Familiar Strangers: the shock of otherness in domestic environments with two of Salman Rushdie's novels

Chargée de cours, dr. Isabela Merilă
Maître assistante, dr. Lidia Necula
Université "Dunărea de Jos" de Galați, Roumanie

***Résumé**: De plus en plus fréquemment, l'autre (l'altérité) est relié à ce qu'il est écarté, exotique, et culturellement dissemblable. Cependant, la sociologie a toujours confirmé que la rencontre avec l'autre peut se dérouler dans l'espace de la famille même.* Midnight's Children *et* Shame *par Salman Rushdie sont de bons exemples littéraires de telles représentations permutables qui influencent la narration même.*

***Mots-clés:** l'autre, famille, genre, représentation*

Otherness has been associated for a long time with the far away places, the clash of cultures and with the sense of nationality. However, articles such as those written by Ron Shapiro [1] or Akhil Gupta [2] state the need to change the perceptions and re-evaluate the concept of otherness. This perspective goes along with the realisation that the shock of otherness seems to come at its strongest with the discovery of the strangeness of persons to whom we have ascribed a whole, well-determined identity, and who inhabit our familiar universe. An equal shock may result from the discovery of our own otherness in varied circumstances. Some situations that lead to the perception of the strange where we assumed the presence of the familiar may be: the perception of a known person in new or unexpected circumstances; one's own displacement from the usual surroundings, like moving to another country; an inner psychological event that leads to a change in perspectives; one's sense of centrality being challenged by other perceptions or by the confrontation with the immensity of the universe, for one. The reactions to these discoveries are usually anger, disappointment, rejection, isolation, or, on a lower key, surprise, re-evaluation, embarrassment, fear.

While the confrontation with the impossibility of eliminating the shock of otherness may give rise to frustration and anger, we would like to think that it is also a source of mystery, intrigue, curiosity which may entice learning, discovering and re-conceptualizing. After all, "if all were the same, we would, in fact, be not much different from a throng of egos engaged only in the pursuit of food, mates, safety, and power but devoid of selves" [3]

Large families are of the greatest importance in Salman Rushdie's fiction, hosting representations that sit at the intersection of all coordinates of otherness and can accordingly provide various examples for the subject matter.

Families, more than perhaps any other group of individuals, start from the assumption of sameness. Expressions like 'blood is thicker than water' stand for the belief that blood relations entail a union of forces against anything life has to offer. Taking for granted that members of a family inhabit the same world and exist towards the same ends provides a feeling of equilibrium and harmony. Everything that is strange is assumed away. However, expressions like 'the black sheep of the family' point at the awareness of a difference that may exist within the household. As a consequence, although it is the basis for the definitions an individual gives to 'familiarity' and the norm, the world of family ties can also become restrictive. This is the case, for example, of teenage individuals who become a more active part of society and who, due to various interactions, are confronted with their parents' otherness.

As far as Salman Rushdie's work is concerned, we choose to refer to the large groups that populate *Shame* and *Midnight's Children*. They are composed of multitudes of characters and personalities, whose voices are heard due to the insightful telling of the narrator-character, fact which gives a somewhat kaleidoscopic aspect to the novels. The areas in focus are mostly: the relationship between men and women in general, and husband and wife in particular; the perceptions of and interaction between different religions – especially Muslim and Hindu; the relation between people of different races. As far as the first one is concerned,

Midnight's Children constructs several a number of interesting female characters, caught in the confrontation between modern ideals and traditional values, in the choice between platonic love and marital life. Within the second, there are scenes of members of the family, who are, more often than not, Muslim, getting caught in the middle of the struggle to create a state as pure or rather as uniform as possible and thus being driven out of their homes or being forced into fixed patterns of behaviour, into political-religious prisons. The third area registers scenes that are mostly relevant from a postcolonial perspective.

In the selected novels, family can be seen as a microscopic version of a community. Thus, patterns of thought discernible at the general level of society can be observed as affecting the family circle. The following paragraphs are concerned with the interaction between the family and the individual with a stress on how the latter can be revealed or isolated as 'other' even within such structures based on the assumption of 'sameness'.

In *Midnight's Children* we see how cultural otherness can be 'contagious'. The experience of Aadam Aziz while studying in Germany, together with his loss of faith, influences his marriage with traditionalist Naseem, as well as the development of his children, who share the attributes of both parents. The reader is made aware of this in the character of Saleem Sinai's mother.

