

**People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English**



Domain: Foreign Languages

Branch: English Language

Option: Comparative Literature

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master in English**

Title:

**Political Violence in Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* (1985)
and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005).**

Presented by:

Supervised by: Mr. KHOUDI Med Lamine.

SOUAD BOUHALA.

OUAHIBA MEHIDI

Board of Examiners:

Mr. KHOUDI Med Amine, M.A.A, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou:

Supervisor.

Mrs. BEDRANI Ghalia, M.A.A, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou:

Examiner.

Mrs. BENSABI Hassiba, M.A.A, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou: Chair.

Academic Year : 2018/2019

I dedicate this present research work to my family: father and mother for their guidance and encouragement. My sisters: Amina, Ouzena, zazie and Celia and my two brothers. My nephew Younes, and niece Alicia. To my cousins, especially Kamelia who helped me during this work. To my aunts and my friends: Henia, zina and Celia.

Souad Bouhala

I dedicate this work to my family: to the soul of my father, to my mother and husband Khaled, my daughter Melissa, sons: Nacer and Akli. To my sister and brothers who provides me support and encouragements. I'm grateful for the support of my uncle Mr. Dendani Smail who constantly provides me precious instructions and constructive feedbacks.

Ouahiba Mehidi

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our sincere gratitude, appreciation, and respect to our supervisor Mr. Khoudi; we are deeply indebted to him for his guidance and help from the beginning until the achievement of this modest dissertation.

We are thankful to the teachers of the English Department, Faculty of Letters and Languages, Mouloud Mammeri's University of Tizi Ouzou.

Contents

Dedications	I
Acknowledgments	II
Contents	III
Abstract.....	IV
I. Introduction	1
1. Review of the Literature	3
2. Issue and Working Hypothesis	7
II. Method and Materials	
a) Theoretical Sources	8
b) Summaries of the Two Novels	9
c) Methodological Outline	11
III. Results	
IV. Discussion	14
1. Chapter One: Sources of Political Violence in <i>The Good Terrorist</i> (1985) and <i>Shalimar the Clown</i> (2005)	
A. Social poverty	15
B. Loss of Identity	23
C. Psychological troubles	29
2. Chapter Two: The Use of Political Violence in Doris Lessing's <i>The Good Terrorist</i> and Salman Rushdie's <i>Shalimar the Clown</i> .	
A. Individual and Group Relative Deprivation	39
B. Terror	48
V. General Conclusion	59
VI. Bibliography	61

Abstract

This work is a comparative study of two novels: Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* (1985) and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005). Our research has dealt with the theme of political violence that is illustrated in the selected works. The main purpose of this study is to point out that the two authors share some similarities in the theme of political violence, but they differ at the level of the setting and history. Relying on the theory of Relative Deprivation; we attempt to establish some affinities between the two works. For instance, both novel's central characters experience social deprivation. After the analyses of the two texts, we have concluded that poverty, identity, and psychological problems are the main sources that draw the characters of both novels to political violence. In addition, we have found that political violence have been used by individuals and groups' experiencing deprivation to reach their desire of justice, status, revenge, and wealth. They endured the act of violence to make a radical change to get rid of all the oppressions and atrocities. Lessing and Rushdie dealt with an event that had influenced them in their lives. Lessing writes about the IRA bombing of the Harrods department store in London and Rushdie writes about the 9/11 attacks in America. They have demonstrated the shift of individual figures socially deprived and dissatisfied, it is the facts that lead them to adhere into political and terrorist groups in order to reach their goals and live in an equitable environment. The two novels are lucid portraits of the modern societies that suffer from oppression and corruption

Key words: *The Good Terrorist*, *Shalimar the Clown*, Relative Deprivation, political violence, social poverty, oppression, terror, justice.

I. Introduction

The following research is a comparative study between Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* (1985) and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005). The two novels analyze the issue of political violence in two different backgrounds. Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* is a political and social struggle of change against the British capitalism; whereas, Rushdie writes *Shalimar The Clown* in order to explain the degeneration of Kashmir from peace to violence. The two authors are inspired by two historical events: the IRA (Irish Republican Army) bombing of the Harrods Department Store in London 1983 for Lessing's *The Good Terrorist*, and the 9/11 attacks in America for Rushdie's *Shalimar The Clown*. Both novels investigate the issue of violence.

The former is used in order to achieve personal, political, and social goals. Violence existed as a phenomenon since ancient times; it has undergone considerable philosophical analyses. Violence originates from "The Latin word *violentia*", which in turn implies an intense force. Etymologically speaking violence is: "akin to violate thus is suggestive of damage and destruction that would characterize a different storm or a traumatic experience such as war, rape and terrorism."¹ Therefore, violence denotes injury and violation involving people or property.

In recent years, scholars like: Hannah Arendt, Veronica Roth, and William Golding...etc, have taken an immense interest in issues concerning violence from different perspectives. The Twentieth Century has appropriately been defined as the long century of violence. The concept of violence has interested philosophers, psychologists, and artists; it is only in this period that it has gained currency in most cultural discourses; perhaps this is owing to the exponential increase in the incidence of violence in the modern period. Social thinkers have lately turned their attention to its moral and cultural justifiability as a means to achieve personal, social, or political ends.

Possible sources of violence involving constraints that abuse people psychologically or physically are originated from economic problems, oppression, sexism, identity crisis, ethnic, religious persecution, and political oppression that is considered as the main reason that draw people to act violently.²

Individual's life conditions such as politics, economy, and social problem are the main reasons that encourage people to practice violence. Power and human's deprivation press people to political violence as defined by the ACLED (armed conflict location and event data): "A politically violent event is a single altercation where often force is used by one or more groups to a political end, although some instances including protests and nonviolent activity are included in the dataset to capture the potential pre-cursors or critical junctures of a conflict."³

Political violence often takes the form of asynchronous warfare (indefinite period of war) where neither side is able to directly assault the other, instead relying on tactics such as guerilla, warfare, and terrorism. In this regard, Robert Kumamoto (1999) states that: "terrorism may be defined as the use of violence by individuals or groups for political purposes acting against the illegalities of a government."⁴ Moreover, Bruce Hoffman (2006) states that terrorism is: "Fundamentally and inherently political, it is ineluctably about power: the pursuit of power, acquisition of power, and the use of power to achieve political change. Terrorism is thus violence or, equally important, the threat of violence used and directed in pursuit of, or in service of, a political aim."⁵ According to Bruce Hoffman, terrorism is the use of political violence to reach power.

In addition, our study investigates the two novels; Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* are good examples that show how ordinary individuals turn to the use of violence. Both authors show from the novels their societies that experience hard life and oppression. The events that have influenced the two authors are: the

bombing of the Harrods's department store in London in 1983, and the attacks of 9/11. *Shalimar The Clown* is set in Kashmir a region located between Pakistan and India, where society that degenerated from a heaven of tolerance and peace to a hotbed of extremism and fundamentalist violence; however, in Lessing's *The Good Terrorist*, London society is surrounded by the extremist capitalism, communist force ...etc. The novel is about a group of squatters that experience difficult life where capitalism is the ruling system. Social figures manifest to improve their lives unfortunately, this resulted on terror. Both novels share the same expression about destruction and violence.

1. Review of the Literature

Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* (1985) and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005) have received a large bulk of criticism. To start with Lessing's novel, Margaret Scanlan studies it from the standpoint of the unimportance of language in her research: *Language and Politics of Despair* (1990). Before introducing the language, Scanlan states first that the reason of writing on the subject of terrorism is related to the author's political troubles. So, events of terror influence novelists to write. This is the case of Doris Lessing who is inspired by the IRA (Irish Republican Army) bombing of the Harrods Department in London 1983. Margaret refers to Richard E. Rubenstein (1987), a political scientist and author of nine books about various types of violent social conflicts, in order to justify terrorist's despair on the unimportance of language. In this perspective, Rubenstein explains that: "Most start out attempting to communicate their programs in speeches and manifestos yet when their words go unheeded; they turn to actions meant to speak louder".⁶

The idea of Rubenstein is also introduced by the founder of Russian terrorism Sergey Nechayev who says: "*We have lost all faith in words.*"⁷ In this sense, Margaret asserts that language used by

the terrorists is related to their anxieties. She notes that what matters to Lessing is the terrorist's choice of action rather than words, and it is only him who is despaired by the inutility of words. Therefore, terrorists speak via acts. Margaret affirms that terrorism turns to bombs because words do not speak loudly enough; hence, novelists choose language to share the terrorists' suspicion of language.

