigms have sought to question the universality attributed to Western modernity in metropolitan developmental theory by drawing attention to premodern, nonmodern, or alternatively modern formations in the margins. This attempt to dislocate Western modernity...has typically taken the form of dismantling those categories deemed to be the central narrative of Western modernity—categories such as “nation,” “nation state,” “culture” and so on... both postcolonial theory and globalization studies have frequently focused on various forms of economic, political, social, and cultural flows that exceed the boundaries of the nation-state and operate in a deterritorialized or transnational fashion.” (*Criticism of Culture* 107)

In his work, Krishnaswamy defines “Third World” literatures as cultural attempts to challenge the grand narratives and institutions of the West and to bring the mythologies, cultural capital, and languages of the Third World into terms with the very cultural and political constructs they challenge. One can see such overlapping tendencies in the works of Rushdie and Pamuk that simultaneously illustrate and illuminate the postcolonial culture, its politics of globalization, and the diverse audiences that respond to such texts according to their own purposes. In sum, their works transcribe and challenge their historicity in several interlocking steps:

(1) The emergence of the modern secular state in the “Third World” after the abolishment of the Caliphate in 1922 by Ataturk, the founder of modern Turkey. This progressive idea is embraced by Rushdie for its tendencies to establish the cultural and political institutions of the modern nation-state in India and Pakistan; but it is questioned by Pamuk for inherently enabling nationalist politics, and oppressive rules on freedom of religious practices that strictly define the individual’s rights in the private and public sphere.

(2) The fierce response of the nation-state, nationalist domestic politics, and religious communities that subjectively interpret these texts as threats to the religious and political *status quo*. As seen by the immediate ban and outspoken criticism by the Indian, Pakistani, and Iranian regimes against the *Satanic Verses*, the book mobilized the constituencies and affirmed their political power. Similarly, Pamuk, after his critical comments on the Armenian question in World War One, has recently been both severely scolded at home yet praised by the European Union as the champion of the freedom of speech in Turkey.

(3) The propensity to a “scandalous” representation of the “Third World” in its relation to the prize industry; namely, the Booker and the Nobel. Both Rushdie’s and Pamuk’s works are defined by their response to a non-western tradition, Islam, Indianness, or Turkishness, in ways that draw from clichés that are often attributed to “Orientalist” pieces of writing.

(4) The transformation of the linguistic skills of the cosmopolitan writer who introduces unprecedented narrative combinations of non-Western languages with English. Rushdie’s fiction is fed by this constructive tension between the traditional use of English, inspired by the masters of (post)modern literature such as Joyce, Grass, and Marquez, and the cadences, allusions, rhythms, and other cultural flexibilities of Urdu and Arabic.

(5) The increasing effect of new communication forms and western-produced devices of popular culture, the novel, the movies, video, radio, and television, on the psyches and collective

memories of non-western societies. Thus, *The Satanic Verses* and *The Black Book* are narratives that portray the technologies of new communication forms as being detrimental to the individual and institutional memories of the “Third World.”

On one hand, Rushdie’s innovative and playful language in works such as *Satanic Verses* and *Midnight’s Children* juxtaposes English with words of Persian-Mughalian origin, thereby contributing to the “decolonization of the English language” (Fischer and Abedi 109). On the other hand, Pamuk’s style, syntax, and unusual word choice, especially, indicates a “colonization” of Turkish in his works. One clearly sees the syntax of English language in Pamuk’s prose, and, accordingly, his characters live through this linguistic and epistemic domination. Insofar as the novel’s chaotic mood is concerned, shaped by deconstructive imageries and binary oppositions deriving from European and Ottoman cultures, this proves to be utterly creative in *The Black Book*. Yet, his overtly political works that aspire to portray cultural class-warfare within the Turkish westernization suffer from a lack of and misdirected audience, as seen in his obvious interest in the rising of political Islam in Turkey during the nineties in novels like *The New Life* (1994) and *Snow* (2002). Both novels thematize the rise of Islam in Turkey, respectively in political sphere through the Welfare Party and the Justice and Development Party, demonstrating this political shift incompatible with “western” cultural and political parameters. For instance, Ka, the main character in *Snow*, is convinced that political Islam, in Turkey, has become the religion of “bearded provincial reactionaries” (96) and that one can sense a different concept of God in Europe: In a conversation with a sheikh, he says, “I want to believe in the God you believe in and be like you, but because there’s a Westerner inside me, my mind is confused” (98). Different from a book like *Cevdet Bey and His Sons* or *The Black Book*, whose characters look at Turkey from within and see it as sort of an epistemic reference point, Ka sees Turkey and political Islam as “provincial” (*taşralı*)—alien and distant to European cosmopolitan urban areas—the allegorization of Turkish culture for “western” or urban audiences only.

5. The So-called Third World Literature

Accordingly, in this study, I analyze Rushdie’s and Pamuk’s representations of the national and religious ideas they thematize in their fiction. I highlight the link between these themes and some larger global concerns such as Third World literature, the so-called clash between Islam and the West, the politics of westernization and the concept of freedom of speech. I argue that both writers begin their careers with an explicit attempt to create literary forms to represent these national histories. I argue that Rushdie’s works are driven by a conscious choice to satirize political and religious hegemonies, and his books are formed by this authorial choice. While Rushdie prefers the magical realism technique for India in *Midnight’s Children* to argue for a diversity of religions, ethnicities, and languages, in *Shame* he captures the Pakistani attempt at nation-formation in the form of a comic-epic in order to show the oddities that emerge when hybridity is replaced with Islamic political agendas. Similarly, Pamuk has a dual technique to represent the foundation of modern Turkey: while his debut novel *Cevdet Bey and His Sons* tells the history of the Turkish nation-building in the form of a saga from a social-realist perspective, in *The Black Book* Pamuk applies the postmodern technique of pastiche to capture the paradoxes that lie in the country’s Ottoman heritage. These texts, I argue, are characterized by a melancholy attitude, for a general feeling of grief, mourning, and questioning the roots of one’s personal and national existence are the general themes.

