



*Journal of Advances and
Scholarly Researches in
Allied Education*

*Vol. IV, Issue No. VIII,
October-2012, ISSN 2230-
7540*

**SALMAN RUSHDIE FROM POSTMODERNISM
AND POST COLONIALISM TO
COSMOPOLITANISM: TOWARD A GLOBALIZED
LITERATURE**

AN
INTERNATIONALLY
INDEXED PEER
REVIEWED &
REFEREED JOURNAL

Salman Rushdie from Postmodernism and Post colonialism to Cosmopolitanism: Toward a Globalized Literature

Mahesh Kumar^{1*} Dr. Harinder Singh Kang²

¹Research Scholar, English, Department of English, CMJ University, Meghalaya

²PhD English, Associate Professor, Department of English, CMJ University, Meghalaya

Abstract – *In the period of what Selden, Widdowson, and Brooker call "post-theory," giving us theory that is depleted due to a regularly expanding trouble in concocting any obvious arrangements, Salman Rushdie's productive, diverse oeuvre typifies contemporary literature's relentless propensity to avoid orders. Being in the middle of societies, customs, types, traditions and impacts, Rushdie's work, frequently depicted as half and half and cosmopolitan, can and ought to be perused from an assortment of points of view. In a period when we are questioning the propriety of terms, for example, "postcolonial" and thinking about whether more broad ones, for example, "transnational," "transcultural," or "international," would be more qualified for the present literature, this article breaks down Rushdie's fiction between classifications as bit by bit swerving away from postcolonial postmodernism toward cosmopolitanism, with unique spotlight on *The Ground beneath Her Feet*, trying to address and answer the disputable question of whether we are in reality advancing toward a global(ized) literature.*

Keywords: Cosmopolitanism, Globalized, Postmodernism, Post colonialism, Salman Rushdie

----- X -----

LITERARY COSMOPOLITANISM AND GLOBALIZED LITERATURE

In the 2005 release of their manual for contemporary literary theory, Selden, Widdowson, and Brooker call attention to once more that we live in a period of post-theory, when "theory [...] appears to be anyway not to be about literature," "the times of theory [...] are finished," or rather we have achieved "the finish of theory" (267), with literature, once at the core of the hypothetical undertaking, being ignored by what theory there is and politicized: "the unmistakable sign of the literary has been overlaid by the goals of race, sexuality, sex" (Selden, Widdowson, and Brooker 269). One need not lose hope, however, the creators guarantee us, for it isn't an end times yet a reorientation (267). A critical commitment to that reorientation is made by a now-generous assemblage of works in the field of cosmopolitan theory—Berthold Schoene's *The Cosmopolitan Novel*, Philip Leonard's *Literature after Globalization*, Katherine Stanton's *Cosmopolitan Fictions*, and Vinay Dharwadkar's *Cosmopolitan Geographies* are some essential titles—which takes late twentieth and twenty-first century literary cosmopolitanism as one of its foci of enthusiasm for the setting of contemporary structures and dialogs of globalization, while likewise thinking back to prior circumstances and customary ideas of cosmopolitanism.

As a wonder, "an attitude and disposition," or "a procedure of protection" (Schoene 2, 5), cosmopolitanism is no novelty. Like globalization, with which it is inseparably and so far vaguely related, it can be followed back to the Renaissance, as indicated by Leonard, the Middle Ages, as proposed by *Cosmopolitan Geographies*, or artifact—the very word "cosmopolitan" gets from the antiquated Greek word "kosmopolitês." What as Schoene would like to think recognizes contemporary cosmopolitanism is that it flags "a takeoff from conventional internationalist points of view while focusing on the criticalness of nearby culture for the advancement of any important and practical world-common future" (1). Schoene identifies its start in 1989—the fall of the Berlin Wall denoting the finish of a time and moving "the idealistic cosmopolitanism of the mid 1990s" (Leonard 11)—yet indicates September 11, 2001 as another defining moment, one that required a more reasonable feeling of cosmopolitanism and started its recasting (6– 7). In spite of the fact that post-9/11 cosmopolitan theory may in any case stray away into credulous envisioning of gaiety, intercommunalism, multiculturalism, and ethnic decent variety, which "fill in as simple colorful backdrop to the self-molding of white collar class personalities, whose personal satisfaction and feeling of self are imperatively upgraded by having the capacity to 'feel

cosmopolitan' due to the obvious, yet a long way from effectively neighborly, closeness of 'others,'" new cosmopolitanism has "developed pragmatist" (Schoene 5, 9) in that it is established in contemporary substances. Vinay Dharwadker undisputedly concurs, expressing that "the quickened globalization of capital and material generation and consumption after the fall of the Berlin Wall" and the fast difference in "the economic and political relations among old and new countries" is likewise one of the three noteworthy improvements that changed the picture of the world in the last quarter of the twentieth century and prompted the "change of cosmopolitanism" (1).

Disassociating this exchange from the fear of cosmopolitanism as "deceitful with the neoimperialist venture of American world domination" (Schoene 10), Schoene centers around the rise of its curiously British shape coming about because of Britain's one of a kind position amongst America and old Europe, trailed by the landing of what he sees as "another sort of novel" (11), the world-incorporating and world-innovative cosmopolitan novel. In the event that the novel is customarily connected with the ascent of the countries, at that point this new subgenre, "less homebound and territorialist" (Schoene 12), can be related with the weakening of countries, particularly when comprehended as spots of having a place, and considerably more so where access to advanced living makes a sentiment one's autonomy of a particular place (Leonard 35). This view of another cosmopolitan literature can be viewed as reflecting Bruce Robbins' contention that "rather than a perfect of separation, really existing cosmopolitanism is a reality of (re)attachment, different connection, or connection at a separation" (3). The possibility that the cosmopolitan novel fortifies a feeling of having a place and collection crosswise over national outskirts, withdrawing from the novel of the country, which either declares or deconstructs national(ist) myths, appears to be emphatically bolstered by the direction took after by Salman Rushdie's fiction, away from his prior accounts of the country toward more cosmopolitan works. Such works transgress the limits of any single envisioned national group to take (a lot of) the world as their mise en scène, their structures and structures mirroring the world's colorful cellularity, discontinuity, or potentially compositeness. In a period when it is progressively more hard to pinpoint what the novel is, and significantly more strenuous to group it, the sort of hybrid fiction, to acquire Lodge's term, that Rushdie's work encapsulates is viewed as a "literary articulation of the global age" (Leonard 11) and, now and again, named global and world literature.

This obviously shows notwithstanding national fringes, disciplinary limits in connection to cosmopolitan literature are to be examined too. Investigating what he sees as "the nonattendance of the cosmopolitan thought in world literature contemplates," César Domínguez fights that, despite the fact that "cosmopolitanism and world literature are so firmly related, to the point where one may ponder whether 'cosmopolitan literature' is synonymous with 'world

literature,'" one reason why "the idea of cosmopolitanism assumes such a minor part in world literature exchanges" lies in "the limits between near literature" (whose key idea cosmopolitanism is) "and world literature" (244). In his article "World Literature and Cosmopolitanism," Domínguez offers a nitty gritty record of the crossing points between these firmly related ideas, utilizing the stage of David Damrosch's tripartite meaning of world literature and Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen's outline of key improvements in cosmopolitan theory between "the two 9/11 occasions" (Schoene 6– 7), that is, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the World Trade Center assaults.