Another criticism undertaken by Ester Gendusa, which is entitled "*Fiction Literature As Commitment*". In the section entitled *Between the Science Fiction and Realistic Phase, Shifting Forms of Social Criticism* (2014). According to Gendusa, Lessing shifts from writing on science fiction to the realistic phase. For this reason, she states that Lessing focuses on social issues, and she continues to expose the underside of oppression and injustice. She declares that Lessing is writing to defend the communist cause, which is close to her heart since she was a communist member. So, the novel is considered as a fiction of commitment, where, she presents the world of terrorists and the causes to such actions. In *The Good Terrorist*, she defends political and social causes, and denounces a situation of feminine political action (the communist protagonist Alice) and commitment of terrorism.⁸

Gillian Bright (2015) in his philosophical criticism, *The Aesthetic of Terrorist Violence in Joseph Conrad's The Secret Agent; Paul Theroux's The Family Arsenal and Doris Lessing's The Good Terrorist*, Bright argues that Lessing and Paul Theroux are inspired by *The Secret Agent*, so there is intertextuality between the three novels. Theroux's and Lessing's novels, take on Conrad's themes and tropes while responding to a general idea of terrorism that is related to anarchism and generally concerned with communist groups or acts of violence associated with the IRA. Lessing follows the same path as Theroux and Conrad by problematizing the role of imagination in relation to terrorists. The three authors share a common subject matter of the art of terrorism; they developed the same themes and the same symbols like the bombing and the house

of domesticity. These three novels, share the same effectiveness and aesthetic of terrorism. However, terrorists have their art related to their experience of madness, surrounding, and suffering like the author. Authors who describe the terrorists' aesthetic acts with talents and tactics. As it is stated in the novel the terrorist reads the local magazine just like the author when he looks for his journal review. The terrorist is described as being an author.⁹

On the other side, Rushdie's novel *Shalimar The Clown* has also received a considerable attention from many critics. One of them is taken from a literary journal of Saurabh Kumar Singh entitled: *Salman Rushdie's Shalimar the Clown: Tragic Tale of a Smashed World (2012)*. Singh states that this novel celebrates the hybrid and diversity of culture in Kashmir. It is a story about the tragic history of Kashmir, which is transformed from paradise into hell. He argues that the novel's tragic story symbolizes the existence of corruption in a civilized world. Rushdie's novel reflects the civilized world, the 9/11 bombing, and wars that occur at that period. So, Rushdie is considered as a worldwide author. In this context, Rushdie uses themes and conflicts of different countries and the problems that unfold between them. In this regard, Singh states: "Whatever be the interpretations of *Shalimar the Clown*, this is much is certain that this is another classic example of fury, the vintage Rushdie kind, not the phony outrage at the shallowness of the opposite direction, at the medieval barbarism that lingers in our so called modern and civilized world."¹⁰ This quotation explains Clearly Rushdie's high of anger about the existence of such barbarism in nowadays modern and civilized world. Rushdie themes of political injustice and religious bigotry have made him a worldwide novelist.

Then, Christopher Rollason in his study "*Shalimar the Clown*": *A Secularist Manifesto?* examines the novel from a religious (secular) perspective where he argues that Rushdie has never practiced any religion. Rollason states that Rushdie is defined as being a secular and an intellectual, his ideas are closer to those of Edward Said: "the good intellectual is a

secularist”. Indeed, a dialogue between secularism and education is necessary. According to Rushdie, secularism is a life without god. Rollason explains that Rushdie’s novel *Shalimar The Clown* represents the major presence of culture which is a creative heritage of Kashmir. For this, Rushdie celebrates this heritage as being a secular in the Indian sense. Despite his secularism, he enjoys participating in indifferent religious events.¹¹

Furthermore, Dr. Vijeta Gautam in his article entitled *Stripping Off Humanity in Salman Rushdie’s Shalimar The Clown (2014)*, studies the novel from a humanist perspective. According to him, Rushdie has given a shocking description of the global consequences of human emotions such as love, betrayal, and revenge. He asserts that the novel shows the mind of a terrorist in Kashmir but the phenomenon of terrorism is globalized. Gautam supports his ideas by using Rushdie’s editorial style, and speech about globalization. This echoes Rushdie’s assumptions: “everywhere was now a part of everywhere else”.¹² In this sense, Gautam reports that:

Shalimar the Clown’ delves deep into the roots of terrorism and explores the turmoil generated by different faiths and cultures attempting to coexist. Within a mere generation nations go from near peaceful ethnic and religious acceptance to violent conflict. In this novel the globalization of terror has been shown brilliantly.¹³

Gautam asserts that the novel analyses deeply the origins of terrorism and the reasons of the great disorder. He states that power is the reason that draws people to act violently. So, the novel shows the impact of the cultural, economic globalization, the resurgent separatist and terrorist movement on individuals.

2. Issue and Working Hypothesis

A considerable amount of research has been tackled to study Lessing’s *The Good Terrorist* and Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar The Clown* from various perspectives. However, these studies remain fragmentary, they discuss only one novel in isolation. No work has tried to undertake a comparison between the two texts. Moreover, the theme of political violence has

received little attention by critics. To our best knowledge, no research has been undertaken to investigate the issue of political violence in the two novels. Therefore, we seek to find out the sources of political violence, its functioning and outcomes. Our aim is to analyze critically the phenomenon of political violence. To reinforce this research, we use the theory of “Relative Deprivation” which turns about survival, oppression, and poverty. This theory will be applied in both novels where we find that the protagonists of the two novels experience oppression and terror, and political violence is the result of the characters’ deprivations. The theory of “Relative Deprivation” is illustrated in *The Good Terrorist*, where a group of people is deprived of their human rights. Thus, this deprivation pushes them to terror. It is also shown in the novel *Shalimar the Clown* where characters experienced deprivation and make a decision to act violently in order to revenge. Consequently, deprivation is caused by individual/collective, historical, psychological, or political reasons. These motives push the characters in the two texts to participate in terrorist acts.

II Methods and Materials

a. Theoretical Sources

In order to provide our analysis with a coherent theoretical foundation, the theory of relative deprivation will be appropriate to analyze the novels *Shalimar the Clown* and *The Good Terrorist*. The theory of Relative deprivation is used in social sciences and is linked to social exclusion and similar poverty. The latter appears when a person cannot find a minimum level of living standards compared to others. It is developed by the American sociologist and psychologist Samuel A. Stouffer (1949) and his colleagues during the World War II. Relative deprivation may be defined as an individual feeling of not receiving “fair share” of available resources.¹⁴ Thus, when this individual feels that he is worst off as compared to others around them, the social conflict arises. Political scientists and psychologists have cited relative deprivation as a potential

cause of social movements and deviance, leading in extreme situations to political violence such as rioting, terrorism, civil wars, and other instances of social deviance.¹⁵ Any individual or group comparing themselves to the rest of society experience dissatisfaction when being deprived of something to which one believes oneself to be entitled, thus people engage in deviant behavior when their means do not match their goals.

Later on, the American sociologist Robert K. Merton was among the first theorist to use the concept of relative deprivation in order to understand social deviance, referring to the French sociologist Emile Durkheim's concept of “anomie” as a starting point. In addition, the theory of relative deprivation is a view of social change and movements, according to which people take action for social change in order to acquire opportunities, status, wealth or human rights.¹⁶

Fifteen years ago, Garison Walter Runciman (1966-1968) proposed a conceptual distinction between the two types of relative deprivation: egoistic relative deprivation and fraternal relative deprivation. While egoistic relative deprivation is a type of personal discontent that occurs when an individual compares his or her own situation to that of others (in-group or out-group members); Whereas, fraternal relative deprivation is a more social discontent that occurs when an individual compares the situation of his / her group as whole to that of an out-group.¹⁷ According to Runciman, fraternal relative deprivation and not the egoistic can instigate social action aimed at fundamental structural change in society. Moreover, Runciman states that income is the object of relative deprivation; it is an index of an individual's ability to consume commodities. This theory is considered as a well-known theory of attitudes to social inequality because people who earn less income experience relative deprivation and those who earn a higher income experience satisfaction.

The suitability of this theory to our work is due to the fact that it fits the events that occurred in both novels. In *The Good Terrorist*, there are revolutionary groups that live a terrible

life in a squat. All the members are from the poor social class and they suffer from unemployment, lack of money, and shelter in their country. The capitalist rulers oppress the communists; they wanted to break these rulers and to have their deserved life. This leads the group to launch manifestations in order to have their rights and reach their needs. While, the novel *Shalimar the Clown* represents the protagonists who are oppressed by their society. The poor village Pachigam is unsatisfactory for them, where oppression still existed. They are deprived from life necessities, this deprivation that draws them to the act of betrayal and pushes Shalimar to revenge and to choose radical action.

b. Materials

1. Summary of *The Good Terrorist* (1985)

The protagonist Alice Mellings narrates the story; an educated girl of thirteen years old, and unemployed graduated of politics and economy. She lives with her lover Jasper in her mother's house for a period. Later on, she leaves her mother to live in a squat with a group of Communist Center Union. In the squat we find Alice, Jasper, Bert and a lesbian couple Faye and Roberta. The squat gets full with the joining of other members. First, the state of the house is in damage, later on Alice arranges everything gradually. The group's members are revolutionary fighters for the fascist imperialism, who attend demonstrations and pickets while Alice spends most of her time repairing the house and cooking for them. Jasper and Bert go to Ireland to join the Soviet Union, but they are rejected. Revolutionaries use the squat as a conduit of arms.