As noted before, coming from Islamic cultural backgrounds, both Pamuk and Rushdie draw from that Islamic lore and myths when developing narratives about contemporary issues such as emigration, diaspora Muslims, globalization, political Islam, and westernization. A striking resemblance between *The Satanic Verses* and *The Black Book* in this context is that their characters, right at the outset in their journey, have to experience a “fall” from their tradition to confront the

“other.” The three imageries of mountain, Satan and serpent as the initiators of transformation and dislocation are given to the reader as epigraphs at the beginning of *The Satanic Verses*:

Satan, being thus confined to a vagabond, wandering, unsettled condition, is without any certain abode; for though he has in consequence of his angelic nature, a kind of empire in the liquid waste of air, yet this is certainly part of his punishment, that he is... without any fixed place, or space, allowed him to rest the sole of his upon (qtd. in *Satanic Verses* ix)

And, similarly in *The Black Book*:

According to what Ibn Arabi relates as an accomplished fact, a sainted friend of his, whom spirits elevated up to heavens, on one occasion arrived on Mountain Kaf, which is circumscribed by a serpent. Now, it is a well-known fact that there is no such mountain which circumscribes the earth, nor such serpent. (qtd. in *Black Book* v)

The first excerpt was quoted as an epigraph by Rushdie from Daniel Defoe’s *History of the Devil* (1726). It serves as an image of wandering souls, the “brown” idlers of “Proper London,” who were once in sleep, as part of a dormant culture, but are now facing a “satanic” rebirth to face their surreal postcolonial condition: “We are creatures of air,/ Our roots in dreams/ And clouds, reborn in flight./ Goodbye” (13). The issue for Chamcha and Farishta is to mutate. They depart from a non-Western realm, which only provides them myths and nuisance, to set foot on a “worldly” territory stripped of mythology. They are characters of transition, as if falling from a mountain, and have been shaped by the aftermath of Indian decolonization and massive labor influx to the Continent from the Subcontinent. They are “up there in air-space, in that soft, imperceptible field which had been made possible by the century and which, thereafter, made the century possible” (5).

Pamuk’s epigraph, however, welcomes the disappearance of the serpent myth. Quoting the *encyclopedia of Islam* with a direct reference to Ibn Arabi, the Andalusian-born Islamic scholar who lived in Anatolia during the Seljuklu period, Pamuk demonstrates the disconnect between the Islamic mythology and the contemporary Turkish reality. The Islamic and Ottoman heritage of modern Turkey, as seen throughout the opaque imagery in *The Black Book*, portrays a grief-struck Istanbul, that re-minds Pamuk’s characters of modern Turkey’s rupture from its history.

The Satanic Verses is a humorous re-visionary account of contemporary cultural and social conflicts and the hybrid, transnational nature of postmodern cosmopolitan life. It aims to turn the intercultural references and authorial interferences into a narrative collage of different religious, linguistic, and cultural discourses the better to investigate the Third World’s encounter with historical categories in the western context such as class, gender, secular state, modernity. It highlights “how...newness comes into world? How is it born? Of what fusions, translations, conjoinings is it made?” (8). The novel is the story of two Indian actors who emigrate to England: Saladin Chamcha, a voice-over artist, and Gibreel Farishta, a Bollywood superstar. Their plane *Bostan* (one of the names of the gardens in the Islamic concept of Heaven) is exploded by Sikh terrorists over the English Channel. The travelers fall to the shores of England, where Chamcha physically finds himself turned into a goat with satanic thoughts, while Farishta is under the conviction that he has become the archangel Gabriel. Using Biblical and Qur’anic imagery to allegorize dislocation and loss of identity, Rushdie questions the meaning of the “booming words, land, belonging, home” (4) for the postcolonial subject.

Chamcha and Farishta arrive in England to encounter the myths and prejudices invented about them by the English: “most migrants learn, and can become disguises. Our own false descriptions to counter the falsehoods invented about us, concealing for reasons of security our secret selves” (49). As the novel proceeds, the identity of the two characters blend into each other, and we are presented with a dreamlike world in which “good” and “evil” coexist, and the “decolonized”

Indian immigrants now face subtler forms of domination, misunderstandings, discrimination, racism, and estrangement.

It is this level of alienation, represented by Farishta's hallucinations, that seems to draw the most critical attention from the Muslim communities around the world. Under the impression that he is the Archangel Gabriel, through whom the holy message is delivered, according to the Islamic belief, Farishta dreams, in flashback scenes, of the early days of Islam and depicts an alternative portrait of the prophet. He is referred to as Mahound, "the medieval baby-frightener, the Devil's synonym" (93), a term used in the Orientalist discourse since the thirteenth-century to depict the prophet in a way that doesn't really correspond to the reality. The OED defines the word as "a god imagined in the Middle Ages to be worshipped by Muslims," and locates it as early as 1275 ("Mahound" para. 1). The word "Mahound" keeps appearing in texts like Harington's *Orlando Furioso*, Tasso's *Godfrey of Bulloigne*, Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, Pope's *Impertinent*, even Joyce's *Ulysses* to signify a horrifying pagan-like Oriental God.