Expounding on world literature in their essay titled "World Lite. What Is Global Literature?," the editors of the literary magazine *n+1* give off an impression of being outlining Domínguez's disputes, since the term cosmopolitanism does not figure in essence in their examination. Connecting world literature to global capitalism and watching the ever-introduce monetary foundation of education yet additionally of literary creation and consumption, the creators of "World Lite" draw a refinement between the parts of strengthening and weakening of national limits and languages, attributed to and embraced by literature, that constitute the distinction amongst vernacular and world literature. Relating the state of world literature after World War II, the creators draw an indistinguishable limit from Schoene and recognize the "prior time of World Literature, when things were still 'postcolonial'" (and whose real example is Salman Rushdie), *The Satanic Verses* speaking to a sort of literary watershed, and "a post-chilly war, globalized World Literature" embodied by novels, for example, *The Ground beneath Her Feet* whose relationship with against colonialism is disappearing. The editors particularly date this new literary globalism to the late 1990s and the economic development of creating countries, which took literature on a "Jason Bourne-like visit through the rising budgetary capitals of what used to be the third world." In this new literature springing from the new world request, the countries have been risen above, "the moist cells of provincialism" have been gotten away from, and an all-inclusive significance of a literary work has been procured. Not just the advance of global capitalism, be that as it may, is reflected by the advance of world literature, yet in addition its imbalances and distortions, the editors assert. Given the way that the present world literature can't however reflect "global capitalism, in its triumph, imbalances, and distortions," it "may better be called Global Literature," "inferring worldwide procedures that spellbind the states of the world's people."

A short study of English department educational program demonstrates that there are currently an assortment of to a great extent near courses titled "Global Novel," "The Global Novel," or "The New Global Novel," centering, generally, on the purported transnational, global literature and creators, for example, Salman Rushdie, J. M. Coetzee, Kazuo

Ishiguro, Zadie Smith, or Haruki Murakami, whose works every now and again include in exchanges on literary cosmopolitanism.

Such courses vouch for an expanding fame and maybe power of transnational, international, transcultural, or multicultural literature—there is unquestionably no lack of terms—in a period when the novel has never been more crossover. Hybridity in literature today isn't just an issue of blending kinds, literary traditions, and customs from various societies, of obscuring the fringe amongst high and low or genuine and mainstream culture and literature, or of mixing fiction and true to life. It is likewise about joining diverse imaginative media, which isn't new in it yet is positively more exploratory now than it was before, what with the more extensive selection of gadgets nearby. This mixing happens, for example, in perpetually brave juxtapositions of content and picture—what William Blake did, putting himself well comparatively radical, is taken to an unheard of level by writers, for example, Mario Vargas Llosa and W. G. Sebald, or specialists, for example, Cy Twombly and Barbara Kruger—or in the use of true to life systems to the story, utilizing the globally comprehended language of film. At different circumstances, hybridity involves joining music and account in execution poetry, along these lines coming back to the very beginnings of literature, to oral poetry joined by music and made exclusively to be performed, or of consolidating the systems of orature into the novel.

Such types of hybridity convolute the question of what the global novel is. Is it the novel as a global sort? Since the issue is once in a while taken up outside Anglophone societies, would we be able to state that the global novel is, truth be told, the novel in English as a global language or the language of globalization? Is it maybe the novel from around the world, or the novel of global settings and concerns—a few courses look for "global subjects, issues, and procedures," expresses "The Global Novel" course diagram in English and Comparative Literary Studies at the University of Warwick? At last, is it the novel about (impacts of) globalization, or a sort of globalized novel? Maybe the global novel is all these, however a considerable lot of these issues additionally portray cosmopolitan and world literature, which may prompt further expressed perplexity. To have the capacity to comprehend them all the more unmistakably and to investigate Rushdie's fiction fundamentally through the crystal of its cosmopolitan ethos, one needs to consider quickly the more extensive setting of cultural and literary globalization.

GLOBALIZATION OF CULTURE AND LITERATURE

A standout amongst the most determined questions in dialogs concerning globalization is whether globalization implies Americanization. From the postcolonial point of view, globalization is inseparably

identified with neocolonialism, to new types of economic, political, and cultural government, and even protection from it accept global measurements, as Robert J. C. Youthful notes (127). Resulting fears of homogenization communicated in Maalouf's *In the Name of Identity* oppositely restrict claims, for example, those found in Appadurai's *Modernity everywhere: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, that globalization implies neither homogenization nor Americanization as America is a bunch, though an essential one, in a transnational system, and a few societies may fear more prompt neighbors. In any case, cultural globalization uses instruments of homogenization, for example, one overwhelming language. In the wide and shifted setting of neocolonialism or economic and cultural neoimperialism, the principle issue of global collaboration is by all accounts the multifaceted play amongst homogenization and heterogenization, and the fundamental component of global culture is the battle amongst similarity and distinction (Appadurai 32, 43). In the expressions of Diana Brydon, "new globalism," as an approach, "all the while declares neighborhood freedom and global interdependencies [...] looks for a way [...] to characterize contrasts that don't rely upon myths of cultural virtue or realness yet flourish with an association that 'pollutes' without homogenizing" (141). Presently, where do we adhere to a meaningful boundary between collaboration that defiles and homogenization? All the more significantly, who will watch the outskirts amongst autonomy and relationship, defiling cooperation and homogenization?

The globalization of literature, as an inseparable unit with the globalization of culture, happens both from without and from inside. From without, it is an integral part of cultural globalization, though from inside, it is a procedure coming about because of literature being established in different literary customs from over the globe and having creators of rich cultural foundations. Tim Parks notes in his article "The Dull New Global Novel" for the *New York Review of Books* that the presence of a world market for literature focuses on the significance of contacting an international group of onlookers on the off chance that one wishes to be viewed as a noteworthy writer. As this is simpler for those writing in English, it has turned out to be basic to have one's work converted into English. In Serbia, for example, a creator's notoriety depends, among different components, on what number of languages their work has been converted into, and especially on whether any of it has been converted into English. The global accessibility of literature by means of the Internet, the way that some may even compose principally for a web gathering of people, the expansion of ebooks, and international literary prizes all imply that achieving an international readership has turned out to be less demanding, definitely suggesting changes to literature. As indicated by Parks, there is currently an "inclination to evacuate hindrances to international appreciation," which

without a doubt suggests that some culture-particular or creator particular flavor is in peril of being lost. We should not overlook that much postcolonial fiction does not take after that standard, and inquire as to whether it is extremely important to evacuate those impediments. Is it worse to push the cutoff points of international perception? Rushdie's fiction appears to vouch for the noteworthiness of the last mentioned. "The language is kept basic," cases Parks—however Salman Rushdie does the exact inverse but is internationally known. Parks cites Ishiguro as having said that one ought to dodge pleasantries and implications to make things simple for the interpreter, additionally naming creators who forfeit the intricacy of style and language to contact an international group of onlookers. Yet, what of writers, for example, the famous Serbian writer Goran Petrović, converted into twelve world languages, whose trademark is an impossible to miss mix of etymological and expressive intricacy, the recovery of ancient, out of date, and provincial Serbian vocabulary? A similar question is raised by Rushdie's wanton style, which, combined with the general extravagancy and erraticism of his composition, speaks to an interpreter's most noticeably bad dream—or his most stunning dream.