The group decides to act on their own and plan a bomb in a car, but they failed because of their inexperience. Therefore, the act of bombing is anticipated and killed Faye with others. They explode an up market hotel in Knightsbridge. The members of the group are shocked, and decide to leave the squat; however, Alice remains there since she cannot abandon the house for which

she sacrifices for a long period. Though, Alice wants to justify the act of bombing and telling the truth, she knows that no one will believe her, so she hides it. Alice ends in a psychological illness when she recognizes that she is a terrorist.

1. Summary of *Shalimar the Clown* (2005)

The title of *Shalimar the Clown* represents the protagonist of the novel Shalimar who is known for making the clown, he lives in Kashmir in a region called Pachigam, this region is surrounded by political conflicts that lead its population to adhere terrorist groups to revolts for their rights. *Shalimar the clown* is a novel that symbolizes political violence in a civilized world. The story is about Shalimar, he loves a beautiful and a good dancer Boonyi Noman but they are from different religions. Shalimar is a Muslim whereas Boonyi is Hindu. For this, their marriage is difficult to be arranged. Fortunately, the elders of the two religions agree for this marriage; as they say “we are all brothers and sisters in law”. So, the marriage is done and both traditions are observed.

After marriage, Boonyi betrays her husband Shalimar for her deprivation and her desire of greed and material. Always she thinks about getting out from their poor village and having a good life. Thus, she decides to make a relation with an American Ambassador; Max Ophuls, who offers her everything she dreamed for. Shalimar does not know about this, which leads him to send her a letter for telling Boonyi to come back home, but she throws it. Later on, Boonyi gets pregnant and has a girl named Kashmira, but she decides to give her to Max's wife to take care of her. Then, she returns to her native land. In order to hide the truth from Shalimar, who warned her before; that if she betrays him, he will kill her. After her arrival, she discovers that they considered her as being dead, so she goes to a forest and starts living alone, while Shalimar joins many political groups in order to make revenge from his wife and the American Max. So; the act of betrayal pushed Shalimar to commit murder. In the end, Shalimar kills Max then Boonyi, and the

police arrest him for ten years. After, India's discovers the truth of her parents' murder. Hence, she sends for Shalimar letters in order to disturb him psychologically for his acts. When Shalimar leaves prison, he tries to kill also India (Boonyi's daughter).

a. Methodological Outline

Our work follows the IMRAD method of writing. First, we have introduced our topic political violence, and precisely the act of terror, which is perpetuated by social members that are oppressed and deprived in their social environment. Then, we have reviewed the two novels. This has been followed by methods and materials, and reached. Besides, in the discussion part, our work will be divided into two main chapters, In the first which is entitled The Sources of Political violence, we will deal with the causes and sources of political violence. This chapter covers three sections: social poverty, psychological troubles, and identity loss. This is shown through providing some illustrations from Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar The Clown*. The second chapter is entitled "The use of political violence", it is divided into two parts: "Individual and group relative deprivation" and "Terror". In this chapter, we have dealt with the way political violence is practiced. Finally, we shall move to the conclusion where we will state the different findings that we have reached.

End notes

1. "Literary article," Google, last modified: 2019.url:<https://literacle.com/literary-violence/>.
2. Ibid.
3. "Agent and Event Types."Google, Last modified: 2019.url: <https://www.acleddata.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Definitions-of-Political-Violence 2015.pdf>.
4. Robert Kumamoto, *International Terrorism and American Foreign Relations 1945-1976*(Northeastern University: Boston Press, 1999), 3.
5. Mark Einer Looney, "Representing Terrorism: Aesthetic Reflection And Political Action in Contemporary Germany novels." Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 2010,16.
6. MargaretScanlan, "Language and Politics of Despair in Doris Lessing's "*the Good Terrorist*," winterv23,no2. (1990): page 183-184, Accessed March19th, 2019, url: <https://www.Jstor.org/stable/1345737>.
7. Ibid.
8. Ester Gendusa, "Doris Lessing's Fiction: Literature as a Commitment," (*Other Modernities*, universitadegli studio di Milano, 2014), 7-10.
9. Gillian Bright,"Paper Ink, and "the Blood-Stained Inanity": The Aesthetics of Terrorist Violence in Josef Conrad's *The Secret Agent*, Paul Theroux's *The Family Arsenal* and Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist*." (*Critic: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, University of Toronto, 2015), 4-5-17.
10. Saurabh Kumar Singh, "Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the clown*: Tragic Tale of a Smashed World," *Lapis Lazuli- An International literary Journal* v2, no1. (2012):11. Accessed April 3rd, 2019, url: <https://docplayer.net,38442614-sa...>
11. ChristopherRollason, "Salman Rushdie's "*Shalimarthe clown*": A secularist manifesto? (*University of Cergy- Pantoise*, 2013), 06.
12. Vijeta Gautam, "Stripping off Humanity in Salman Rushdie's*Shalimar The clown*," *International Journal of English and Education* v3, no1. (2014):5, Accessed March2nd, 2019,url: <ijee.org>24.1154532.pdf>
13. Ibid.
14. Video Lecture: Various Theories of Social Movements accessed on April 2nd, 2019 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o4ZEneNSqYs>
15. Ibid
16. Chegg study," Google, last modified: 2003-2019,url:<https://www.chegg.com/homework-help/definitions/relative-deprivation-theory-49>
17. Serge Guimond, "Relative Deprivation and the Quebec Nationalist Movement: The Cognition- Emotion Distinction and the Personal Group Deprivation Issue,"*Journal of personality and Social Psychology* v44, n3.(1983):3, Accessed may 12th, 2019, doi:10.1037/0022-3514,44,3,526.

IV. Discussion

Political violence is an issue that has been treated by different authors and theorist Fyodor like: Dostoyevsky, Victor Hugo, Samuel Huntington, Salman Rushdie and Doris Lessing. Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* are literary works analyzing social members in respectively England and Kashmir; these characters are deprived from their rights and marginalized by their societies. This oppression is caused by their political power and the harshness of life that lead them to act violently and to join political groups such as communism which is the case of the characters of *The Good Terrorist* whereas the protagonist of *Shalimar The Clown* joins the jihadist groups. In this sense, the present research set for an in-depth comparison between the two cited novels in relation to Samuel A. Stouffer and other theorists of relative deprivation (1949). Relying on this theory, we will explore and analyse in the first chapter the sources of political violence in both novels. The first chapter is carried out through three main sub- themes that derive from political violence: social poverty, loss of identity, and psychological troubles. By analyzing the two novels, we will show that political violence is caused by these three elements. These issues are experienced by characters in both societies who are suffering from poverty, identity problems, and psychological troubles. It is divided into two parts: "Individual and Group relative deprivation" and "Terror." Political violence is used by both individuals and groups who experience deprivation. The characters in the two novels practiced the act of terror individually and collectivity to get their rights. As a result, they choose radicalization and terror to get out from their misery and oppressions.

1. Chapter One: Sources of Political Violence in: Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist*, and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar The Clown*.