It is the realization of the coexistence of "good" and evil" that defines, though not resolves, the concept of "newness" in *The Satanic Verses*. Only this sort of realization can provide the characters with the idea that the non-Christian individual's religious predispositions and the secular tendencies of the modern state are irreconcilable. This schizophrenic narrative—as symbolized by the fragmented experience of westernization in the novel, Farishta's hallucinatory views about the birth of Islam, and the references to Hindu deities—demonstrates that the transitional emigre individual's psyche has, historically, to face the norms of the Anglo-Saxon state, its political ideology during the eighties, and the secular character of Western society, secularism.

6. Homi Bhabha and Hybridity

It is at this point that one should remember Homi Bhabha's definition of the differences between specific hybrid conditions. In the "Dissemination" chapter of *The Location of Culture*, he looks at John Berger's depiction of a Turkish guest worker in Germany in *A Seventh Man* (1975). The worker's experience is compared to Chamcha's and Farishta's. They are portrayed as suffering from the opacity of newly-learned German words, "the historical memory of the Western nation which is 'obliged to forget'" (165). The primary difference between the two texts is that while the concept of foreignness in Berger's text is characterized by the dialectical relationship between "labor" and "life," the latter Rushdie text, due to its emphasis on the dissemination (dissemiNation) of culture and language through the colonialist enterprise, is bound up to be more creative. Hence the famous encounter of the master and slave consciousnesses.

Rushdie...seems to suggest that it is only through the process of dissemiNation—of meaning, time, peoples, cultural boundaries and historical traditions—that the radical alterity of the national culture will create new forms of living and writing: 'The trouble with the Engenglish is that their hiss hiss history happened overseas, so they do do don't know what it means.'" (*Location of Culture* 166-167)

According to Bhabha, Rushdie's postcolonial human subject in *The Satanic Verses* appears as a supplement to the imaginative geography of the metropolitan space. Instead of enriching the English culture, he poses a nuisance; since there is no English attempt to have a "melting pot," his presence is always contingent, incomplete, and different. And for this, he is punished. "He is the history that happened elsewhere" Bhabha notes, "His migrant presence does not evoke a harmonious patchwork of cultures, but articulates the narrative of cultural difference which can never let the history look at itself narcissistically in the eye" (168). Nevertheless, his "radical alterity" claims negativity, an idiosyncratic feeling of self-consciousness, as it proves productive in noticing ideological forms and formations of domination that the "natives" couldn't see.

In pointing out the tension between the “postcolonial” and “metropolitan” spaces, Bhabha responds to the term *differance* Derrida laid out in *Of Grammatology* (1976). This Derridean concept connotes a linguistic and epistemic interplay between different social forces, both diachronic and synchronic alike, that do not necessarily acknowledge the presence, distance, and “meaning” of each other. Nor does it ask for the resolving of this highly-charged reciprocity. And yet, the reader nevertheless may see a “meaning” in the witty interchanges between Rushdie’s emigres, his English characters, and the Indian-born ones in *Satanic Verses*. For example, “blasphemous” opinions that appear as “enlightening” and operate as devices for developing a counter-memory/tradition for

Muslim émigrés. Meanwhile, such “new forms of living and writing” mentioned by Bhabha are achieved through Rushdie’s secularized vision are taken as contempt or blasphemy by his Muslim readers. As seen in the death threat, *fatwa*, issued by the late Ayatollah Khomeini on February 1989, four and a half months after the publication of *The Satanic Verses*, worldwide protests began calling for banning of the novel and trial of Rushdie for heresy.

The responses varied from communal gatherings of book burning in England, such as the famous upheaval in Bradford on 14 January 1989, to solemn press statements made by various Muslim organizations around the world. A summing list of the Muslim demands can be found in Dr. Mughram al-Ghamdi’s 28 October 1988 statement, who, on behalf of the U.K Action Committee on Islamic Affairs, asked British Muslims to launch a signature campaign asking Rushdie

(1) To immediately withdraw and pulp all copies of...[*Satanic Verses*]...as well as to undertake not to allow to be published any future editions of this sacrilege.

(2) To tender an unqualified public apology to the world Muslim community for the enormous injury to the feelings and sensibilities of the Muslim Community;

(3) To pay adequate damages to an agreed Islamic charity in Britain. (Appignanesi and Maitland 47)

The protests occurred in a diverse pool of countries with Muslim populations. From Great Britain and France to Pakistan, Iran, and Egypt, the protestors blamed Rushdie and his publisher for being a part of a plot, as one would see in an Umberto Eco novel, aimed at the defamation of Islam.

Rushdie’s satire in *Satanic Verses* is two-folded. First, the text is directed towards the Thatcherist policies of neo-conservatism, police brutality against the people of color in England, and the Race Relations Act of 1976, which banned racism in the country but exempted the British government and all its actions from the jurisdiction of the act. In addition to this, the novel was a reaction to the Parliament of the Nationality Act of 1981 that abolished citizenship by virtue of birth, *ius soli*, and handed the permission over the state (Rushdie, “The New Empire within Britain” 136). Second, *The Satanic Verses* is the continuation of Rushdie’s critical view of the political structures of a Third World that struggled with newly founded nation-states and increasingly diversifying constituencies.