Amina Sinai or Mumtaz Aziz is rather a result of a marriage, literal and psychological, of two sets of cultural ideologies. She can both relate to the demands of a capitalized society and resonate to the rhythm of a mythical world, although she eventually becomes dominated by the second. It is Aadam's liberal ideas that determine Amina, his daughter, to save a Hindu from death by lynching at the hands of Muslim mobs. And it is Naseem's superstitious nature that makes her accept to go and see a man who is to prophesize about the coming of her son. Therefore, her parents' past influences her future choices. She seems to be brought up according to the image of the modern Indian woman her mother refused to be. However, this status is not very much different from the traditional one.

Her first marriage is indeed her own choice and is based on mutual love, but she is forced out of it by her parents, who discover that it does not correspond to their standards. The name of the groom is Nadir Khan and he is hidden in a room under the house of the Sinais from political adversaries who sent assassins on his trail. It is sweet Mumtaz who brings him food and takes care of him, and the love that springs between them is purely platonic. It is interesting to see how the reason Padma, the narratee, voices might very well by the reason why the girl's parents agree to the marriage: "'Poor girl', Padma concludes, 'Kashmiri girls are normally fair like mountain snow, but she turned out black. Well, well, her skin would have stopped her making a good match, probably; and that Nadir's no fool. Now they'll have to let him stay, and get fed, and get a roof over his head, and all he has to do is hide like a fat earthworm under the ground. Yes, maybe he's not such a fool.'" [4]

Besides the pitying tone which shows that in Padma's opinion having a darker skin is a great misfortune, we are given another assessment: it cannot be love; it must be some scheme of Nadir's to ensure his safety. The turn of the events prove her wrong, however, when Mumtaz is chosen by her second husband over her sister, Alia, thus alienating the two for the rest of their lives.

Padma is not the only person to consider darker skin a disadvantage. Take, for instance, the remark of Ahmed's cousin, Zohra, with reference to race: "How awful to be black, cousinji, to wake every morning and see it staring at you, in the mirror to be shown proof of your inferiority. Of course they know; even blackies know white is nicer, don'tyouthinkso?"[5] Since the perspective from which the moment is narrated belongs to the 'blackie' wife of Ahmed, Amina Sinai, this statement, besides striking as inappropriate, is immediately portrayed as worthy of contempt.

It may be a proof of the influence the colonial set of values had on the society and indicate the fact that return is impossible, that the contamination exists; the colonizers will be present even after they are gone and people like Amina will continue to live in the prison that

others build for those of her race. However, since varieties in the colour of skin exist when passing from one geographical area of India to another (Kashmiri girls are usually white, Padma says), we think that Zohra's words might rather be seen as proof that racism is not a European invention.

A similar dual interpretation to an incident connected to the colour of the skin may be provided in Ahmed's case. He seems to have the regret of not corresponding to a Western set of values, or, as we said, he might be marked by a preference inherent in Indian patterns of thought. At any rate, he keeps his opinions secret and reveals them only under special circumstances. When he starts to 'become whiter' with every day, he pretends for a while to be worried and consults doctors for a cure, only to admit later his long term envy of the Europeans for their pigmentation, since "All the best people are white under the skin; I have merely given up pretending" [6]. Since his bragging is done in the presence of his not so white neighbours and friends, his words also are revealed as embarrassing and limited. Nevertheless, there is a scene in the novel that may support the suspicion that his reaction does indeed have something to do with the colonial presence. We are referring to his encounter with William Methwold, the Englishman who sells his villas to Indian families – the area's name remains 'the Methwold Estate' even after his leaving Bombay. In Ahmed's conversations with Methwold, the former brags at a certain point that he is an actual descendant of the Mughals.

> Tales of the first Methwold, who had dreamed the city into existence, filled the evening air in that penultimate sunset. And my father – apeing Oxford drawl, anxious to impress the departing Englishman – responded with, 'Actually, old chap, ours is a pretty distinguished family, too.' […] Ahmed Sinai, lubricated by whiskey, driven on by self-importance, warms to his theme. 'Mughal blood, as a mater of fact.' To which Methwold, 'No! Really? You're pulling my leg.' And Ahmed, beyond the point of no return, is obliged to press on. 'Wrong side of the blanket, of course; but Mughal, certainly.' [7]