This chapter aims to compare how the two narratives: *Shalimar the Clown* and *The Good Terrorist* share the same sources of political violence. The three sources of political violence are Social Poverty, Identity, and Psychology. Moreover, these factors are studied by making reference to the theory of "Relative Deprivation". The two novels have some similarities in terms of social poverty, which is centered to its characters and their economic problems, and then the two novel's main characters experience psychological problems. There are some differences in identity problems; while the characters in *The Good Terrorist* suffer from their individual identity, Rushdie's characters face historical conflicts. The two authors write about their societies experiencing hard life and oppression. Nearly all the population of the two novels experience deprivation, the characters suffer from social poverty and this leads them to have problems in their identity and of course, it causes psychological troubles in their minds. As a solution to their deprivation, they join political and Islamic groups for gaining power to reach their goals. As a result, they use terror as self-defense to maintain their needs.

a. Social Poverty

Poverty is considered as a social phenomenon that touches every community. It is demonstrated through the two novels: *The Good Terrorist* and *Shalimar The Clown*. Nyiwul Mabughi and Tarek Selim in a journal article "Poverty As Social Deprivation: A Survey" states that the concept of poverty is discussed using qualitative and quantitative measures as an indicator for social deprivation. Poverty can be absolute, relative, income based, consumption based, or entitlement based.¹ In addition, in his theory of relative deprivation Samuel A. Stouffer examines intergroup relations, collective conflict and social protest. They assert that social poverty is used when an individual cannot obtain a minimum living by

comparing himself to others.²Compassion international association (A Christian association which defends the rights of poor children in the world) defines Poverty as follow:

Poverty is hunger. Poverty is lack of shelter. Poverty is being sick and not being able to see a doctor. Poverty is not having access to school and not knowing how to read. Poverty is not having a job, is fear for the future, living one day at a time. Poverty is losing a child to illness brought about by unclean water. Poverty is powerlessness, lack of representation and freedom.³

Poverty is difficult to manage and people live an unbelievable life and this is due to the capitalist rulers in Britain. All societies experiencing poverty face problems, illness, hunger, and social disorders. According to “Social Deprivation”, people who suffer from harshness of life procure to manifestations and political violence in order to retrieve their rights. As the theory of relative deprivation focuses on the existence of individual’s reaction to their deprivation: satisfaction or dissatisfaction in comparing themselves to others.⁴ That is to say, only poor people feel dissatisfaction because of injustice, illegal rights.

Social Poverty is an omnipresent theme in Lessing’s *The Good Terrorist* and Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar The Clown*. First, Doris Lessing points out in her narration the cruel aspects of social poverty. She imitates the life of the British society through the squatters who are oppressed by hard life and injustice. The squatters are unemployed who live in a temporary squat without basic conditions like amenities, warm, water, gas, and electricity, but they stay there in spite of the horrid mentioned conditions. Lessing describes these terrible conditions in the following passage:

This time she went ahead of him and opened a door she felt must be to the kitchen. Light fell on desolation. Worse, danger: she was looking at electric cables ripped out of the wall and dangling, raw-ended. The cooker was pulled out and lying on the floor. The broken windows had admitted rainwater, which lay in puddles everywhere. There was a dead bird on the floor. It stank. Alice began to cry from pure rage. “The bastard,” she cursed. “The filthy stinking fascist bastards [...]”⁵

Alice describes the state of the destroyed house with broken windows, no electricity and no water...etc. Alice is outraged, the house is found in a great disorder. The major effect of poverty is unemployment. Thus, Lessing describes the unemployed lives as it is illustrated by Faye and her comrades discussing about their gas and electricity bills: “and what are we going

to pay with?" asked Faye. "We are all on unemployment, aren't we?"⁶ then, as Mrs. Whitfield, council employee, said: "aren't any of you in work but Alice answered that there are ten of them in the house; however, only one of them is employed?"⁷ This is considered as "an object of relative deprivation which is considered as an index of individual's ability to consume commodities."⁸ In a word, work is the most important thing to discuss about because it provides a full life and helps to face poverty and horrid life conditions.

The second consequence of poverty is lack of money; since the squatters do not work, they will not gain any money which is the essential means of life. There is no income coming in at all in the squat. For this, the first idea that Alice has is to go to her mother's friend Theresa, and asks her for some money in order to renovate the house. Theresa gives her what she needs, and for that Alice is ecstatic: "Thanks." Alice wants to fly off with them, but feels graceless; she is full of affection for Theresa."⁹ Additionally, the next idea that comes in her mind is to steal a rug from her mother's house in order to sell it and to get money. Later on, the most grievous act is becoming a thief; she has stolen 300 pounds from her father's house then 1000 pounds from her father's office. When Alice sees that there is nobody in her father's office, she creeps and stole the money. Alice succeeds to steal the money, she flees out of the office in order not to be caught. Furthermore, she finds three old dresses in the squat and decides to sell them. The degree of poverty is so extreme, to the extent that she sells very old dresses, these justify that they have no money. Moreover, when Alice reorganizes the house, she counts how much money is needed for electric light bulbs: "Alice thought: how many rooms in the house? Let's see, an electric light bulb for each one? But they will be pounds and pounds, at least ten. I have to have money..."¹⁰ She is the only one that looks for a solution to get money, so whenever she gets the chance she calculates how much money is needed in order to improve the squat's conditions.

Poverty has many consequences; one of them is health problems that are taken into account by Lessing. As it is noticed through the bad health situations of life in the squats, Alice and Jasper are living in a house where there is not any warmth during winter, which causes illness:

Before her mother's house she had gone through a winter in a squat that had no heating at all. She had simply worn a lot of clothes, and kept moving. Jasper had complained, had got chilblains, but even he had put up with it; yet that was one of the reasons he had been pleased to move in to live with her mother's warmth, after a cold winter.¹¹

Jasper suffers from chilblains, an itchy purple red inflammation of the skin, occurring when capillaries below the skin are damaged by exposure to cold weather. Housing conditions like heat and, water are necessary to mankind. Therefore, if these basic amenities are not available there will be health problems.

In addition, another important consequence of poverty is starvation. The squatters do not have any food to eat unless Alice procures it for them. Thus, they can neither buy nor cook it. Sometimes, the characters spend days and nights without food because they are jobless. If there is no work, there is no money or food which may cause health problems as illustrated in following quotation: "[...] she was hungry; she did not have the energy to go out again. Against the wall was a crumpled carried bag, and in it, a loaf of bread and some salami. God knew how long had been there, but she didn't care. She sat eating slowly."¹² Alice is so hungry to the point that she does not find anything to eat apart from a piece of old bread that has been in the sitting room for a very long time. She does not care about that, she just wants to avoid the hunger. From Alice's hunger, Doris Lessing points out the whole society famine. She also shows this from another member the life of married couples with babies. One of them is Monica, who asks Alice to come and to live with them in the squat, Monica describes the room where the council sends them to live with no proper amenities and that misery where they are not allowed to cook and the floor is filthy. She cannot even let her baby crawl. Moreover, there is only one room for all the family and the children, which is

completely in very bad conditions; they cannot survive in it, as it is miserable. This is illustrated in the theory that “Relative Deprivation” reflects social protests to make change in order to have what people deserve. The characters in *The Good Terrorist* have experienced deprivation. As a result, they adhere to social movements to rebel against the British capitalist oppressor in order to gain their rights. The issue of poverty is also examined in Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar The Clown*.

Next, Salman Rushdie’s novel *Shalimar the Clown* also speaks about social poverty that has touched all the Provinces of Kashmir and its people. The foreigner’s presence on the Kashmir landscape is slowly beginning to degrade the values of the valley. Kashmir’s destruction is the scene of all the atrocities committed by the armed forces. Everything in Pachigam disappeared: individuals, animals, houses, people, and the life have been totally erased from the place where love had blossomed. Pachigam now exists only in memory, the land of paradise transformed into a land of war, death, and struggle. Rushdie describes this society in the novel as the following:

The village of Shirmal, like most places in the valley, had been stricken by the twin disease of poverty and fear, that double epidemic which was wiping out the old way of life. The decaying houses seemed actually to be built of poverty, the unrepaired rooftops of poverty, the unhinged windows of poverty, the broken steps of poverty, the empty kitchen of poverty and the joyless beds... is a part of the cruelty of death that is taking our little children.¹⁴

The village of Shirmal in the valley has almost been stumbled; the sickness of poverty has erased its positive lifestyle. Rushdie describes everything in a state of poverty; houses are in ruins and the cruelty of death killed their children. From this, we understand that there is no food, no shelter, and even epidemics exist. So, their health is in danger and their children died daily. Consequently, there is no hope for life in that village, since all types of misery exist. Another illustration of poverty is the lack of means, so that the setting is given a third world picture. Shalimar goes to Shirmal village to watch television, which is not available in every household. This reflects the lack of technology in Kashmir where people are living simple

life. Kashmir's society is oppressed by three forces: Indian Army, the Pakistan forces, and the USA policy that prevented them from a good life. Their village is destroyed and the tradition, religion, and culture, have been disturbed.