POSTMODERNISM, POSTCOLONIALISM, AND COSMOPOLITANISM IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

Regular highlights of postmodernism and postcolonialism and open deliberations over them are no news. There are various shared highlights, for example, bland hybrids; intertextuality; historiographic metafiction; the revising of history, literature, folklore, or scriptural stories from new or some time ago disregarded points of view; a general questioning and subversion of values and standards of previous focuses; or the disassembling of fabulous accounts and of the middle/edge polarity prompting ex-centricity. Both are associated with procedures of "deconstructing existing orthodoxies," in Hutcheon's words (130), and they make adequate utilization of magic(al) authenticity and the subversive account methodologies of satire, incongruity, and moral story in their discourse with the past, notwithstanding sees that postmodernism is ahistorical on the grounds that it questions the procedure of history, as Hutcheon states (132). Numerous postcolonial creators are likewise postmodernist creators—Rushdie being an a valid example—yet would one be able to abstain from being postmodernist today, and at what taken a toll? A few, for the most part early as well as non-Western postcolonial works, for example, Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*, dismissing most Western literary customs, traditions, classes, and so forth, appear to be among the few which are particularly not postmodern(ist).

The relationship amongst postmodernism and postcolonialism is a beset one, so postcolonial literature and theory act like hesitant focuses of feedback because of their relationship with Eurocentric poststructuralism and postmodernism, with their

appropriation of Western theory seen as possibly strengthening Western dominion. Another issue is postmodernism's charged apportionment of postcolonial works that battle against such digestion and the putting of postcolonial literature inside another internationalist and universalist worldview (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 154). In her dialog of "the connections between the post-colonial and the post-present day," Hutcheon focuses to the difficulty of postcolonial identity regularly being uncontaminated by universalist or Eurocentric ideas and pictures (130, 135). Will postcolonial literature—"literatures" may be a more suitable word—unravel itself from them? From this point, it appears to be definitely to be a sort of reaction to them, or in exchange with them. When it isn't, it moves away from the postcolonial, or it quits being postcolonial. Kureishi's topical move in *Intimacy* and *The Body* vouches for it.

Regardless of the considerable number of crossing points, there is a noteworthy contrast between the postmodern and the postcolonial that keeps a conflation of the two or full ingestion of postcolonialism by postmodernism. Postcolonialism is unavoidably political, though postmodernism does not need to be. Postmodernism is some of the time increasingly a matter of style, as proposed by Kwame Anthony Appiah's thoughts on postcoloniality, postmodernism, and postmodernization in Africa (119– 124), despite the fact that Hutcheon advises us that "both have unmistakable political motivation" however postmodernism is "politically undecided: its evaluate exists together with [...] capable complicity with the cultural dominants inside which it inevitably exists" (130). Postmodernism proposes "an aestheticizing of the political," and postcolonialism "frontal areas the political as definitely debasing the tasteful" (Brydon 137), where sully is seen by Diana Brydon as a literary gadget and in addition a cultural and political undertaking.

The question of political responsibility additionally remains at the focal point of a few level headed discussions over cosmopolitan fiction's political reason. On the off chance that cosmopolitanism, similar to cosmopolitanization as a procedure, is viewed as globalization's twin marvel and its relating group of political thoughts (Schoene 1, 6), it is certain ensnared in a web of contradicting feelings, some of which comprehend globalization as "politically decentralized" (Leonard 8), while others translate the perspective of the world as politically, economically, ideologically or culturally decentered as a folklore (Schoene 3). In the globalized world's interchange between the global and the neighborhood, which keeps up unequal openings and witnesses a determined development of new disparities, cosmopolitanism now and again is relied upon to demonstrate "firm political responsibility" (Schoene 7) and to make a feeling of global group so capable, as Schoene would see it, as to have the capacity to "pre-empt war and fear mongering" (10). In the event that cosmopolitan theory, similar to

globalization theory, somewhat speaks to an expansion or continuation of postcolonial theory, it, as well, is pervaded with political reason that needs to do with protection from "majoritarian directions of global power" (Leonard 45). In any case, as Schoene's examination of Ian McEwan's *Black Dogs* and *Saturday* appears, the cosmopolitan novel itself does not have to receive a specific political position, which echoes the cases that globalized world literature even can be blamed for letting its previous radicalism "quickly fall into a solitary devout adage—the right to speak freely," made by the fairly radical creators of "World Lite." Instead, it considers political equivocalness, lack of bias, hesitation, and detachment, maybe as a type of protection from any definition or program (Schoene 124).

RUSHDIE: FROM POSTMODERNISM AND POSTCOLONIALISM TO COSMOPOLITANISM

Protection from definition is positively an unmistakable normal for Salman Rushdie's written work. He makes at a convergence of innovation, postmodernism, and postcolonialism—the last two filling in as the most well-known interpretative systems for the examination of his works, in any case, as we might see, his novels have experienced a change, winding up less particularly postcolonially postmodern and more cosmopolitan. The innovator parts of his exposition might be perused because of colonialism and cultural relocation—thus the thoughts of the unsteady idea of truth or the nonexistence of sureness—however the postmodernist parts of Rushdie's fiction are likewise established in history and speak to "an item not of textuality or of language alone but rather of cultural hybridization" (Teverson 61). The "post" in the postcolonial parts of Rushdie's stories can be comprehended as "hostile to" because of his inventive recovery of lost histories and fanciful countries, his nonexistent recreation of past, and a plaguing contestation of colonial generalizations and beliefs of immaculateness, or as "past" in light of the fact that his works move past the damage of colonial presuppositions to remake postcolonial identity.

In a plenitude of widely examined postmodern(ist) and additionally postcolonial highlights of Rushdie's thinking of, one most every now and again experiences historiographic metafiction, enchanted authenticity, carnivalesque subversion through satire, incongruity, purposeful anecdote, or a mixing of high and low or high and pop culture. Self-reflexivity and self-questioning are available all through, as is bland hybrid, with classifications unendingly undermining each other on the grounds that no single sort could deal with such complex stories (Afzal-Khan 138). Rushdie's fiction likewise modifies history, reality, and culture through intersexuality and pastiche, separating authentic and story assurances, while the etymological, complex, and nonexclusive experimentation inspects the status of the content and gets rid of well-known account associations of time

and space. All these point to Rushdie's novel, and his short story, as a destabilized frame amongst postmodernism and post colonialism, reflecting shaky postmodern and postcolonial, nearby and global substances.