In this case, the status of centre belongs to Western civilizations and the subscription to its points of view becomes obvious. Although living in a post-colonial society, one which is supposed to have been liberated from the previous, imposed evaluations, Ahmed bears the mark of the colonized longing to accede to the status of colonizer. The desire to be accepted and acknowledged as an individual by the authoritarian other may be seen as being determined by the quest for a stable sense of identity and power. The fact that this is a general attitude at the level of the society is described by Rushdie with his characteristic irony:

> All over India, I stumbled across good Indian businessmen […] who had become or were becoming very, very pale indeed! It seems that the gargantuan (even heroic) efforts involved in taking over from the British and becoming masters of their own destinies had drained the colour from their cheeks…in which case, perhaps my father was a late victim of a widespread, though generally unremarked phenomenon. The businessmen of India were turning white. [8]

The case somehow resembles the story of Kronos and his automatons from the novel Fury. When the enforced strings are gone, will the former puppets find the courage and the power to look for a road to define them, or will they just become copies of their previous leaders?

When the confrontation with the external otherness disappears, one discovers the internal otherness instead and a new confrontation begins. Accordingly, one of the basic concepts of Midnight's Children is that there is no such thing as identity, if this is perceived as standing for unity, wholeness. There's only a multitude of inner voices and masks that have correspondents in the multitude of interests, nationalities, races, religions, traditions, gender relations, etc in society. Any attempt at achieving something else will lead to the creation of prisons, of limits that should not be there and which eventually fail their purpose.

At the level of the family, Mumtaz is confronted with the limits of her own freedom when her marriage is evaluated by her parents. She is not asked whether it is her wish to get a divorce or not; the generally accepted, traditional laws of marriage have not been respected, therefore

nothing more needs to be said: Mumtaz is to leave her husband although she is in love with him.

The incident is interesting, on the one hand, for the parallel that can be made between the behaviour of the parents towards their daughter – who is by now a married adult woman – but whom they choose to treat as a child, and one of the typical descriptions of the colonized by the colonizers as being incapable of self-governing. Just as the colonizing authority made decisions in the name of the people they held under control, Naseena's parents decide that her marriage is unsound and dissolve it. It is one sign of the woman's limited freedom, a situation which will only continue within her second marriage.

She is given a new identity, a new name when she marries for the second time, Mumtaz being exchanged for Amina, which confers upon her husband the status of parent as well, thus the continuation of her position as a child.

> 'Change your name,' Ahmed Sinai said. 'Time for a fresh start. Throw Mumtaz and her Nadir Khan out of the window, I'll choose you a new name. Amina. Amina Sinai: you'd like that?'
> 'Whatever you say, husband,' my mother said. [9]

Her answer is 'the proper' one and induces a sense of security and authority in the husband, which is the root of his later surprise and disbelief at his wife's 'change into someone other than she was'. Mumtaz's reaction to the changes is complex. On the one hand, she sees this identification dark-inferior as a judgement without foundation and she is upset by the role she has to play as a doubly disadvantaged person – a woman with dark skin – in the relationship with her husband. Nevertheless, the rules of conduct for a wife that are instilled in her prevent her from voicing her displeasure.

Besides being bothered by racial discrimination, coming from different members of the clan, she also feels oppressed by the common association of the woman with the passive principle. She depends on her husband financially and she is forced to make use of flattery and sensuality in order to obtain the money needed for the proper keeping of the house: "Ahmed Sinai liked to be asked nicely for money, to have it wheeled out of him with caresses and sweet words until his table napkin began to rise in his lap as something moved in his pyjamas; and she didn't mind, with her assiduity she learned to love this also…the techniques of the street beggars and she would have to do it in front of that one with her saucer eyes and giggly voice and loud chat about blackies." [10] The sudden change of narratorial voice shows the fact that Amina actually does mind and that she feels humiliated.

Still, as a 'good wife', she follows, without her knowledge, the same ritual of the perforated sheet her parents used. She wills herself into loving Ahmed Sinai piece by piece, learning to cherish each part of him at a time: "she began to train herself to love him. To do this she divided him, mentally, into every single one of his composing parts, physical as well as behavioural […] in short, she fell under the spell of the perforated sheet of her own parents, because she resolved to fall in love with her husband bit by bit." [11]