Furthermore, poverty is portrayed through the main character Boonyi, who is living in a poor village in Pachigam with her husband and family, but she is not satisfied by their poor life. She is always dreaming of a luxurious life. Before her meeting with Max Ophuls, she lived in bad conditions, and her married life is unpleasing. She feels that she lives in a tight place where everything is closed:

[...]the village had decided to protect her and Shalimar the clown, to stand by them by forcing them to marry, thus condemning them to a lifetime jail sentence, Boonyi had been overwhelmed by claustrophobia and had seen clearly what she had been too deeply in love with Shalimar the clown to understand before, namely that his life, married life, village life, life with her father chattering away by the Muskadoon and with her friends dancing their gopi dance, life with all the people amongst whom she had spent every one of her days, was not remotely enough for her, didn't begin to satisfy her hunger.¹⁵

Clearly, this quotation explains that the villagers of the two families decided to make peace and harmony between the Muslims and Hindus in order to arrange Shalimar and Boonyi's marriage. However, this decision is not satisfying and the marriage is like jailing for her. She has not an opportunity to live in the way she dreams, and this life is not what she wants. Furthermore, because of this, Boonyi betrays her husband when she meets the American ambassador Max Ophuls, and asks him to take her out of the poor village Pachigam. Boonyi makes an appointment with Max in which she has an occasion to declare all her needs and dreams in the form of a speech: "Please, I want to be a great dancer," she told him. "So, I want a great teacher. Also I want please to be educated to high standard. And I want a good place to live- please-so that I am not ashamed to receive you there."¹⁶ She is not ashamed to offer her body to an American foreigner in exchange of getting all her needs. Rushdie shows the degree of poverty that draws Boonyi to become a greedy woman. Rushdie through characterization explores how poor people feel about the lack of resources, and how they

compare themselves to others. This idea is sustained by the essence of “Relative Deprivation” theory, relative deprivation lies in social comparison feeling of dissatisfaction and discontent.¹⁷In *Shalimar the Clown*, Boonyi’s unsatisfactory life and her poor village Pachigam leads her always to compare herself to the rich people. That is why she makes a decision in order to change her life and reach her goals.

By comparing the two novels we deduce that social poverty is a chief cause that pushes the protagonists of the two novels to choose radical action and violence. The characters have been deprived of their human rights, like work, shelter, fair, and security the fact that resulted poverty and misery. Consequently, the figures try to look for solutions to better their conditions. The authors point out the shift from security to terror and danger. These characters choose radical action to improve their individual and social lives in order to be satisfied and to restore their removed rights.

On the one hand, Lessing demonstrates to the reader the terrible conditions that the British society suffers from and the degree of oppression that the British capitalist causes on their population through Alice the protagonist. On the other hand, Rushdie depicts Kashmir’s poverty through one of the characters to betray her husband in order to go out from the poor village. From the theory of “Relative Deprivation” we deduce that it is ordinary for the deprived characters to look for solutions to improve their lives in order to experience the feeling of satisfaction. As a result, the state of poverty is a chief reason that pushes and convinces members to think about radicalization. Feeling of poverty pushes people to frustration; therefore, they look for a new and good life. This leads them to experience identity crisis.

b. Loss of identity

Iain Walker and Heather J. Smith in their book *Relative Deprivation Specification, Development, and Integration* (2001), explained that relative deprivation is linked to social

identity. So, according to the theory of Relative deprivation, identity is measured as a result of the comparison between one's own situation and that of other individuals or groups.¹⁸ This explains the notion of personal identity in comparison with others that result in either personal or individual identity or social identity.

Furthermore, James D. Fearon in his article *what is identity* (1999) defines identity crisis as: "the condition of being uncertain of one's feelings about oneself, especially with regard to character, goals, and origins, occurring especially in adolescence as a result of growing up under disruptive, fast-changing conditions."¹⁹ This article explains identity as a period where people experience uncertainty and confusion about themselves, needs, goals, origins, and life, this confusion may result in identity loss. There are people who question themselves, who are they? People's feelings of this crisis may do everything in order to find the place of their real belonging. This can be the result of integrating in a given social or a political movement. Accordingly, identity is illustrated in *The Good Terrorist* through the protagonists Jasper and Alice whereas, in *Shalimar the Clown* through the protagonists: Boonyi, India and Shalimar. Identity is measured and evaluated throughout *The Good Terrorist* in: society, family, and inter-groups. In contrast, in *Shalimar the Clown* identity is evaluated by: personal and historical levels. Thus, in both work, people compare themselves to others because they are individually unsatisfied; therefore, they look for social solutions to join social movements to integrate with other social groups. Unfortunately, these people are alienated from work and no one listens to them. They are deprived of their right in their own society. Identity in the two novels is ridiculed; it is subjected to humanity, social oppression, and injustice.

First, Lessing demonstrates identity that is related to family through a group of squatters that have an opportunity to live among their families, thus they do not belong to anywhere. Each member of this group has moved from place to place feel that they do not have no

sheltering space. One of them is the protagonist Alice Mellings whose identity has been altered since her childhood and she used to have a family, but she is not happy with them. Thus, she has no feeling of belonging to them. Alice's parents do not think about her, nor do they know how to make their girl happy and safe, as it is illustrated in the novel:

Alice was always protested, sulked, made scene-manifestations that of course scarcely got noticed, so many other things were going by other stage of the party: women gusts in the kitchen washing, intimate conversations between couples up and down the stairs, the last tipsy dancers circling around the hall. Who possibly have the time to care that Alice was sulking again? Sleeping in her parent's bedroom made her violently emotional, and she could not cope with it.²⁰

As it is pointed in the novel, Alice doesn't accept the parties that her parents do all the time, neither does she accept sleeping with them and watching adult's behavior. Moreover, the problem is that Alice still a young girl when her parents sent her out of the house to her best friend's house during the night because there is no place for her at home. Overall, Alice's ideas go wrong because she feels desperate from her parents and their attentions toward her are wrong. In this sense, she has always had the desire to leave her parents house, because of this disappointing life. She says:

They took my room away from me- "Alice, you'll just have to give up your room again." It went for four years. What the fucking hell did they think they were doing? Why, every time she had felt that it was not really her home at all, she had no right to a place in it, and at any moment her parents would simply throw her out altogether.²¹

Doris Lessing shows the degree of Alice's anger towards her parents so, she thinks that the house does not belong to her, but it is for the guests. In addition, her parents would neglect her for any reason. From all this, we notice that Alice is suffering from identity crisis, as she does not belong to a real house and family, therefore she is hasty about leaving them.

Furthermore, Alice's identity does not only end with her parents. However, when she is a student she goes out of the house to live with other students, and then her boyfriend Jasper joins her. Identity is also measured according to intergroup. Alice is a girl that had a miserable life, living in service of others and looking after them, she is moving from a squat to a squat from one place to another looking for a place where to survive. She is graduated; however, she

does not find any work. She suffers from identity crisis, she does not know which society, community or group she belongs to. This crisis gives birth to psychological problems and a troubled mind, which is very clear in the novel.

Furthermore, Jasper is another member in the novel who suffers from identity crisis. Much like Alice, Jasper also does not have parents. He has been solely dependent on Alice since he knows her and he has no shelter. Alice says to Jasper: “At one, feeling her advantage, she said, don’t forget you have been living soft for four years. You’re not going to find it easy after that.”²² Alice is reminding him that they are living with her mother and they are living a good life in worthy conditions. In addition, this time they must do their best to survive in whatever the circumstances they faced. Alice’s mother hates Jasper and she is letting him live with them just to please her girl. Because of this, Jasper feels uncomfortable with them; therefore, he lives in secret and whenever he wants to get food, he reacts like a thief. He waits for the moment when Dorothy, Alice’s mother, is out of the house so that he can go to the kitchen and bring back all things that he can find there to the room. So, he leaves the room only when it is necessary.

Jasper’s life is a burden on others since he is not active. He can’t work, and he cannot do anything to help Alice. He has a weak personality and this can be justified by his urge to ask a woman for money, while he is a man who is able to do any work to sustain his needs. He looks for easy money as Jasper said: “he stood silent, stilled a moment. Then, he said, “Alice, I’ve got to have some money.”²³ Then, Alice answered: “she forced herself to fight him: “you picked up three weeks” money this week. You had a hundred and twenty pounds plus. And I paid your fine. You can’t have spent more than at the most twenty pounds on train fares and snacks.”²⁴ And he also said: “why don’t you go and get some more from your fucking bloody mother, from her? Or from your father?”²⁵ Jasper does not have any money, and he demands Alice to get money and he barks an order at her. He is a man deprived of

work, money, shelter, and family for this he is dependent on Alice. Jasper suffers from identity crisis. Thus, he fills his free time on revolting and manifestations. He is oppressed by the British capital rulers that deprived him of their human rights; therefore, this make him psychologically depressed, and cause him to think of violence and terror. As a result, the two characters Alice and Jasper experience uncertainty about who they really are and what their proper roles are in life.