7. The Earlier Works of Salman Rushdie

As seen in the representations of states in *Midnight’s Children* (1981), *Shame* (1983), *The Jaguar Smile: A Nicaraguan Journey* (1987), India, Pakistan and Nicaragua respectively, Rushdie’s early career highlighted the link between the individual and the state in cultures that were historically determined to decolonize and confront the west. These three texts show that satire as a theme and literary form is inherent in Rushdie’s work well before *The Satanic Verses*, and that he had already shown imaginative satires of authoritarian nation-states and political Islam.

On multiple occasions, Rushdie defended the true purpose of the book as bringing up the troubles of being an emigre in England, the political pressures and the oppressive nature of the neo-conservative Thatcherist policies into the literary discourse. In one of his essays, he notes

This is, for me, the saddest irony of all; that after working for five years to give voice and fictional flesh to the immigrant culture of which I am myself a member, I should see my book burned, largely unread, by the people it's about, people who might find some pleasure and much recognition in its pages. I tried to write against stereotypes; the zealot protests serve to confirm, in the Western mind, all the worst stereotypes of the Muslim world. (*Book Burning* 26)

So, how should one explain the disconnect between Rushdie and his audiences and the controversy that surrounded the text? How did Rushdie's secular vision in *The Satanic Verses* single-handedly upset the masses and create such a controversy within the complex international politics? In his essay, "In God We Trust," Rushdie provides an answer to this:

God, Satan, Paradise and Hell all vanished one day in my fifteenth year, when I quite abruptly lost my faith. I recall it vividly. I was at school in England by then. The moment of awakening happened, in fact, during a Latin lesson, and afterwards, to prove my new-found atheism, I bought myself a rather tasteless ham sandwich, and so partook for the first time of the forbidden flesh of the swine. No thunderbolt arrived to strike me down. I remember feeling that my survival confirmed the correctness of my new position. I did slightly regret the loss of Paradise, though. The Islamic heaven, at least as I had come to conceive it, had seemed very appealing to my adolescent self. I expected to be provided, for my personal pleasure, with four beautiful female spirits, or *houris*, untouched by man or djinn. The joys of the perfumed garden; it seemed a shame to have to give them up. From that day to this, I have thought of myself as a wholly secular person, and have been drawn towards the great traditions of secular radicalism—in politics, socialism; in the arts, modernism and its offspring—that have been the driving forces behind much of the history of the twentieth century. But perhaps I write, in part to fill up that emptied God-chamber with other dreams. Because it is, after all, a room for dreaming in. (*Imaginary Homelands* 377)

Rushdie's worldview in *The Satanic Verses* is clearly defined by this interest in the secular vision made possible by the Humanities at an early age, which proves to be an alien thought to the Third World in general, and Islam in particular. The Humanities, in the West, is a comprehensive episteme that consists of such diverse fields as Philology, History, Religion, Philosophy, Law, Literature, Music, Performance and the Visual Arts. It is grounded in a long tradition rooted in Judeo-Christianity and the Classical Period and has drawn heavily from the cultural achievements and aesthetics of these founding civilizations. It analytically envisions a world in which even Religion has been annexed to the tradition of hermeneutics, re-visions, and epistemic modifications. In return, as Michel de Certeau notes in *The Writing of History* (1988), Christianity has also codified itself into Humanities, especially during the seventeenth and eighteenth-centuries, and contributed to the nascent imperialist venture. It has eventually invented the concept of secularism as a means to establish a social order and has been colored heavily by the West's own traditional heritage.

However, as Gayatri Spivak notes in a 1991 interview on the *Satanic Verses* controversy, we haven't encountered such a self-reflexive re-visioning within the Islamic tradition, one that could be made to resemble the Reformation and the Renaissance for instance. Especially after the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire in the beginning of the twentieth-century, the relatively monolithic "Islamic world" lost the sense of political unity it once had. The Ottoman sultan was the Caliph for the "Islamic world," whose political aspirations were followed by the Arab countries, East India, North Africa, and the Balkans. Caliphate's disappearance from the world politics as an institutional and theocratic power has allowed such social structures as secularism to permeate the Islamic world.

Spivak, however, mentions that Islam's encounter with secularism has just as much potential for being regressive as with potential for becoming progressive:

...in the sub-continent, since Islam is a minority religion, it is faced with a national identity that is turned like a migrant towards Mecca. Now, in that context, Islam's efforts have never graduated into what Christianity has managed, that is to say secularism as such in the name of Christian Commandment rewritten. The Khilafat movement had to confront Ataturk's own desire to modernize. So you have an unequal combat here. Islam is always there as the other monotheist voice; it is always there as the reactive potential for mobilization because of these historical contingencies. (Najmabadi 124)

In this respect, through bringing in the secular analytical tradition of Humanities to revision the Islamic narrative *The Satanic Verses* translates the origins of Islam for the Western audience to account for the dilemmas of the Muslim émigrés in London, who are born across a secular cultural environment that threatens their spiritual life. Such a "blasphemous" attempt at representation, however, indicates Rushdie's authorial choice of audiences. In Homi Bhabha's words, blasphemy, in Rushdie's case, constitutes "a moment when the subject-matter or the content of a cultural tradition is being overwhelmed or alienated, in the act of translation" (225) Thus, the novel becomes the negation of what it wants to represent: it is perceived as anti-Islamic and anti-emigre by millions of people, whereby it draws power from the Orientalist clichés that I shall be demonstrating shortly. In Bhabha's words, "Secular translation of the origins of Islam is itself the product of 'the disjunctive rewriting of the transcultural, migrant experience'" (226).