Zohra's voice and the parents' perceptions are only two examples of the effect the opinions and reactions of the close ones can have on one's own perspective and on the life of a couple. Another example, and one probably worthy of Scheherazade's tales, is included in Shame. The fact that family dynamics are central in the events of the novel is revealed from the first. Even before starting his tale, the narrator presents one with a genealogy of the families participating in the plot. On this background, Raza Hyder and Bilquis' first encounter could very well be soap-opera material: she is involved in an explosion - he is a soldier, she is completely naked and numb - he comes to the rescue (not on a white horse, though). Bilquis is so determined to have her fairy-tale, that she will not be bothered with the origin of the subsequent gifts of clothing she receives from Raza (the bodies of the people killed during the Partition). She also imagines their journey to a new country and a new home to go along these lines. However, displacement brings otherness, and Bilquis sees herself forced to integrate into a house full of relatives under the imperious gaze of Bariamma ('Great/Big Mother' -

grandmother). There are three main events that mark the young wife's fall into disgrace and final exclusion from the family as a complete and undesirable other.

The first event is connected to a ritual instated in Bariamma's house, grounded in the taboo of sexuality:

> the mere fact of being married did not absolve a woman of the shame and dishonour that results from the knowledge that she sleeps regularly with a man; which was why Bariamma had devised, without once discussing it, the idea of the forty thieves. And of course, all the women denied that anything of 'that nature' ever took place, so that when pregnancies occurred they did so as if by magic, as if all conceptions were immaculate and all births virgin. The idea of parthenogenesis had been accepted in this house in order to keep out certain other, unpleasantly physical notions. [12]

Bilquis thinks of the habit as backward and ridiculous but is faced for the first time with her husband's otherness, when he is unwilling to agree with her or do anything about it. Since she cannot hide her disapproval completely, this is also one of the first reasons for friction with the rest of the clan.

A second step is taken due to the nature of the language, which has a distinct word for each type of family relation. No easy escape with 'uncle', since there are terms that change according to the order of birth, the mother or father line, the rank of relation etc. Bilquis tries to get the appellatives right, but she fails most times, her ignorance being considered insulting. Accordingly, "Bilquis's tongue was silenced by the in-law mob. She virtually never spoke, except when alone with Rani or Raza; and thus acquired the triple reputation of sweet-innocent-child, doormat and fool." [13]

The final break comes from the fact that her first child is still-born, something which alienates her in the eyes of her husband as well. Her way to escape this othering is by convincing her husband to find a house of their own.

The way Amina finds to mediate between what she felt as domineering tendencies and wifely duties is also moving to a new home, combined with the addition of a new member to the family: a child.

With the arrival of the child, Ahmed sees himself pushed from a position of authority to a marginal one. The baby-boy is used by his mother as a means of demanding money for the house: "with my birth, everything changed for Ahmed Sinai, his position in the household was undermined by my coming. Suddenly Amina's assiduity had acquired different goals; she never wheedled money out of him any more. […] Now it was, 'Your son needs so-and-so,' or 'Janum, you must give money for such and such.' Bad show, Ahmed Sinai thought. My father was a self-important man." [14] Considering that the birth of Sufiya Zinobia brings shame on her parents and more especially to her mother, one must assume that the position of power Amina gains after the birth of her child is due to the fact that the latter is a boy. Leaving aside Freudian implications of the event, we would like to focus at this point on the relationship between brother and sister as another mark of the shifting perspectives within the family based on ideas of 'sameness' and 'difference'.

Saleem starts from a privileged standing within the clan, since male children are seen as keepers of the name and are raised as representatives of their family in society. Because her brother gets all the attention, the Brass Monkey, as she is nicknamed because of the colour of her hair, feels compelled, the narrator explains, to draw attention any way she can, more often that not, by mischief (monkey business). When Saleem is revealed as not a Sinai by blood, roles change. After the family's relocation to Pakistan, she is known by her name, to which she adds a social distinction by becoming the voice of the country: Jamila, the Singer. And although Saleem's family tries to entertain the thought that the boy is still part of the family, the shock of his otherness was so strong that they can never truly see him as one of 'us' again; or he them, for that matter. The illusion mentioned in the beginning of the sub-chapter as standing at the basis of a family was broken there is no going back.

Perhaps aware of the importance such illusions play in a marriage, Amina is sure to hide her own efficiency in financial matters from her husband or from too many outsiders,

because it would be perceived as castrating. When all their assets are frozen and Ahmed is more and more taken by his preoccupation with whisky and djinn, Amina decides to take things into her hands – not without a sense of guilt for doing something inappropriate. She manages to take her family out of the financial trouble, but she is determined to keep her involvement a secret since "a man must keep his pride." [15]

Therefore, the guilt and responsibility Saleem feels whenever something bad happens around him does not affect only him. Elsewhere [16], we rested upon the effects that the clash between the reality principle and the pleasure principle may have on the individual, as exemplified in Shame, but we only dealt with the rules society at large devises for its members. One may say that a similar process takes place at the level of the family.