In the same context, Rushdie in *Shalimar the Clown* addresses the problem of group, individual and historical identities which are all corrupted. Each character carries a double oppression. The land of Kashmir is dominated by two forces (Pakistan, India) and these forces disturb their identity because each country has its own religion, culture, and tradition. For this, they are lost and they did not find the way to chase their identity. This identity problem is revealed by every character lost in Kashmir. Rushdie has shown different locations, and this gives a different fight of thoughts to various places beyond imaginative ground.²⁶

Boonyi sacrifices her private life, family, and region just to sustain her needs, as Rushdie asserts: “She would do anything to get out of Pachigam, [...] get me away from here, away from my father, away from this slow death and slower life, away from Shalimar the clown.”²⁷ Boonyi’s changing her places standards for the possibility of finding a new identity, she is lost in Kashmir and she is looking for a new Boonyi far from her origins. She is describing Kashmir as a place of darkness. Also, in the novel, Boonyi is seen as a dead person who does not exist to all the villagers, she betrays her husband and everyone all over Pachigam. After Boonyi’s return to Pachigam, she discovers that they considered her as dead. Boonyi’s truth about her death declared by her family all over Pachigam shocked her, as her father Abdullah Noman announced: “Boomi my child has chosen the path of death in life.”²⁸ The act of betrayal done by Boonyi pushes her family and husband to do their best in order to make Boonyi look as if she is a dead person after erasing her identity. Since

Boonyi has been rejected from all her lovers; she lives alone in the forest between mountains in a wooden house. She grows her own vegetables and she barely has everyday necessities, she sells goats milk in order to get enough money for all her needs.

Moreover, another character who undergoes a crisis of identity is Shalimar the clown who changes his name from Noman to Shalimar to make his father proud of this name as stated: "Until he found out about the shadow planets Noman the child [...]. He wants to set Noman the child aside and be his new adult self. He wanted to make his father proud of Shalimar the Clown, his son."²⁹ When Shalimar discovers the existence of the Noman ghost planets, he wants to put Noman the child aside and become a new adult version of himself. This shows again the disturbance of identity; the original personality has changed to a terrorist. Shalimar changes his personality as he has already changed his name. This remains striking as it is an exclusionary particularistic identity. His identity is ruined and he is forced to become another person. Shalimar's personality shifted from a good and innocent clown to a terrorist figure. This idea is related to relative deprivation theory that studies the distinction between individual and group level deprivation as possible precursors of collective actions. Therefore, the deprived Boonyi pushes Shalimar's identity from an individual into a terrorist. He joins groups to find his way and his real identity but at the end the quest for identity causes his mental disorder. Even if he reaches his desire of revenge, he loses his identity.

Furthermore, the association of India (Boonyi's daughter) with her motherland is not yet resolved. Her adoption of the name Kashmira (India's second first name) means a nostalgic return to Kashmir the place of her roots and true identity. Kashmira must return to Kashmir to understand the truth of her biological mother's story in order to trace her identity. She is lost and torn between lie and reality. She wants to know everything to find her true personality and identity as shown by Rushdie: India could hear the words however, the picture of her mother fascinates her. Her father (Max) is dead but her mother is still alive, except that

she is not her mother, it is another lie, her mother is a great dancer. Max's wife confesses that her biological mother chooses to abandon her and she chooses to take care of her. In this regard, Rushdie states the way Kashmira thinks and speaks to herself about her real identity:

Kashmira the woman said, spinning on her heel, removing her hateful unwanted world-altering presence. Kashmira Noman. That was your given name. She felt as if the weight of her body had suddenly doubled, as if she had suddenly become the woman in the photograph. Gravity dragged her and she fell backward on the bed...saw in the mirror the mattress yield and sag. Kashmira The weight of the word was too much for her to bear Kashmira. Her mother was calling to her from the far side of the globe[...]I'll be there as fast as I can.³⁰

Kashmira, Max Ophuls daughter, stays alone thinking about her falsified identity. During the twenty four years, her parents were lying about her true life. For instance, her mother is alive, but they told her that she has left her the day of her birth. And it is until death of her father that she discovers the truth. Then, she decides to go to Kashmir in order to learn everything about her mother (Boonyi) on her own. India's identity is disturbed because of her real name (Kashmira) which is given by her mother the day of her birth. The facts about her mother's story destroy everything on her.

Both the protagonists of the two novels experience the problems of identity. They are oppressed and thrown into a damaged state. They do their best to find a sense of belonging to live happily. Unfortunately, they fail to find their real identities. The crisis of identity pushes the character to disoriented behaviors like terrorism, which is a means to reach what they deserve in their life and to be satisfied in their societies and to find the world in general. The quest to remove Kashmiri people from poverty results in identity problems. In *The Good Terrorist*, the characters are not able to find their real sense of belonging in their own country and their identity is confused. For this, they decide to join political groups in the quest for a good life and a real identity. *Shalimar the Clown* focuses on the comparison between the poor and the rich people that draws the poor to take revenge from the powerful American Max. From this comparison, we deduce that their dreams and desires are not satisfied, so they look for other solutions and ways to be rich and to acquire the identity that they deserve. We

conclude that Rushdie's story reflects the region of Kashmir where most Kashmiri lost their identity. Most of all, we can say that the fact of losing identity or having crisis of identity drives individuals to psychological troubles.

c. Psychological troubles

Psychological troubles are linked to social deprivation. According to the theory of Relative Deprivation, psychology is considered as an effect. That is to say, when people compare themselves to others, they may experience satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Thus, when they feel that they are deprived; they feel despaired, and that will end in psychological problems. Additionally, the psychological development of people can be a reason of identity crisis. People who are oppressed psychologically recourse to violence as a reaction in order to fulfill their ambitions. However, they experience psychological disorder which is a dysfunction in an individual that is associated with distress or impairment and a reaction that is not culturally expected.³¹ The two psychologists Iain Walker and Heather J. Smith (2002) argue that: "social psychologists must pay more attention in the future to relative gratification and relative deprivation on behalf of others. Any general theory of social evaluation must be able to explain reactions of both the deprived and non-deprived."³² This shows that relative deprivation is in relation to psychology and for this, psychologists must study and take into consideration the behavior and the reaction of the poor and deprived people and this will be achieved by comparing them to the non-deprived.

Doris Lessing and Salman Rushdie are authors that write about terrorist psychology which is centered on terror, political contact, and ways/solution to reach one's needs. Since terrorists' minds are full of hate and violence, terrorists speak by acting. The authors state how these radical characters are oppressed from their deprived life that resulted in acts of terror in order to rebuild their societies. The protagonists want to have their lives as they are in their minds and all these inner thoughts and sufferings cause psychological troubles.

Doris Lessing talks about the protagonist Alice's feelings and emotions. Lessing is deeply aware of the flaws of the society that she lives in and shows the latter as an image or incarnation of England. She narrates the development of Alice with the development of her psychological troubles and this means unhappy childhood that makes unhappy grown-ups. Since her childhood, Alice is deprived of her parents love, and the house where she lives in hard conditions. She is not happy with her parents because of their bad behavior with her. Her parents are organizing parties all the time, they invite lot of people and they prevent their girl from staying in her room. Due to this, Alice is shocked by what she has seen and heard from them doing at night and all the bad adult behavior. She is still young to witness such actions and couple's intimate subjects. The following quotation reflects the emotions of the young Alice seeing her parents at night: "he would put his arm round her, she snuggled up-a glance, a quick reminder from one or the other that Alice was in the room some sleepy kisses, and they would be off, asleep. But Alice was not asleep".³³ This means that Alice is unable to sleep because of her parents. She has bad emotions and memories about her childhood, she thinks that this would be changed within the years to come; unfortunately, this is not the case, as she said:

And then growing older, at eleven or twelve, and the older still, at fifteen or so. She changed, grew up. [...] Nothing changed. It was always the same, that scene after the party, with the two of them, her parents, sliding into that bed of theirs, arms around each other, and then willingly sliding into the sleep which took them so far from Alice that she was always lifting herself up on her elbow to strain her eyes through the dark of the room towards the two mounds, long, heavy, that were her parents.³⁴

Alice is in a state of psychological anxiety about her parents and all her life troubles. This worry has been following Alice all her life and she always time she remembers the bad emotions and memories about the past with her family. Alice's psychology is carried through the story.

Furthermore, Alice is in a mental disorder because of those people who can damage the house. She creates a monologue thinking about all of those people, the word monologue is

a proof of Alice's psychological madness; she speaks to herself in her mind. Alice and the group need a house to live in but the conditions are horrible. For Alice, people that can manage to destroy a house like this are inhuman; they cannot think about other people that do not have any shelter. Alice is a sensible woman; she cannot believe those creatures that are hurting other people with their stupid minds. This psychology is developed in Alice when she grows up and lived with the group and contrary to others, she is not a violent person. She is shocked by the idea of the explosion and she is against it, but since the majority of the squat agreed she can not do or say anything in order to stop them. When the others went to plant the explosion, she is thinking to call the Samaritans to prevent the bombing but she thinks that it is too late, thus she told them that the bombing "is because of the IRA. Freedom for Ireland! For united Ireland and peace to all mankind!"³⁵ and she cuts off.