As noted before, *The Satanic Verses* is characterized by a switch in tone in Rushdie's career. It is the first of his novels to challenge the validity of a transnational monotheism, Islam, and its place in the contemporary global cosmopolitan life. His first three books, *Midnight's Children*, *Shame*, and *Jaguar Smile* critiqued the authoritarian states in India, Pakistan, and Nicaragua, as well as fiercely questioned the racial stereotypes produced of "brown" Englishmen by their fellow "white" citizens. Also, Rushdie's other main concern in those texts was to demonstrate the linkage between the "decolonized" individual's destiny and the dystopic nation-state experiences. The controversy around *The Satanic Verses*, however, brought in liberal concepts such as "free speech" in a time period when anti-liberal totalitarian regimes such as the Iranian Revolution and the Soviet Union posed serious threats to the West, or in E.P. Thompson's words, "Natopolis," at the expense of the very people he is representing. Yasmin Alibhai cites a Muslim woman's reaction to the Rushdie venture in *The Satanic*

Verses: "And what hurts so much is that one of our own, someone I really used to admire, someone who stood up on television and told the white British how racist they were, has let us down so badly" ("Satanic Betrayals" 12).

Midnight's Children and *Shame* highlight the interconnected stories of two nations, India and Pakistan, and allegorize the birth of Pakistan after the Independence War of 1947. *Midnight's Children*, especially, won international acclaim immediately after its publication; and, ironically, the Persian translation of *Shame* was awarded the official state award by Iran. *Midnight's Children* consists of serious passages that can be taken as direct attacks to the political progression of the Nehru family after the independence movement. Blaming the Nehru lineage, Jawaharlal Nehru, Indira Gandhi, and Rajiv Gandhi for making themselves hereditary kings of India, the narrator Saleem Sinai finds a hazardous link between the mistakes of the political power and his personal growth, a sentiment one emphatically notices in Nehru's speech: "I had been mysteriously handcuffed to history, my destinies indissolubly chained to those of my country" (*Midnight's Children* 3). Sinai describes Indira Gandhi almost as a mythical figure that will turn into a grotesque Muslim leader type, such as the Ayatollah Khomeini's depiction in *Verses* for instance, in Rushdie's

future novels: “mother-goddess in her most terrible aspect, possessor of the shakti of the gods, a multi-limbed divinity with the center-parting and schizrophenic hair” (*Midnight’s Children* 438).

Pakistan comes off even worse in *Shame*, a similarly dystopic narrative that allegorizes the disappointment after the establishment of Pakistan that replaced the English colonization with Islamic fanaticism. The representations of the two political nemeses in the novel, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto (Iskander Harappa) and Zia ul-Haq (Raza Hyder), can be paralleled to the portrayal of the Nehru “dynasty” in *Children* for its belittling the political visions of these historical characters, tendencies to develop totalitarian policies about the ethic, gender, and sectarian problems in Pakistan, as seen in the issues related to the role of women in Islamic Pakistan, the separatist Bengali groups, and ul-Haq’s military coup against the Bhutto regime. Especially the novel’s blunt criticism of the authority structure of political Islam in Pakistan foreshadows the approaching *leitmotif* in Rushdie’s fiction, the coercive tendencies of religious and political institutions:

Repression is a seamless garment; a society which is authoritarian in its social and sexual codes, which crushes its women beneath the intolerable burdens of honour and propriety, breeds repressions of other kinds as well... Contrariwise: dictators are always- or at least in public, on people’s behalf- puritanical. (*Shame* 189)

The *Jaguar Smile* is also a satirical account of a Third World country, Nicaragua, portraying a romanticized picture of the anti-imperialist Sandinista movement that overthrew the Somoza regime in 1979 via a coup. Insofar as the American interests in the Somoza and Zia regimes are considered, the Sandinista movement, for Rushdie, is identical to the Indian resistance movement of the 1940s. And yet, despite his tendencies to caricaturize the Junta and its supporters, Rushdie finds the scope of the Sandinistas genuine, because the Nicaraguan movement of decolonization was initiated by the intelligentsia who had appreciation for writers like Marquez, Vargas-Llosa, and Fuentes, the representatives of “new novel,” whose works had tremendous impact on Rushdie’s understanding of the concept of nation-formation and creating counter narratives. In other words, as a “translated man” who was “borne across” (*Shame* 24), Rushdie sees the West Indies as a geographical “other” that had a preferable experience in developing anti-colonial attitudes during its attempt at becoming a “nation.” Despite the romantic portrayal of the Sandinistas, readers witness Rushdie’s sympathy for Nicaragua:

I recognized a deeper affinity with that small country in a continent [Central America] upon which I had never set foot. I grew daily more interested in its affairs, because after all, I was myself the child of a successful revolt against a great power, my consciousness the product of the triumph of the Indian revolution. It was perhaps also true that those of us who did not have our origins in the countries of the mighty West, or North, had something in common- not certainly as simplistic as a unified, “third world” outlook, but at least some knowledge of what weakness was like, some awareness of the view from underneath, and how it felt to be there, on the bottom, looking up at the descending heel. (*Jaguar Smile* 12)

Such an affectionate consideration of other anti-imperialist struggles or processes of nation-state formations would be unthinkable in Pamuk’s fiction. Everywhere in his works, the reader sees his emphasis on the uniqueness of the Turkish encounter with Europe. As Erdağ Gökner states, Pamuk’s fiction is overall characterized by a tension between the Ottoman/Islamic heritage of Turkey and the contemporary secular, as well as nationalist, Turkish identity (“Ottoman Theme” 34). Similar to Rushdie, Pamuk repeatedly uses history as a *leitmotif* in his novels to (1) narrate the Ottoman history within the European context; (2) highlight the transition from the Ottoman Empire to Turkish nation-state; and (3) criticize the aftermath of the nationalist/secularist Kemalist revolution of the 1920s, which gave way to the European model of singular nationalism and ignored complex Ottoman legacies such as multiculturalism, multilingualism, and religion (34).