Albeit the greater part of these keep on characterizing Rushdie's accounts, which deconstruct themselves to such extremes—the demonstrations of deconstruction speaking to a play amongst fixing and certification—that the storyteller in *Midnight's Children* has to ask himself, "Can any story stand to such an extent soon?" (Rushdie, *Children* 321), Rushdie's exposition has encountered an essential move in center. Maybe obviously, his first real novels enjoy an emphatically postcolonial reproduction of nonexistent countries fixated on the births of recently free countries. The overflowing and energetically carnivalesque *Midnight's Children* refutes myths of realness, immaculateness, and homogeneity by stating the Indian country's brilliant heterogeneity, though the stuffy, tangled, "claustrophobic, even neurotic" (Teverson 137) *Shame* elaborately, formally, and fundamentally reflects the shut, severe arrangement of post-autonomy Pakistan. In spite of the fact that in *The Moor's Last Sigh* Rushdie again exhibits clashing unwaveringness to national moral story, his slow move past postcolonial accounts of the country toward more cosmopolitan fiction is as of now recognized in *The Satanic Verses*, "without question the absolute most imperative model of the contemporary cosmopolitan novel" with "a variety of contrastingly found stories extended one into the other" (Schoene 28), the book that "resembles the initiation of World Literature's global stage, as the novel of 'hybridity'" ("World Lite"). In spite of the fact that Schoene is right in assuming that, if there can be any valuable and generally clear distinction amongst cosmopolitan and postcolonial thinking of, it is most likely to do with cosmopolitan literature's "endeavor at unfastening and moving past dominion's center fringe proverbial" (25), *The Satanic Verses* isn't altogether separated from that aphoristic. The same is valid for his next cosmopolitan works, *The Ground beneath Her Feet* and *Fury*, which go above and beyond by enveloping a greater amount of the world—the pivot India-England is supplanted by India-England-America. These stories, which, inquisitively enough, diagram the course of Rushdie's life from his youth in India, his education and ascend to popularity in England, and his last move to the United States, appear to be no less cosmopolitan for their proceeded, however weakening, relationship with postcolonialism. In being "long winded yet strong" and by turning to "the montage procedures of contemporary silver screen," they show "the cosmopolitan novel's compositeness" (Schoene 14), however these characteristics are usually found in postcolonial and postmodern fiction also. Put in an unexpected way, it is inappropriate to expect that Rushdie has deserted postmodernism and postcolonialism for cosmopolitanism as they keep on

investing each other notwithstanding the expanding cosmopolitanism in Rushdie's written work.

This powerlessness to draw a reasonable line that imprints where postmodern postcolonialism closures and cosmopolitanism starts—one really want to ponder in the case of drawing it would not be more unsafe than supportive—affirms the possibility that Rushdie's exhaustive exposition dwells in the middle of and past classifications. Rushdie's difference in enthusiasm from national to international symbolizes the progress from a world of country states to a more globalized reality where his fiction might be said to partake in the globalization of the novel. Without a doubt, it isn't by chance that the editors of *n+1* regard Rushdie "the major transitional figure from this prior time of World Literature, when things were still 'postcolonial,' to the contemporary globalized period." His novels are global(ized) as far as the assortment of impacts and conventions he consolidates—he himself has commented that his is a multilingual literary family tree. Besides, Rushdie's settings and concerns are global, and his exposition is composed in English as a global language and the language of globalization, which is itself globalized, for it experiences changes or cross-fertilization simultaneously. Globalization includes as a noteworthy subject in some of his works, the creator exhibiting it as an improvement of economic and cultural trade that has always existed. Contemporary globalization is trade quickened by contemporary types of correspondence, broad communications, and the Internet, its images being music, in *The Ground beneath Her Feet*, and the Internet, in *Fury*. Rushdie likewise looks at globalization as Americanization, jokingly calling neocolonialism the "Coca-Colonization of the planet" (Rushdie, *Verses* 420), with America as the gravitational power behind it, drawing in migrants looking for new, reexamined, or reclassified selves. Inside this setting *The Ground beneath Her Feet* and *Fury* can be perused as a diptych on relocation, redefinition, globalization, and the decision of association over filiation, where America is the blend of societies and personalities, the battleground of cultural concurrence and osmosis. As the more "mongrelized" and, unfortunately, if as anyone might expect, less widely praised of the two, *The Ground beneath Her Feet* may suitably show the workings of its twin main impetuses of postmodernism and postcolonialism, exemplifying the inclination toward cosmopolitan literature.

THE GROUND BENEATH HER FEET: A MONGRELIZED NOVEL FOR AND ABOUT A MONGRELIZED WORLD

Without a doubt, Rushdie's 1999 novel remains overshadowed by his famous various victor of the Booker Prize, type of an exceptionally impossible to miss type of literary event that helped change the importance of "success." The novel is additionally, unavoidably, screened by the acclaim or reputation of *The Satanic Verses*, the literary value of which

succumbed to political sloganeering. It might likewise be dominated by the Booker shortlisted titles, *Shame* and *The Moor's Last Sigh*. What adds to the novel's relative haziness in feedback is that names, for example, "rock'n'roll novel" or "pop novel," if (mis)taken to mean light, shallow literary amusement, do the novel more mischief than great. Thus, the impression is that *The Ground beneath Her Feet* gets less basic consideration than its Rushdie-esque epic breadth without a doubt merits.

Rushdie's prior novels obviously have epic characteristics, essentially stretching out to his whole oeuvre, yet dissimilar to his prior legends, *The Ground beneath Her Feet* is free from a relationship with any one particular territory as it endeavors to "ponder the sudden developments and sharp withdrawals of group in the late-twentieth century" (Stanton 2) on an international level. As it were, rather than forming another national epic, Rushdie turns his regard for a more global topical structure of cosmopolitan collaborations in a world that offers priority to citizenship over nationality. In this he brings his novel nearer to what will end up being "another cosmopolitan usual way of doing things for twenty-first-century British fiction" (Schoene 97), spearheaded by David Mitchell, whose epic stories, without a moment's delay divided and firm, "traverse and bind together the globe" (Schoene 97). Rushdie's geographic and cultural compass may not be as wide as to envelop the globe, the country endures in the novel, if just as Appadurai's structure of feeling for the storyteller, and the settings—India, England, and now America—truly take into consideration a postcolonial elucidation, however the novel's advantages decidedly lie with the transnational developments of the globalized world.

This present epic's cosmopolitan ethos is additionally somewhat credited to its adherence to innovation, with its mid twentieth-century strains in regards to group and nationality. Innovator accounts transpose the "question of group [...] to a liminal zone where group is both cozy and political, both neighborhood and worldly" accordingly inciting "a reassessment of the relationship amongst group and cosmopolitanism" (Berman 6– 7). The very term "group," Berman reminds us, is utilized as a part of twentieth-century social science principally to signify preindustrial as opposed to present day types of association (8– 9). Cosmopolitan theory and fiction reclassify the term, applying it to new types of group envisioned past thoughts, for example, nationality or ethnicity and, in numerous regards, deconstructing the possibility of conventional group, now envisioning it as the Nancean being in like manner. With cross breed national groups out of sight, the novel's worry is with the impacts of global flows worldwide, on the on occasion tricky adjusting between the neighborhood and worldly, however the worry appears subordinated to an enthusiasm for the lives of "enabled heroes" (Stanton 1) strolling the edge amongst separation and (re)attachment, fortifying globalization and benefitting from it. Joining through

their craft people from around the world one might say of group as being in like manner, they appreciate an exceptional status, the legendary measurement of which is yet another indication of the novel's faithfulness to pioneer cosmopolitanism.

Through the eyes of a storyteller "halfway amongst voyeur and witness, high craftsman and low filth" (Rushdie, Ground 13– 14), Rushdie makes a cutting edge epic that sets folklore as the setting of the ordinary, the trite and the trifling, tuned in to the considerable pioneers, T. S. Eliot and James Joyce. Be that as it may, he keeps up the fundamental harmony between myth, legend, and reality, and a feeling of epic grandness and significance of try, without definitely differentiating myth "against the social and individual no man's land in a dualistic plan of request versus scatter, of legendary request against the distancing condition of the present world" (Hoffmann 326). Or maybe, he looks for the mythic in contemporary reality, finding both set apart by clutter. Like Joyce's more esoteric Ulysses or Bellow's less unique Herzog, Rushdie's novel follows the odyssey of customary people and present day legends, with VIPs acting here like current divine beings, offering "a knowledge of the mythic, the overweening, the awesome" (Rushdie, Ground 575) inside standard human presence.