Alice is a revolutionary woman, but she is also a peaceful activist who protests by writing slogans on walls. Unlike, the other characters are so violent, and Jocline is the best example who is fond of books on terrorism and books of how to make bombs and explosives. They make a bomb in an up market hotel in London, and this resulted inhuman damage. The problem is that their friend Faye is killed in the attack, which causes them to have major anxiety. It is a decision that splitted the members of the family; each one left the squat and goes to another place. Next, Lessing sticks to depict the way Alice has changed as Alice said: "mummy, I am a good girl, aren't I?"³⁶ She said then "but today her mind would not stay in this dream."³⁷ So, the good innocent Alice becomes a "good terrorist," this is related to Lessing's title that reflects the protagonist Alice. On the one hand, she is the founder of the squat where she sustains the terrorist's group. Thus, she is viewed as a "good terrorist". On the other hand, Alice's regrets of the terrorist act, allows the readers to find her humanistic side. This idea explains that Alice is a terrorist, but with good and humanistic intentions. Alice is mentally disturbed, she thinks about the event that occurred and its horrific outcome;

all this is due to of her tenderness. However this hard experience also causes her schizophrenia, a mental disorder.

Furthermore, the squatters group is psychologically traumatized because of the capitalists as Alice said: "Alice listened and smiled, and her heart hurt for him. [...]one day life would not be like this; it was like this; it was capitalism that was so hard and hurtful and did not care about the pain of its victims."³⁸ The capitalist hard rulers are one reason that let them down, poor with no work and no shelter. Each member of the group has his diploma and graduated from university; unfortunately the capitalists who are not good rulers, prevented them from working opportunities. Alice is upset and she knows that the reason behind all this pain is caused by the hurtful government. People are deprived of work, shelter, and lot of other necessities and this is the reason that draws them to psychological madness. Alice wants to hide her emotions by smiling giving the illusion that everything is fine; whereas, on the inside her heart is aching because of this oppressive state. Another example of Alice's psychology is when she is in a state of thinking alone in the street, Alice's terrible moment, she is walking up and down the roads alone seeing at the home of her mother and remembering about the terrible memories from her childhood in her mother's house. She inspects from the outside Theresa and her father's homes thinking about their good life comparing all the difficult and disappointing moments which occur in her life and cause Alice's social and behavioral dysfunction. She is mentally depressed, and this urges her to take revenge on her father by throwing a stone through his window. This act is done unconsciously and without thinking.

Lessing sticks to depict realistic circumstances that lead her character to act violently. She shows the bleakness of the urban landscape, the poverty, the state ineptness, and capacity for brutality. This brutality pushes the squat to go to demonstrations against the fascist British government and spray painting anti-capitalist slogans on government buildings. The group is

aCCU (Communist Center Union) and they want to tear down the system. They feel strongly about the injustices of society and are willing eager to do something about it. From here, Doris Lessing imitates the life of all the society through Alice's life.³⁹

Similarly, in *Shalimar the Clown* psychological disturbance are illustrated through many characters who are disturbed and their psyche are wounded due to different reasons which are surprise, discoveries, cultural collision marked by bewilderment, and a sense of shock unpleasant effects or adaptation. The first psychological problem is the effects of Max's murder by his driver Shalimar the clown, this effect disturbed India, and then she is left broken after learning her mother's story. She feels the resurrection of her parents in her as illustrated:

At twenty four the Ambassador's daughter slept badly through the warm, unsurprising nights. She woke up frequently and even when sleep did come her body was rarely at rest, thrashing and flailing as if trying to break free of dreadful invisible manacles. At time she cried out in a language she did not speak.⁴⁰

India is in a disturbed state after the death of her father Max. She has terrible nightmares, and she never feels at rest after that. She always remembers the murder scene which happened in front of her eyes and caused by his confident driver Shalimar. The daughter Kashmira's (India) mental trouble is not due to only her father, but also the truth of her mother. When India discovers her mother's murder, she is shocked that the same person who murdered her father is Shalimar. The latter used to be the confident driver of her father who later would turn into his assassin, and he is also the same murderer of her mother. She is full of rage, and promised herself to kill him and take a revenge for her parents. In a way to see him dies in front of her eyes, the same as he does with her parent's murder. Later on, as a response to Shalimar's desire of disturbing India's life, she decides to write letters to Shalimar in the hopes of breaking and forcing him to remind him that her parents are not dead, they are not gone not forgotten, but they live with her.⁴¹ She asserts in the letter:

My letters are curses; they will shrivel your soul. My letters are threats they should frighten you and I will not stop writing them until you are dead and maybe after you

died I will go on writing them to your spirit as it burns and they will torment you more agonizingly than the inferno.⁴²

India uses words in her letter which express her anger, hate, and rage against Shalimar. She promises herself to continue to distress and remind him that he is in a dangerous state as far as she is alive. Kashmira's goal is to make Shalimar crazy and making him feels remorse. She wants to make the world his personal prison by using painful words. From this deep description, Rushdie wants to show the mental dysfunction of Kashmira and at the same time her desire to cause a deep madness will fallow Shalimar for the rest of his life and make him regret what he commits for her parents.

Another character who undergoes a psychological crisis in Rushdie's novel is Shalimar's disturbed soul. He is broken by Boonyi's betrayal, and his innocence is robbed and he becomes a dreaded assassin, which causes him to become consumed by hatred and rage as it is illustrated: "He gives himself up to the devil on terrorist inside him, he dies as a human and takes birth in the formed assassin of death".⁴³ He joins jihadist groups and participates in different terrorist acts, he is training as a terrorist and diplomat with Pakistan terrorists and in a short time he becomes a killing machine. Shalimar is transformed from an angel clown to an inhuman killer. His behavior is destroyed and became a blind man as Rushdie reposts through Kashmira's eyes. Shalimar's behavior turns from a protector into an assassin."⁴⁴ Rushdie makes a chocking description of Max Ophuls murder by his driver Shalimar in a tragic way to show his transformation from a lover and a good man, to a killer due to the betrayal of his beloved Boonyi. From the theory of relative deprivation we deduce that the deprived Boonyi suffers from poverty and illiteracy. The greed of Boonyi for materialism pushes her husband to act violently. Shalimar kills Max Ophuls upstairs in his daughter's apartment by using her kitchen knives, in order to make her suffering and feel his pain as a revenge for what he has lost. Another illustration is Shalimar's psychology in prison. The consequences of India's letter affected Shalimar, whose psychological worsens by having nightmares and dreams about

a female demon who is India. Her letter disturbs his soul, spirit, and makes him crazy. Shalimar tries to commit suicide because he is morally and psychologically disrupted; he cannot support India's threats through the letters. Furthermore, because of his bad situation, they give him a tranquilizer, Xanax, to reduce his anxiety and stress. He demands to see an Imam of Islamic faith to advise him and recite the Quran in order to be calm. Hence, India succeeds and achieves to disturb Shalimar's psychology.

In conclusion, we can say that psychoanalysis is understood through the hidden meaning of texts or through the authors' intentions through the analyses of motives and actions of the characters through the texts. Through our analysis, we deduced that psychology is an effect of oppression that leads the characters to join political violence to improve their lives. Doris Lessing and Salman Rushdie succeed to show their societies psychological disorder through their characters behavior, emotions, feelings and delusions. Nearly all the protagonists of the two novels suffer from life's deprivation, which causes psychological troubles, it even occurs when these characters fail in their quest for better lives.

Both Doris Lessing and Salman Rushdie succeed in giving a representative image to their two societies. After analyzing the two novels, we have deduced that political violence is achieved due to different reasons and sources which are: social poverty that is developed by the two authors, identity loss which corrupts both of the societies, and psychological troubles that leads them to deviant behavior. These three factors are the main reasons that draw characters to terror. We conclude that social and individual deprivation push figures to interact in order to make a change. Moreover, they do everything that they found suitable to reach their goals. For instance, the bombing in *The Good Terrorist* is done to show the communist power and their desire to change the corrupted British capitalist. Then, assassination in *Shalimar the Clown* aims to make revenge for the Americans power to show the strength of Shalimar. We deduce that Rushdie wants to illustrate the corrupted American

power through an innocent Kashmiri clown which is able to erase one of the corrupted Americans

End notes

- ^{1.} NyiwulMabughu and Tarek Selim, “Poverty as Social Deprivation: A survey,” *Review of Social Economy* v64, no2. (2006):1, Accessed September 28, 2019, doi: 10.1080/00346760600072.