8. Other Relevant Works of Pamuk

Similar to Rushdie's, Pamuk's career is characterized by a deliberate switch of audiences in that, after certain points in their career, they start producing narratives specifically for "western" audiences. As mentioned earlier, *The Satanic Verses* is the first Rushdie novel that demonstrates his switch from national allegory to narratives about the transnational diaspora encounters and critique of Islam mythology. In Pamuk's career we find a similar shift. In his early novels, such as *Jevdet Bey and Sons* and *Silent House*, we see Pamuk's interest in the psychohistorical anthropology of the national culture and identity in relation to the rise of the secular Turkish bourgeoisie. *The Black Book*, *New Life* and *My Name is Red* take this attempt further by bringing in concepts such as imitation, influence, double-identity, globalization, Eastern and Western perspectives in art and philosophy as subject matters. It is with the publication of *Snow* that Pamuk's fiction ushers in the arrival of the "westernized" individual to his "homeland," as almost similar to that of Rushdie's *Chamcha* and *Farishta*.

Snow encapsulates the clash of two political discourses in contemporary Turkish culture, secularism versus stereotypical political Islam, which is best exemplified by the headscarf ban in state institutions implemented by the Constitutional Court of Turkey. The main character, a poet named Kenan Alakuşoğlu, who prefers to be called Ka, pays a visit to Kars from Germany. He encounters Sunay Zaim there, a militantly secularist actor, who is about to stage a propaganda play entitled *My Fatherland or My Scarf* about the triumph of the secular regime over political Islam. Ka is torn between his "humane" desire to associate with the young women who cannot wear their scarves and his "Western" belief in a secular regime. Zaim tells Ka,

Like you I spent the years of youth roaming the streets of Nişantaşı and Beyoğlu [two neighborhoods in Istanbul that represent the upper-class residential areas and entertainment center]. I was mad about films from the West and couldn't see enough of them, I read everything Sartre and Zola had ever written, and I believed that our future lay with Europe. To see that whole world destroyed, to see our sisters forced to wear headscarves, to see poems banned for being antireligious, as has already happened in Iran—this is one spectacle I don't think you would be prepared to take lying down. Because you're from my world. There is no one else in Kars who's read the poetry of T.S. Eliot. (201-202)

The idea of westernization via movies and literature can be traced back to *The Black Book* in which we see the effects of Hollywood productions and classical pieces of western literature on the erasure of collective memory and Turkish identity. Especially the chapters entitled "We Lost Our Memories at the Movies" and "The Story of the Prince," highlight this "loss." "Was any administrator in the movement aware of the parallel between the rise of the movie theaters and the fall of Istanbul?... "Was it mere chance that whorehouses and movie theaters opened on the same streets?" asks a paranoid character in *The Black Book* (110).

Snow indicates a deliberate attempt for the representation of domestic Turkish politics in Pamuk's career, for it is the first overtly political novel he has written. The Turkish politics, in his previous novels, were narrated within the Ottoman context, in the form of a melancholy re-visioning of history, which proved to be a space of transgression, fruitful imagination of self and other, and even "the sublime." However, the infamously calm Pamuk became even more politically outspoken after the publication of *Snow*. In a 2003 interview, he even declares his support for the Justice and Development Party, which swept the 2002 general elections in Turkey whose leader was formerly jailed for leading a political agenda to bring the Islamic Law, *Shariat*, to Turkey: "I want Erdogan to succeed, and I want the army to stay away from politics. Erdogan is opening a narrow path right now. If that narrow path is crossed carefully, Turkey could eventually be a more open, more liberal society. So, all I say to you, to my compatriots and to my fears, please wait and see" ("Soft Islam Takes Over in Turkey" 7).

Of course, the irony in Rushdie's and Pamuk's cases is their complicated relation to a political ideology in claim of governing according to Islamic rules, either Khomeini's Iran, or respecting Islamic sensitivities, in Turkey. While Rushdie opposes any ideological alternative to secularism and goes as far as "insulting" Islam, the recent shift in Pamuk's career demonstrates his tendency to embrace the possible implementation of Islam into secular democracies. *The Satanic Verses* and *Snow* are published in these opportune times when the Iranian Revolution comes to the forefront of international politics, and political Islam becomes so systematically powerful in Turkish politics for the first time in its history.