The work of folklore positively recommends a proceeding with inclination in Rushdie's work toward the postcolonial. Reviving nearby myths and legends was basic for the recuperation of cultural identity in early postcolonial works, while ensuing postcolonial literature has made this a couple of strides further. It blends indigenous folklores and adjustments of European myths not exclusively to question Western customs, support scholarly decolonization, or assist reclassify identity yet in addition to exhibit the combination of conventions normal for postcolonial societies. This is the structure in which Rushdie, from a cultural foundation that was amazingly various even before the colonial time, thinks about his cross breed folklore. Like the storyteller in his story "The Courter," he declines to pick, choosing rather to grasp and acclaim the multilayered postcolonial legacy that enriches him with what Katherine Stanton calls an international perspective regular to cosmopolitan creators, for example, Ondaatje or Coetzee (1). From such a perspective he makes through parallels and mixing a sort of folklore that is far less postcolonial than transcultural and cosmopolitan. In no basic way is this novel an adjust of any single myth since the writer reworks and joins various myths not from one specific territory but rather from over the world. Besides, folklore in *The Ground beneath Her Feet* doesn't involve cultural recovery, contestation of colonial generalizations, or redefinition of identity yet a methods for setting up a global fanciful system, maybe a legendary being in like manner, with characters, for example, Ormus Kama, an amalgam of around twelve gods and supernatural symbols of pop culture,

exemplifying the majority and ease of postmodern, postcolonial, and, all the more essentially, migrant identity. "Myths change in the brain contingent upon the telling—there is no general right form," says A. S. Byatt in a note to *Ragnarok*, and it is accurately the never-endingly moving sands of folklore beneath the peruser's feet that mirror best the regularly changing composite identity of the migrant as "the prototype figure of our age" (Rushdie, Step 356).

Relocation in the novel isn't just a postmodern or postcolonial condition—any type of movement is among the "different highlights of the recently pluralized and particularized cosmopolitanism" (Stanton 1) and essentially an unquestionable requirement in cosmopolitan fiction. Presently, on the off chance that we think about another perspective of cosmopolitanism, that which comprehends it as the result of interpretation through movement, we may consider relocation to be the gathering purpose of the postmodern, postcolonial, and cosmopolitan, which also problematizes questions of having a place, alliance, separation, and (re)attachment. As Anshuman Mondal reminds us, the migrants in *The Ground beneath Her Feet* are conceived without a feeling of having a place, so the idea of migrancy in this novel is an existential condition "joined by an inclination for 'vagrancy'" (179). This is the thing that Rai has as a main priority when he talks about those "who are essentially conceived not having a place," those "without solid connection to family or area or country or race" whose genuine, flimsy characters are "beneath the bogus skins of those personalities which bear the belongsers' seal of endorsement" (Rushdie, Ground 72– 73). We should see, be that as it may, that their predeterminations and characters are not decided exclusively by a mind-boggling feeling of separation, yet in addition, to a degree, by what Robbins calls cosmopolitan "(re)attachment, different connection, or connection at a separation" (3).

Similarly as with Malik Solanka in *Fury*, the principle heroes' separation from India in *The Ground beneath Her Feet* is related with a subdued injury (Mondal 169). For the storyteller, injury is identified with his folks' all-devouring affection for Bombay, which transforms his connection with his origin into one of contention. The sentiment claustrophobia in the city Rai encounters as the parental body—he needs to stop Wombay to be conceived—drives him over the sea to his lala land America. In spite of the fact that India does not motivate in him thoughts of home or having a place, it is an imperative basic square in his fragmentary yet composite identity, and it is available all through as a dubious, annoying sentiment wistfulness. Be that as it may, in America, "the Great Attractor" (Rushdie, Ground 100), the epicenter of the globalized world, the genuine America where he has a favored existence, and also the glorified, mythologized America of the creative ability, Rai's Indian nationality decreases in significance as he turns into an American native. He sinks his underlying

foundations into the variegated American soil, "signifying an astounding loud historyless self-concocting citizenry of clutters and perplexities" (Rushdie, Ground 252) and partaking in the making of a globalized, world culture. Not exclusively does this geographic move flag "the migration of Rushdie's inventive geology away from the Indian subcontinent," yet it ushers "a completely new idea of geopolitical space," one in which the globe is "a particular and unbreakable space without outskirts," thought about "as far as urban areas" (Mondal 169, 180).

Ormus Kama, a urgent bunch in the novel's "global media and broadcast communications coordinate with its specialist culture of big name" (Mondal 169) that regards workmanship as industry ends up being an admirer of "the genuine Metropolis" whose incarnations are Shanghai, Tokyo, Buenos Aires, Rio, and "most importantly [...] the mythical urban areas of America" (Rushdie, Ground 100), urban spaces of cosmopolitan collaboration. On his transitory course to the new focus of gravitational power England, his dad's age's fantasy land, is only a travel zone, which denotes an unequivocal takeoff from the postcolonial dyad India-England, inferring that "the center fringe aphoristic of past dominions has broken up" (Schoene 5) regardless of whether the East-West proverbial has not. Without endeavoring to find a feeling of place, Ormus encapsulates the rootlessness symptomatic of contemporary relocations halfway empowered by globalization. Based on various family injuries, this level of placelessness and transculturality is high to the point that it for all intents and purposes liberates him from all ties, with his total freedom of a particular place emblematically show in the hatchery that isolates Ormus from the world upon birth, and in addition the glass confine he later performs. He is additionally distanced by his awesome vision, which showcases the all the while halfway and twofold migrant or potentially postcolonial point of view, literalizing the possibility of in-betweenness. Ormus' distance isn't just postcolonial, however—it is one of the "types of dislodging and disengagement that are frequently connected with the development of global culture" (Leonard 3). Ormus' destiny, both as a postcolonial and a cosmopolitan, is to possess a situation in the middle of societies, clashing substances, the genuine and the fanciful. Like Guy and Arjun in Hari Kunzru's *Transmission*, Ormus is "readied to surrender to add up to cultural deracination and self-antagonism from a particular territory, which is the value one purportedly pays for global portability" (Schoene 147).

On the off chance that we are to pick one among Rushdie's numerous migrants to represent change, cultural cross-preparation, the fall of all assurances, or the assortment, shakiness, and constructedness of postcolonial and postmodern identity and additionally the liquid compositeness of cosmopolitan identity, Vina Apsara is an exceptionally sure thing. The establishment of her persistently changing self is a culturally half breed foundation, however it is the unending moving starting with one place then onto the

next, joined by a large group of family tragedies and injuries, which transforms her into "a broke down animal [...] denatured, dehistoricised, pawing at the lack of definition, attempting to make a type of check" (Rushdie, Ground 121). This is the insecure beginning stage for her gallant accomplishment of interminable self-redefinition, allegorically spoke to by a few name changes, bringing about "'Vina Apsara,' the goddess, the Galatea with whom the entire world would fall [...] in affection" (Rushdie, Ground 122). This composite cosmopolitan identity, divided yet strong, isn't absolutely a consequence of relocation or cognizant exertion for Vina's benefit but at the same time is molded by the requests of global capitalism and consumerism.