Due to the influence of Reverend Mother and her views on sin, Amina is overwhelmed by guilt and "it was not difficult for her to think of verrucas as a punishment… not only for her years ago escapade at Mahalaxmi, but for failing to save her husband from the pink chitties of alcoholism; for the Brass Monkey's untamed, unfeminine ways; and for the size of her only son's nose." [17] It seems like Fay Weldon's Superwoman complex is not reserved for the women inhabiting Cosmopolitan ridden circles.

What perhaps makes Amina feel most guilty is her continuing affection for her first husband. While her second husband 'turns white', she 'turns black' under the weight of culpability. This particular conflict within her is solved when her husband has a heart attack and she is there to restore him to health. Perhaps as a compensation for the break with her son, Amina falls in love with her husband, and he with her.

Family relations are complex, and, as we have seen, the game has a different set of rules for each group. These rules can be broken or adapted, but always with care and sometimes with tragic results. One of the basic mechanisms of family life seems to be interaction, within it or with the exterior. Having to accommodate and find a common ground for the views and ways of two people is difficult; the more so when dealing with whole 'clans.' The assumption of sameness appears to be under more strain than ever within such numerous groups, and otherness is always lurking in the corner.

Perhaps that is why authority is of great importance for the gatherings of Shame and Midnight's Children. It is interesting to notice how the most powerful voices in this context are two women: Bariamma and the Reverend Mother. It corresponds to some of the Indian traditions that regard the oldest woman in the family as the keeper of the family spirit and wisdom to be held in the highest respect (especially if she's a widow as it is Bariamma's case). Being acknowledged as part of the family by their voices is of great importance. Saleem finds this out after his first exile, when he returns home and finds his place 'usurped' and his family turned cold. It is his grandmother's recognition of his belonging to the Sinais that brings back a sense of normality into everyday life. Due to her acceptance, he is less an 'other' than before. The reverse side of the coin is experienced by Bilquis in Bariamma's house.

Next in authority seem to be the parents, who can also pass judgements on what is norm and what is deviance. The case of Mumtaz is such an example. But it is not only parents who pass judgements on their children. The reverse process can sometimes have as much power. In Midnight's Children, one is given a hint about this by observing Saleem's trail of thought while spying on his mother's phone conversations and then meetings with another man (Nadir Khan, her first husband). The actions he takes against what he sees as his mother's betrayal are less violent for the mother as they are on others: he causes a scandal on the Methwold Estate by slipping a letter to Commander Sabarmati about his wife's affair. The result is the death of the wife and her lover plus Amina's decision to stop seeing Nadir.

A more direct approach is taken by Arjumand Harappa with regards to her mother in Shame. Rani Humayun marries Iskander Harappa to escape Bariamma's domain but ends up in another 'prison', where she cannot be queen, despite that being her name. "Never mind all that, lady, in this house it's still what Isky's ayah says."[18], the servants are quick to inform

her. There she is left, while Iskander fights his way into becoming President and takes his daughter, Arjumand, along with him. He is idolized by her and will hear nothing bad about him, not even when it comes from her mother, who thus becomes twice estranged. The fact that Iskander is killed and the two women are forced to share house-confinement does not help to bring them together, but seems to deepen their differences. When the power plays back into Arjumand's hands and she is decided to rebuild her father's 'dream', she decides to keep her mother in the same state of confinement as before, demonstrating that children's views of what is right and wrong can become as oppressive as those of the parents.

Impressive in number of members, marked by accomplishments and failures, being oppressive or comforting, the families of Shame and Midnight's Children play a very important role in the development of the individual. To ponder on this is one of the very characters whose origin is veiled in mystery. Omar – who is the son of three mothers and no father, who is not allowed to feel shame, who is a marginal character of his own story, while Shame, politics and history carry him in one direction or another – seems to be most concerned with the importance of genealogy.