Additionally, Pamuk's comments in a 2005 interview with the Swiss magazine *Das Bild* created an impact in Turkey that resulted in his receiving death threats and, in minor cases, book-burnings. Also, a state prosecutor attempted to bring charges against him for violation of the Article 301 of the Turkish constitution that bans insulting "Turkishness." In the interview, Pamuk referred to the ethnically-diverse Ottoman Empire's relocation of a part of its Armenian population to places like Syria and Lebanon, also Ottoman territories at the time, in the last phases of World War One. In addition to this, he mentions Turkey's thirty-year-long fight with the PKK, the "Kurdistan" Revolutionary Front that is recognized as a "terrorist" organization all around the world, saying that "thirty thousand Kurds and a million Armenians were killed in these lands [Turkey]. Almost no one dares to speak out about this but me" (Pamuk, "On Trial" para. 4). Pamuk elaborately situates himself further within the tradition of Orientalism:

The hardest thing was to explain why a country officially committed to entry in the European Union would wish to imprison an author whose books were well known in Europe, and why it felt compelled to play out this drama (as Conrad might have said) "under Western eyes." This paradox cannot be explained away as simple ignorance, jealousy, or intolerance, and it is not the only paradox. What am I to make of a country that insists that the Turks, unlike their Western neighbors, are a compassionate people, incapable of genocide, while nationalist political groups are pelting me with death threats? What is the logic behind a state that complains that its enemies spread false reports about the Ottoman legacy all over the globe while it prosecutes and imprisons one writer after another, thus propagating the image of the Terrible Turk worldwide? When I think of the professor whom the state asked to give his ideas on Turkey's minorities, and who, having produced a report that failed to please, was prosecuted, or the news that between the time I began this essay and embarked on the sentence you are now reading five more writers and journalists were charged under Article 301, I imagine that Flaubert and Nerval, the two godfathers of Orientalism, would call these incidents *bizarceries*, and rightly so. (para. 12)

Especially since the publication of *Snow* in 2002, Pamuk's fame as a novelist has been undermined by the international press coverage that introduced him as an ideologue of freedom of speech, rather than a promising and innovative novelist. His comments on the Armenian issue and the Kurdish problem that are topics discussed *ad nauseam* in Turkey and they are far from taboos. In fact, many years earlier than Pamuk did, these ideas had been articulated by many intellectuals in Turkey from the political left, Taner Akcam or Murat Belge, for instance, none of whom had such unfortunate experiences.

Additionally, the scholarship of leading American and French Turcologists, such as the veteran American Orientalist from Princeton University Bernard Lewis, historian Justin McCarthy, British Norman Stone, and French historian Gilles Veinstein, who have written extensively on the Armenian issue. They have argued that the events started as local disputes when Armenian organizations, such as *Tashnak*, went under the Russian influence and started upheavals in eastern Turkey. The Ottoman practice of relocation, as clearly stated by Lewis, Stone, Lewis, and Veinstein, were common practices against such upheavals within the tradition of empires.

What's striking in the difference between the Rushdie and Pamuk controversies is that, while the anti-Rushdie league reacted to his "blasphemous" imaginative vision, which is based on his reading of Islamic sources about Mohammed's life, Pamuk's comments were considered merely political and did not stem from such imaginative reinvention of current historical analysis. Nowhere in Pamuk's work, whether literary or non-fictional, do his readers encounter an account of the subjects he bluntly brings into the political discourse. And yet, the controversies that surround both texts have been particularly fascinating in the way they do not only allow us to see unique cultural productions, but also let us encounter the politics of revision and transformation in (post)colonial and global literatures.

9. Conclusion

The controversies surrounding *The Satanic Verses* and *Snow*, in time, have brought the authors such "success" that their works have been regarded as dissemination's ruses for grand concepts such as freedom of speech, liberalism, democracy, human rights; and, more recently, enrolled in the fight against "Islamofascism." However, as earlier noted, the majority of Muslims around the world found *The Satanic Verses* difficult to read due to Rushdie's successfully experimental technique, which renders the work's political impact ineffective in transmitting such messages.

As wrote Syed Shahabuddin, member of the Janata Party, the Indian Parliament and the initiator of the ban in India, in a 13 October 1988 newspaper column addressed to Rushdie:

Even more shocking and saddening...is the communication gap between the Muslim community and the so-called intelligentsia. There is no rapport, no instantaneous recognition of pain, no spontaneous sharing of anguish... The elite do not understand the dynamics of mass communication— how reports spread and how rumours, sometimes exaggerated and wild, fly and take possession of the minds of the men... You are aggrieved that some of us have condemned you without a hearing and asked for the ban without reading your book. Yes, I have not read it, nor do I intend to. I do not have to wade through a filthy drain to know what filth is. (Appignanesi and Maitland 37-39)

It is interesting to note a couple of claims in this statement. First, like many others, Shahabuddin declares that he hasn't read the book, and has no need to, arguably, due to its subject matter. Second, and more importantly, he emphasizes a split between the "Muslim community" and the "so-called intelligentsia," a binary opposition that consists of the secular "elite" and the religious "community," in order to show Rushdie's callousness, lack of sympathy, and heresy toward Islam. Insofar as the response from the devout member of Islamic community is considered, if one forgets about political motivations for a second, it can be said that Shahabuddin is right in expressing the concerns of Indian Muslims. And yet, what's striking in a statement like this is that it shows a Muslim concern with the intelligentsia on the political level and defines the intellectuals like Rushdie in a way that Antonio Gramsci would call "inorganic:" unable to cater to the powers of specific social or religious communities it attempts to represent and, more than that, that it offends those very people by making use of the disseminative techniques and rhetorical strategies for self-marketing benefits.

Similarly, due to the syntax errors and misuse of Turkish grammar, Pamuk's novels have been found "unreadable" among the respectable literary critics, Fethi Naci for instance, and some Turkish poets such as Hilmi Yavuz and Oruc Aruoba. Ironically, we see that the first two of these figures were among the jury who awarded Pamuk the Milliyet Prize in 1980 after the publication of *Cevdet Bey and Sons* in 1980. Yet, they later criticized Pamuk for resorting to "Orientalism" after his second novel, *The Silent House*, a comment that indicates a deliberate shift in perspective, which aimed at promoting the image of the European Orientalist tradition of Turkey.