In spite of the fact that famous people in the novel are appeared to be "consummate mythologisers of themselves" (Rushdie, Ground 92), choosing and fictionalizing points of interest to appear, living the American myth of the self-made man, superstar characters are fabricated generally by the requests of the global market.

Just when it is past the point of no return will Ormus find that Standish has issued a bogus life story of his new star, imagining a blend, interwoven blanket, rainbow-coalition story of blended qualities, explaining on the times of battle in odd makes a plunge European urban areas, all around yet Hamburg (to maintain a strategic distance from the Beatles correlation). The destitution, the despondency, the conquering, the making of the completed article. (Rushdie, Ground 292)

In spite of the music business' view that fact does not offer, Vina takes a portion of reality about herself and mixes it with certainties about other people, making an array, a much-cherished symbol, as Rushdie calls it, of numerous confounded selves.

Educator Vina and Crystal Vina, Holy Vina and Profane Vina, Junkie Vina and Veggie Vina, Women's Vina and Vina the Sex Machine, Barren-Childless-Tragic Vina and Traumatized-Childhood-Tragedy Vina, Leader Vina [...] and Disciple Vina [...] She was these and that's only the tip of the iceberg, and all that she was, she pitched uncompromisingly high. (Rushdie, Ground 339)

Focusing on the mythic identity of the hotshot, Rushdie opposes "cosmopolitan portrayal's perhaps most noteworthy test" to connect "the crack between the world of globalized business, showcasing and political basic leadership [...] and its incalculable sub-worlds of feeble, disappointed day by day living" (Schoene 14). This—by the questionable principles of the globalized world—favored identity, featured through legendary parallels and painstakingly planned as an item available to be purchased ("the completed article"), appears to be pretty much similarly made out of untruths and realities in a confession booth age that deciphers Vina, who

carries on with her private life freely, as a magnified picture of the normal lady. This anticipated picture of misrepresented humankind is, incomprehensibly enough, without mankind when, at the stature of popularity, genuine Vina and Ormus nearly vanish behind the facade of their created selves, getting to be indications of their circumstances.

A comparable procedure of creation is utilized in the development of the novel's parallel substances, confounding the scattered account structure normal in cosmopolitan fiction. The structure of *The Ground beneath Her Feet* isn't the sort of account gathering with various storylines normal for David Mitchell, however it, as well, is a kaleidoscope of over a wide span of time, all over, with a scattered plot that crumples the refinement amongst certainty and fiction. To grandstand facts as interceded, developed, and controlled, Rushdie makes utilization of true to life procedures, which cosmopolitan portrayal habitually turns to (Schoene 14), and enjoys a carnivalesque play with "known" political and cultural history. On the off chance that some find in this a desire to dislodge the West's centrality—its driving music stars are people from culturally underestimated spaces—others, for example, Anshuman Mondal, caution that the very demonstration of decentering the West halfway affirms its centrality (178). In any case we comprehend it, the proposed motivation behind frolicsome historiographic metafiction in *The Ground beneath Her Feet* isn't constrained to a void confuse of facts. The writer's overwhelming worry with history, changing, the converging of fiction and history, or fictionalizing history, in the meantime stating fiction's fictionality, puts the worlds of truth and fiction against each other, with the outskirts between them giving way in ending up continuously permeable and foggy. Literally, Rushdie enlivens the "thought that the world began to end up borderless eventually towards the finish of the twentieth century" that "has turned into the stock-in-exchange of late reactions to cultural having a place" (Leonard 4). As the borderless planet "goes to war with itself" (Rushdie, *Ground* 327), the endless quakes—strict, political, social, familial, and enthusiastic—metonymically invoke a dream of across the board deterioration.

Fracture, unsteadiness, the constructedness of reality, and the confusion of fringes between the measurements of truth and fiction are additionally accentuated by methods for Rushdie's notorious otherworldly authenticity. Like Rushdie's folklore, his mysterious or mythic(al) authenticity is international, as Bruce King has recommended (141), by virtue of its entrenchment in both Eastern and Western customs. It adds to the novel's general cosmopolitanism and its particular quality is its multicultural foundation. It is neither the sole property of a specific culture nor is it "kept' in a geographic area" (Bowers 32), despite the fact that specific areas—Latin America being the most evident illustration—have been related with this mode or type. The areas it is by and large found in, as

Bowers recommends, are chiefly rustic and profoundly impacted by the political power focuses (32)—consequently its significant noteworthiness in postcolonial literature, where it every now and again has a political influence. It is widely embraced by postmodern writers of all influences—Angela Carter is among its most unmistakable experts—yet here again the postcolonial contrasts from the postmodern since postmodern accounts that are not postcolonial utilize it for political purposes less frequently, albeit all appear to abuse its subversive potential. Due to the political measurement connected to mystical authenticity, a lot of Rushdie's written work is perused as containing "figurative portrayals of specific political noteworthiness" (Bowers 28). Despite the fact that this is positively valid for *Midnight's Children* or *The Moor's Last Sigh*, *The Ground beneath Her Feet* moves away from simply postcolonial political issues to manage cultural and economic types of neoimperialism and global legislative issues.

In the inexorably globalized world of political changes, Rai, Ormus, and Vina remain politically vague and—Vina's minor endeavors at activism aside—don't act "for methodical change and change" (Stanton 3) yet are cosmopolitans in the first sense: genuine "nationals of the world" whose movements, be that as it may, never take them outside the Anglophone world. They are no less cosmopolitan for that, nor does the novel state a perspective of cosmopolitanism that Katherine Stanton cautions us against, as a solely Western marvel (2). Each of the three exemplify the cosmopolitan state of having a place not with a particular region but rather to the world, and their harried cultural compositeness is evoked by their utilization of not a postcolonial "english" but rather an exceptional "refuse lingo [...] in which a sentence could start in one language, swoop during a time and even a third and after that swing back round to the principal" (Rushdie, *Ground* 7). This flags their desire to frame their very own little group, not one that is "joined under some standard or other" (Berman 20), yet they are hesitant to "relate, shape persevering securities and make groups" (Schoene 162) outside their circle. As Schoene recommends, citing Zygmunt Bauman, this failure might be illustrative of contemporary mankind when all is said in done, yet we should not overlook that Rushdie's subaltern cosmopolitans are among the special couple of whose examples of overcoming adversity, reflecting Rushdie's own, don't mirror the lives of the lion's share. Schoene's top to bottom investigation of James Kelman's novels, which manage movement and diaspora from a completely alternate point of view, affirms the presence of "a cosmopolitanism of the underprivileged that prosecutes economic bad form and hates the nonattendance in the world of a really law based multiculturalism" (69), demonstrating that cosmopolitanism isn't "an essentially special marvel" (Stanton 2). As opposed to Schoene's conviction that "portrayal of worldwide human living and global

group" is "key to the cosmopolitan novel" (17), this cosmopolitan novel is all the more barely centered around the lives of altogether globalized selves who constitute, impel, and propagate global dissemination (99).