> Once, during the time of his drinking and carousing friendship with Iskander Harappa, millionaire play-boy, radical thinker, Prime Minister and finally miracle-working corpse, Omar Khayyam in his cups described himself to Isky; 'You see before you,' he confided, 'a fellow who is not even the hero of his own life; a man born and raised in the condition of being out of things. Heredity counts, dontyouthinkso?'
> 'That is an oppressive notion,' Iskander Harappa replied. [19]

Omar's reaction might issue from his wish to find an identity for himself that would enable him to feel whole, in other words, to feel that he is the protagonist of his story, that he holds the threads. It seems to be his belief that such an identity can only be found within a past that he does not know, within the genetic code that was transferred to him. Isky's reply seems to state that this is only another way of accepting some pre-determined self, therefore, another prison. Harappa's current and later behaviour shows that, in his opinion, we are in charge of who we are and who we become. History proves him wrong. As Saleem says: "no escape from past acquaintance. What you were is forever who you are." [20]

However, to say that family shapes the individual's future interactions with society, what they sense as normal or strange in their future encounters, would be, we believe, telling half the story. Parents bring their life experience besides their early education into the formation of their own family and families do not normally develop outside social interactions. Therefore, the feed-back is always there. Events outside the intimate circle influence or change the perceptions those within it have of each other. The result for the individual is the one contained in the end of Midnight's Children and in the metaphor of the chutney jars. In the beginning of Saleem's tale, the jar is empty, but by the end of it, thirty and one jars sit full on his shelf and he filled them with ingredients and spice, trying to put a bit of order into his experiences, while keeping their diversity. And since 'chutney' means 'to crush into powder', he must now disperse into the crowds he also contains:

> I am the bomb in Bombay, watch me explode, bones splitting, breaking beneath the awful pressure of the crowd, bag of bones falling down down down, just as once as Jallianwala, but Dyer seems not to be present today, no Mercurochrome, only a broken creature spilling pieces of itself into the street, because I have been so-many too-many persons, life unlike syntax allows more than three, and at last somewhere the striking of a clock, twelve chimes, release. [21]

Notes

[1] Shapiro, Ron, "In Defence of Exoticism: Rescuing the Literary Imagination." 'New Exoticisms'. Changing Patterns in the Construction of Otherness, Ed. Isabel Santaolalla, Rodopi, Amsterdam-Atlanta 2000: 41-9
[2] Gupta, Akhil; James Ferguson, "Beyond 'Culture': Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference." Cultural Anthropology Vol. 7 No. 1 (Feb., 1992): 6-23

[3] Gurevitch, Z. D., "The Other Side of Dialogue: On Making the Other Strange and the Experience of Otherness," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 93, No. 5 (Mar., 1988), pp. 1180
[4] Rushdie, S., *Midnight's Children*, Pan Books, London, 1982, p. 57
[5] Idem, p. 69
[6] Idem, p. 179
[7] Idem, p. 110
[8] Idem, p. 179
[9] Idem, p. 64
[10] Idem, p. 70
[11] Idem, p. 68
[12] Rushdie, S., *Shame*, Pan Books, London, 1984, p. 74
[13] Idem, p. 75
[14] Rushdie, S. *Midnight's Children*, p. 131
[15] Idem, p. 144
[16] see Isabela Merilă "Sufiya Zinobia and the Reflexions of the Psyche," Comunicare interculturala si literatura, nr.4 (8), 2009, pp 243-246, Editura Europlus, Galati, ISSN 1844-6965, Modern Language Association: www.mla.org si Fabula. La recherche en litterature: www.fabula.org
[17] Rushdie, S. *Midnight's Children*, p. 158
[18] Rushdie, S., *Shame*, p. 94
[19] Idem, p. 24
[20] Rushdie, S. *Midnight's Children*, p. 368
[21] Idem, p. 463

Bibliography

Gupta, Akhil; James Ferguson, "Beyond 'Culture': Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference." Cultural Anthropology Vol. 7 No. 1 (Feb., 1992): 6-23
Gurevitch, Z. D., "The Other Side of Dialogue: On Making the Other Strange and the Experience of Otherness." The American Journal of Sociology Vol. 93 No. 5 (Mar., 1988): 1179-1199
Rushdie, Salman, *Midnight's Children*, Pan Books, London, 1982
--- *Shame*, Pan Books, London, 1984
Shapiro, Ron, "In Defence of Exoticism: Rescuing the Literary Imagination." 'New Exoticisms'. Changing Patterns in the Construction of Otherness, Ed. Isabel Santaolalla, Rodopi, Amsterdam-Atlanta 2000: 41-9