It is interesting to note that Rushdie and Pamuk have reached even wider range of audiences after their cooperation with Andrew Wylie, an internationally famous American publisher based in New York and London. In a 2007 interview, Lloyd Grove discusses with Wylie the “scandalous” nature of the publication of *Satanic Verses* and states that Wylie is one of the most influential publisher in the contemporary literature industry in hatching “scandals,” since he has worked with over six hundred famous authors including Salman Rushdie, Saul Bellow, Norman Mailer, Susan Sontag, Philip

Roth, Jorge Luis Borges [whose copyrights he owns], and Italo Calvino (“World According to Andrew Wylie” para.1). Grove notes that Wylie has devoted his career “to shaking up the once-genteel book business on both sides of the Atlantic by doing things that just weren’t done—stealing writers from fellow agents, demanding and receiving outrageous advances, and otherwise making a huge pain of himself in the service of his clients” (para. 2) and, thus, obtained a nicknames within the industry such as “the Jackal,” “evil madman,” “cold-eyed predator,” and a “monster” (para. 1). Wylie further explains the process he started to work with Rushdie, after the publication of *Shame*, which infuriated the then Pakistani primer minister Benazir Bhutto, thereby leading to the ban of the novel. He volunteers that it was his close relationship with Bhutto that made Rushdie to consider working with the Wylie Agency.

In his analysis of the contemporary politics of the “prize industry,” in specific relation to the Booker Award that has also been granted to Rushdie, James English highlights such transition from “cultural capital” to “symbolic capital,” in Pierre Bourdieu’s terminology. English argues that the cultural production in recent years has deliberately adopted a “register of *mock-scandal*” (112) to draw further attention, publicity, and affirmation. Such thought-provoking, yet “scandalous” (in English’s terms) representations, in *The Satanic Verses* and *Snow*, show themselves in the form of contributing to the “Orientalist” representations of Islam, India, and Turkey, that renders those texts marketable and inflicts the burdensome duty of bringing the concept of “freedom of speech” into public discourse. Edward Said, who has also been a keen admirer of Rushdie’s artistic talents, nevertheless feels compelled to ask: “Why must a Moslem, who could be defending and sympathetically interpreting us, now present us so roughly, so expertly and so disrespectfully to an audience already primed to excoriate our traditions, reality, history, religion, language, and origins?” (Appignanesi and Maitland 149). Said’s question has arisen among the Turkish intellectuals as well: “Why, in other words, must a member of our culture join the legions of Orientalists in Orientalizing Islam so radically and unfairly?” (149). The answer, though, is still yet to be found through careful critiques of the valuable works of these two authors.

“There is no document of civilization which is not at the same time a document of barbarism,” wrote Walter Benjamin in his famous analysis of modern rationality (*Illuminations* 256). Today’s ideological and cultural conflicts, “the clash of civilizations,” require such “contrapuntal” readings of literature that project the problems within the increasingly diversifying global village we live in. The Rushdie and Pamuk texts, in this respect, are the very social texts that surround us. For this reason, their “freedom of speech” has to be defended as these texts are imaginative creations we can rely upon to understand the transnational encounters we live through.

REFERENCES

- Alibhai, Yasmin. “Satanic Betrayals.” *New Statesman and Society*. 24 Feb. 1989. 12. Print.
- Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

- English, James. "Winning the Culture Game: Prizes, Awards, and the Rules of Art." *New Literary History*, 2002. 33: 109-135.
- Fisher, Michael J. T. and Mehdi Abedi. "Bombay Talkies, the Word and the World: Salman Rushdie's Satanic Verses." *Cultural Anthropology*. 5.2 (1990): 107-159. Print.
- Goknar, Erdağ. "Orhan Pamuk and the 'Ottoman Theme.'" *World Literature Today*. 80.6 (2006): 34- 38. Print.
- Krishnaswamy, Revathi. "The Criticism of Culture and the Culture of Criticism: At the Intersection of Postcolonialism and Globalization Theory." *Diacritics*. 32:2 (2002): 106-126.
- Najmabadi, Afsaneh, Gayatri Spivak. "Interview with Gayatri Spivak." *Social Text*. 28 (1991): 122-134.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *The Black Book*. Trans. Guneli Gun. London: Faber & Faber, 1997.
- . "On Trial." Trans. Maureen Freely. *The New Yorker*. 19 Dec. 2005.
- . *Snow*. Trans. Maureen Freely. New York: Knopf, 2004.
- Rushdie, Salman. *The Satanic Verses*. New York: Viking, 1989.
- . *Midnight 's Children*. New York: Penguin, 1971.
- . *Imaginary Homelands. Essays and Criticism. 1981-1991*. New York: Granta, 1991.
- . "The Book Burning." *The New York Review of Books*. 2 Mar. 1989, 26.
- . "A War that Presents Us All with a Crisis of Faith." *Guardian*. 3 Nov. 2001. Web.
- . "Yes, This is About Islam." *New York Times*. 2 Nov 2001. Web.
- . *Shame..* London: Jonathan Cape, 1983.
- The Rushdie File*. Eds. Appignanesi, Lisa and Sara Maitland. Michigan: Syracuse, 1990.
- Wylie, Andrew. "World According to Andrew Wylie." Interview with Lloyd Grove. *Portfolio*. 17 Dec. 2007. <http://www.portfolio.com/views/columns/the-worldaccording-to/2007/12/14/An-Interview-With-Andrew-Wylie>.