The three primary heroes of *The Ground beneath Her Feet* do as such as agents of the global businesses of music, war, and design and as donors in the making of a half breed global mass culture, outlining the undeniably hazardous question of having a place in a general disengagement, movement, or eradication of outskirts because of globalization. Globalization suggests a further removal of the middle/edge, at the same time, on the off chance that it is comprehended as Americanization, it sets up another inside—one that isn't admired in the novel as Rai infers that America isn't so not at all like India, and Ormus is embittered with his dream of the West (Rushdie, *Ground* 262, 270)—a middle that is really Rushdie-esque in being syncretic and heterogeneous. The predominant American culture is mongrelized, which is symbolized by hybrid music, music crossing fringes of classifications and originating from everywhere throughout the world, in this way subverting the legitimacy myth. It isn't one of the more nearby variations of shake 'n' move, for Ormus adds to its unmistakably "un-American sounds" of Cuban horns, Brazilian drums, Chilean woodwinds, African male voices, Algerian female voices, and the Pakistani qawwals (Rushdie, *Ground* 379). This is the sort of music that shakes the world of the novel, joining people one might say of group as being in like manner, demonstrating that by "crossing limits, joining numerous sorts of knowledge, [...] the cutting edge craftsman legitimizes the entire venture of society" (Rushdie, *Ground* 386). By and by, a portion of the (post)colonial pressure between the East and West remains.

In India, Rai lets us know, mainstream music is viewed as "one of those infections with which the all-powerful West has tainted the East, one of the considerable weapons of cultural colonialism" (Rushdie, *Ground*, 95) yet then goes ahead to uncover that Ormus' music

did not rise because of, or in impersonation of, America; [...] the music he heard in his mind [...] was not of the West, aside from as in the West was in Bombay from the earliest starting point, polluted old Bombay where West, East, North and South had always been scrambled, like codes, like eggs, and so Westernness was a legitimate part of Ormus, a Bombay part, inseparable from the rest of him. (Rushdie, *Ground* 95–96)

The feared reliance on the West, more particularly the United States—American culture "contaminates" the East, and prevalent music in the East is made "because of" or "in impersonation of" the United States—is the reason "OK disapproved of people" battling against it see artists, for example, Ormus Cama as "cultural double crossers" (Rushdie, *Ground*

95). On one hand, globalization as Americanization rouses fears of homogenization prompting consistency and the loss of neighborhood cultural characteristics, strengthening the feeling that we face a daily reality such that has a place with others (Maalouf 75). On the other, Rushdie recommends that globalization can improve us by putting us in contact with an assortment of societies, the vast majority of which are simply a tick away. Music is in this manner exhibited as a heterogeneous space of cultural experiences, and a majority rule one as indicated by Teverson (185–86).

Rushdie's next novel, *Fury*, is in some cases dissected nearby *The Ground beneath Her Feet*, and it changes center to the Internet as a half and half cultural space in an advanced time when culture is industry. This novel additionally denotes a "move from locally particular worries to global subjects [...] symptomatic of globalization's consistently expanding infringement on standard life" (Schoene 66). Like its topical forerunner, *Fury* is among "cultural materials [...] created by globalizing patterns" which have "subjected those patterns to investigation" (Stanton 1). It offers a study of global mass culture because of consumerism, triviality, and abundance, and also a festival of it for its chances for improvement caused by contact with a hodgepodge of societies that does not really ruin, proper, or uniform them. Solanka, the novel's wrath filled focal character, scorns the United States, where promotions offer pictures of a perfect America, and obliviousness progresses toward becoming knowledge whether went down by adequate dollars. He scrutinizes the nation's outside approach and its need to possess things, yet in the meantime he can't get away "the massive goddamn energy of America, the colossal fucking temptation of America" (Rushdie, *Fury* 68). Solanka needs to be washed in its numbness, mixed into its namelessness so he can change himself, and he is traded off by giving in. He flees from useless familial relationships, so one can declare that both *Fury* and *The Ground beneath Her Feet* rotate around a standout amongst the most clear, inquisitive mysteries of today: the separation of family as an image of filiation in a time of societies joining a global "family," with the Internet as a Foucauldian heterotopian space "in which huge numbers of impacts mix inventively and conflict progressively" (Teverson 191), an in the middle of room outside administrations that, similar to Rushdie's composition, fabricates spans.

The globalized world encapsulated in music and the Internet is a simulacrum, a world of pictures, duplicates, and echoes more grounded than the blurring reality. In *The Ground beneath Her Feet*, the world isn't occupied with the genuine Ormus or Vina however in what they remain for, and when truths are in strife, it is this present reality that breakdown, while the world of fiction survives. In *Fury*, Solanka's Frankendoll slips from the hands of her maker, turning into a "genuine" TV character, a business symbol with her own shows, films, even a diary. That we without a doubt live in a world of copies and

proliferations is recommended by such wonders as the Philippine Superman, a youthful Filipino who has experienced various excruciating surgeries to resemble his most loved hero, and by city reproductions in Vegas or by the Japanese 3D image vocalist, Hatsune Miku, at present among the best pop stars in Japan. Examining Pico Iyer's impressions of a perhaps new, at odds global cultural framework, Arjun Appadurai states that Iyer's record of, for instance, "the uncanny Philippine liking for American well known music" is declaration to the presence of "the global culture of the hyperreal" (29). Such a culture inevitably causes and sustains literature that is mongrelized, shaky, and globalized.

BY WAY OF CONCLUSION

Flimsiness and mongrelization as both state and process are among the characterizing highlights of *The Ground beneath Her Feet*, one of those works that "historicize the developments and systems of the transnational and the global, keeping their sights on the different histories of colonialism and government" (Stanton 1). As the main constants in the novel, they describe geopolitics and shape the idea of societies, countries, and socially decided ways of life as continuous procedures of getting to be. Like whatever is left of Rushdie's shape-moving exposition, *The Ground beneath Her Feet* protects the contamination it embodies against "the pernicious crawls of the oppressed smaller scale creatures" (Rushdie, *Ground* 95) caught inside the thin bounds of their envisioned "unadulterated," "real," "perpetual" worlds. It doesn't fear the duplicating common, instead of one-way, impacts propagated by globalization. In actuality, the novel commends them, taking an edge from which the music of hybridity is "not a dissonance but rather a symphony, a choir, an amazing plural voice" and attempting to indicate the ways for one see "how to make of assortment a gathering quality" (Rushdie, *Ground* 299).

The hybridity and resulting equivocation of Rushdie's work are unquestionably among its greatest attractions and enticements, as is a sure similarity to arranged frameworks as insignias of globalization and the global group since his novels are "scattered, dissonant and heteromorphic, they leave from intelligible structurality" (Leonard 42). His famously untrustworthy accounts are told by inconsistent storytellers, while the creator plays with language, literary traditions, history, and desires of assorted types in a perpetual procedure of self-questioning indicating a provisional nature of all realities. Such characteristics, among others, take into account various translations of Rushdie's fiction, which proposes that even with the unquestionable cosmopolitanism of *The Ground beneath Her Feet* or *Fury*, postmodernism and postcolonialism stay pertinent, however to a great extent depleted, interpretative focal points. To rethink Stanton's claim that "to assign a literary type as cosmopolitan [...] isn't to assert that the country is never again a practical

classification of literary investigation" (2), to characterize a novel by Rushdie as cosmopolitan isn't to state that postmodernism and postcolonialism stop to manage any hugeness in its examination. Similar to the case with every single awesome advocate of mongrelization, Rushdie makes in the middle of societies as well as in the middle of speculations and classifications of any sort, which is absolutely the in the middle of room possessed by global(ized) composing, in spite of the fact that we clearly can't utilize the term global(ized) composing without some uncertainty.

The normal dangers and perils of global(ized) literature would be universalization, homogenization, or condition. What's more, hypothetical issues of definition and classification emerge. What sort of theory would we be able to plan to apply to such literature? More neighborhood novels that arrangement with more culture-particular issues have not vanished, but rather they appear to have lost prevalence as the market's—perusers' and distributors'—premium movements toward more global(ized) works. The part of college courses must not be overlooked as consideration in the scholarly community progressively focuses on cosmopolitan and global(ized) world literature. In any case, literature with nearby flavor may not precisely be in threat of annihilation, especially in those occasions when it communicates concerns rising above the given setting. Composing managing the neighborhood may to some degree exemplify the global when, for instance, national issues in some postcolonial fiction, for example, Caryl Phillips' *The Final Passage* and *A State of Independence*, end up transnational on the off chance that they delineate the battle of numerous countries for autonomy, their issues of arranging the past and the present, or desires and reality in recently free countries. It is literature of tight spotlight on microcosms that Tim Parks has at the top of the priority list when he declares, if to some degree unreasonably, that "another Jane Austen can overlook the Nobel."

From another edge, globalization might be seen as a procedure of shared preparation and exchange among societies, yet "few people outside the world of business and economics see globalization as an especially constructive marvel" (Young 134). In his 1999 section on globalization, Rushdie says that against American notion is on the expansion—maybe much more so today than when the segment was distributed—and at the same time we ache for their cultural and different items. Rushdie's Malik Solanka encapsulates this irresolute attitude to Americanization/globalization. Globalization is often dreaded as a social fiasco that may cause the eradication of cultural assorted variety, however Rushdie makes vital inquiries that propose the certainty of cultural cross-pollination.

Do societies really exist as independent, unadulterated, faultless elements? Isn't mélange, debasement, contamination, pick 'n' blend at the core of the possibility of the cutting edge [...] ? Doesn't the possibility of unadulterated societies, in pressing need of being kept free from outsider tainting, lead us relentlessly toward politically-sanctioned racial segregation, toward ethnic purifying, around the gas load? (Rushdie, Step 268)

Obviously, we could contend that Rushdie rushes to judge globalization, or that he feels equivocal about it on the grounds that, as an internationally eminent creator, a superstar creator whose works have been converted into many languages, he benefits from it, so he doesn't see it "outside the world of business." The cosmopolitan novel can barely stay away from the commodification it endeavors to oppose, yet, as Schoene convincingly reminds us, "a cosmopolitan novel that offers does not really should offer out" (131). It is similarly persuading to guarantee that creators, for example, Rushdie are supportive of blending and exchange as a type of insubordination as far as possible we may force on literature. The imagery of his *Sea of Stories* is bolstered by the possibility that literature ought to never be bound by political, geological, cultural, or different fringes. It has never existed as a confined framework and can't remain totally unaffected by cultural, social, and political issues or different societies, however it ought not be compelled to live inside a solitary culture, or inside any single thought or belief system. In a period after the "announced end of globalism" (Saul 223), credited to an arrival to national interests—as indicated by John Ralston Saul, Colin Powell articulated globalization dead when he expressed, before the U.S. attack of Iraq, that the United States would act regardless of whether others were not set up to join—in "the post-Globalist world" (223), Salman Rushdie's oeuvre gives confirmation of literature opposing restriction and, maybe, through the immense huge number of diverse impacts, getting to be global(ized).

WORKS CITED

- "World Lite. What Is Global Literature?" *n+1* 17 (Fall 2013). 22 Apr. 2015.
<<https://nplusonemag.com/issue-17/the-intellectual-situation/world-lite/>>.
- Afzal-Khan, Fawzia (2012). "Post-Modernist Strategies of Liberation in the Works of Salman Rushdie: The Subject/Object Dialectic and Manichean Imperialism." *Journal of South Asian Literature* 23.1 (Winter/Spring 1988): 137–45. JSTOR. UC Berkeley Libraries.
- Appadurai, Arjun (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2003). "The Postcolonial and the Postmodern." *The Post-Colonial*

Studies Reader.
Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, pp. 119–24.

- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Berman, Jessica (2001). *Modernist Fiction, Cosmopolitanism, and the Politics of Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Bowers, Maggie Ann. *Magic(al) Realism*. London: Routledge.
- Brydon, Diana (2003). "The White Inuit Speaks: Contamination as Literary Strategy." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, pp. 136–42.
- Byatt, Antonia Susan (2012). *Ragnarok*. Edinburgh: Canongate.
- Dharwadker, Vinay (2001). "Introduction. Cosmopolitanism in Its Time and Place." *Cosmopolitan Geographies: New Locations in Literature and Culture*. Ed. Vinay Dharwadker. New York: Routledge, pp. 1–14.
- Domínguez, César (2012). "World Literature and Cosmopolitanism." *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*. Ed. Theo d'Haen, David Damrosch, and Djelal Kadir. New York: Routledge, pp. 242–52.
- Hoffmann, Gerhard (2005). *From Modernism to Postmodernism: Concepts and Strategies of Postmodern American Fiction*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Hutcheon, Linda (2003). "Circling the Downspout of Empire." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, pp. 130–35.
- King, Bruce (2005). *The Internationalization of English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Leonard, Philip (2014). *Literature after Globalization*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Maalouf, Amin (2000). *In the Name of Identity: Violence and the Need to Belong*. Trans. Barbara Bray. New York: Penguin.
- Mondal, Anshuman (2007). "The Ground beneath Her Feet and Fury: The Reinvention of Location." *The Cambridge Companion to*

Salman Rushdie. Ed. Abdulrazak Gurnah.
Cambridge: Cambridge UP, pp. 169–83.

Parks, Tim (2014). "The Dull New Global Novel." 9
Feb. 2010. 20 Aug. 2014.
<<http://www.nybooks.com/blogs/nyrblog/2010/feb/09/the-dull-new-global-novel/>>.

Ralston Saul, John (2009). *Collapse of Globalism and the Reinvention of the World*. Toronto: Penguin.

Robbins, Bruce (1998). "Introduction Part I: Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism." *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*. Ed. Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, pp. 1–19.

Rushdie, Salman (1991). *Midnight's Children*. New York: Penguin.

Rushdie, Salman (1997). *The Satanic Verses*. New York: Picador.

Rushdie, Salman (1999). *The Ground beneath Her Feet*. New York: Picador.

Rushdie, Salman (2002). *Fury*. London: Vintage.

Rushdie, Salman (2003). *Step across This Line*. New York: Modern Library.

Schoene, Berthold (2010). *The Cosmopolitan Novel*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.

Selden, Raman, Peter Widdowson, and Peter Brooker (2005). *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. Harlow: Pearson Longman.

Stanton, Katherine (2006). *Cosmopolitan Fictions: Ethics, Politics, and Global Change in the Works of Kazuo Ishiguro, Michael Ondaatje, Jamaica Kincaid, and J. M. Coetzee*. New York: Routledge.

Teverson, Andrew (2007). *Salman Rushdie*. Manchester: Manchester UP.

Young, Robert J. C. (2003). *Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Corresponding Author

Mahesh Kumar*

Research Scholar, English, Department of English,
CMJ University, Meghalaya

E-Mail – maheshdbi76@gmail.com