2. Gabrielle Petta. Iain Walker, "Relative *Deprivation and Ethnic Identity*," British journal of social psychology n31. (1992), Accessed April 20th, 2019, url: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com>abs.1>.
3. "Compassion International," Google, last modified: 2019. url: <https://www.compassion.com/poverty/what-is-poverty.htm>.
4. Gabrielle Petta. Iain Walker, "Relative *Deprivation and Ethnic Identity*," British journal of social psychology n31. (1992), Accessed April 20th, 2019, url: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com>abs.2>.
5. Lessing, *The Good Terrorist*, 09.
6. Ibid, 32.
7. Ibid, 129.
8. Shlomo Yitzhaki, "Relative Deprivation and the Gini Coefficient*," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* (1979): 1-2, Accessed May 12th, 2019, url: <https://www.researchgate.net./publication/24092604>.
9. Lessing, *The Good Terrorist*, 35.
10. Ibid, 62.
11. Ibid, 142.
12. Ibid, 74.
13. "Cheggstudy, «Google, url: <https://www.chegg.com/homework-help/definitions/relative-deprivation-theory-49>
14. Rushdie, *Shalimar the Clown*, 118.
15. Ibid, 40.
16. Ibid, 64.
17. Gabrielle Petta. Iain Walker, "Relative *Deprivation and Ethnic Identity*," British journal of social psychology n31. (1992), Accessed April 20th, 2019, url: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com>abs.1>.
18. Iain Walker and Heather J. Smith, *Relative deprivation: Specification, Development, and Integration* (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2002). url: <https://books.google.dz/books?id.pp254>.
19. James D. Fearon, "What is Identity (As We Now Use The Word)?" (Draft, Stanford University, 1999), 8-9.
20. Lessing, *The Good Terrorist*, 192.
21. Ibid.
22. Lessing, *The Good Terrorist*, 09.
23. Ibid, 136.
24. Ibid, 137.
25. Ibid, 138.
26. "Shodhganga," Google, url: Shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in>Chapter VI Kashmir Conflict: As Represented in Salman Rushdie's Shalimar the Clown.15.
27. Rushdie, *Shalimar the clown*, 40.
28. Ibid, 78.
29. Ibid, 20.
30. Ibid, 115.
31. "Psychology today," Google, last modified: 2019. url: <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-mysteries-love/201503/what-is-psychological-disorder>.
32. Iain Walker and Heather J. Smith, *Relative Deprivation: Specification, Development, and Integration* (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2002). url: <https://books.google.dz/books?id.366>.
33. Lessing, *The Good Terrorist*, 193.

- 34. Ibid, 194.
- 35. Ibid, 314.
- 36. Ibid, 328.
- 37. Ibid.
- 38. Ibid, 102.
- 39. "Shodhganga,"Google,url: Shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in>jspui. Chapter IV Disappointed Idealism, The Good Terrorist. Divya186.2.
- 40. *Rushdie, Shalimar the Clown*, 07.
- 41. Ibid, 123.
- 42. Ibid, 122.
- 43. "Shodhganga," Google, url: Shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in>5 Chapter, Impact of the Neo-imperialist Strategies, Terrorism, Individual life-Shalimar The Clown.10-11.
- 44. *Rushdie, Shalimar the Clown*, 18.

2. Chapter II: The Use of Political Violence in Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*.

After studying the sources of political violence in Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar The Clown*, we will enlarge the scope of analysis to study the use of political violence in both novels. The phenomenon of political violence is used by individuals and groups who experience deprivation. All individuals or characters who feel dissatisfied in their life experience frustration and this leads them to the use of political violence. Walter Garrison Runciman divides relative deprivation into two types: "egoistic and fraternalistic deprivation. Egoistic is about an individual comparing herself to others. However, fraternalistic is about group relative deprivation, a group compared to an out-group."¹ These deprivations can be limited by the use of violence. In *The Good Terrorist*, deprivation is used by a group of individuals who can not rebel by their own. They join a squat to live all together protesting to make a change. The squatters group is a Communist Center Union. It aims to have a good position to fight the British capitalists rulers who are their source of deprivation and oppression. In *Shalimar The Clown*, political violence is used by individual and group relative deprivation. The individual Shalimar commits many assassinations and the Islamic groups make terrorist acts to reach their desire of wealth, status, and power.

In both novels, the individual and group's grief is to get out of poverty and deprivation and their solution is the use of violence (terror). The anger and frustration caused by relative deprivation lead the characters to the use of political violence. In *Relative Deprivation Theory in Terrorism* (2011) Clare Richardson argues: "frustration is caused by relative deprivation and the resulting aggression is manifested as terrorism." Political violence is used by individual

and group terrorist attacks in collective protest in order to change their national political order. So, terror is used as a means to reach their goals.

The aim of this chapter is to introduce the two types of relative deprivation; individual and group deprivation which is the first section of this chapter. Political violence is used individually and collectively to maintain a position and to get rid of deprivation. Consequently, the only solution that the figures find more reliable is the use of terror. The latter is investigated as a second sub-theme in our chapter. The objective is to analyze the two narratives in relation to the issue of terror by making some illustrations of the acts of terrorism committed by the characters. By doing so, we will explain the “*modus operandi*” of radical figures in the second part.

a. Individual and Group Relative Deprivation

The fact of living and acting individually differs from being a member in a group. So, individual feeling of discontent tends to adhere into groups and interact with each other. This idea reflects Walter Garison Runciman investigation about relative deprivation that divides into two types: individual deprivation named egoistic and group deprivation named fraternalistic. The two types are measured when people feel discontent while comparing themselves to others. He declares that fraternal relative deprivation is the one that can bring a social change.³ So, among the two types the most relevant is fraternalistic because it is the one that can bring about a social change in society. The use of political violence is done by individual and group relative deprivation. The characters in the two novels react to their deprivation to get their desire for stability and justice. Deprived figures in both novels want to reach their goals and this lead the individuals and groups to adhere into social groups, this desire to be in groups is to be more powerful, as a result they found that violence is the last solution which is suitable to reach their aims.

Iain Walker and Heather J. Smith in the theory of relative deprivation assess that it is group relative deprivation that could make a change and result in affirmative actions like manifestations, strikes, and collective violence.⁴ That is to say, relative deprivation especially group deprivation is the one that can emanate political violence. According to the two authors, deprived individuals adhere to groups in order to change their situation. By the way, they use on terror. The authors Doris Lessing and Salman Rushdie present the issues in England, Kashmir, and their populations' struggle to acquire good positions. They describe how characters experience hard life and oppression from their oppressive forces. The two nations suffer from the harshness of life that leads them to interact with social groups (group deprivation) to improve their human conditions.

Doris Lessing depicts the life of suppressed figures experiencing anxiety and deprivation. The latter is expressed by both individuals and groups in *The Good Terrorist*, the individuals suffer from the capitalist rulers; hence, they decide to act in a group. Alice and Jasper decide to leave Dorothy's house (Alice's mother) to live in a squat. The members of the squat decide together to be strong in order to make their own politics "communism" to rebel against capitalism. Lessing points out the situation that draws the individual characters to these squats. The first example is Alice's deprivation in her parent's house, which draws her to leave the house and moves from one squat to another just to survive. She lives in a squat in Birmingham for thirteen months, then six months in a student house in Halifax, then later in another squat at 43 Old Mill Road. She moves from one place to another in the quest for good life. When she is a student, she likes joining protests in order to redress the British life. This idea is supported by Bolino and Turnley (2009), which are two relative deprivation theorists, explaining that: "feeling deprived may inspire participation in collective behavior."⁵ Alice's deprivation is the reason that draws her to be among groups and interact with them in their bombings. Alice from a middle class British citizen is transformed into a mother in a poor

squat; she focuses on the domestic affair and on money for the improvement of the household. She loves revolting and writing slogans on walls during the pickets. Lessing in her narration shows how characters shifted from individual deprivation where they used “I” as personal pronoun to speak about personal emotions, memories, and deprivations to group deprivation where she uses the pronoun “We” to demonstrate plurality in decisions, solutions, acts, protests and schedules.

Lessing introduces another instance of individual deprivation through the two characters Jim and Philip. These individuals are deprived of work and shelter. Fortunately, they are accepted to join Alice’s squat at the same time by contributing to the rearrangement of the destroyed squat. Next, there are two couples who join them because of their bad situation. Lessing succeeds in the construction of a communist squat revolting against the capitalist oppressor. The squatters’ political plan is to make the group bigger by asking other people to join them as it is revealed: “we thought it mightn’t be a bad thing, having other people here, but they have to be CCU. Jim will have to join.”⁶ So, their work plan is to make lot of members adhere to their political party in order to build a powerful group, and their plan decision is that some of the members must join the CCU (communist center union) and others must join them as being a cover to hide the group decisions and acts. In other words, they must let the group’s action in secret. According to Runciman, the key factor promoting fraternalistic deprivation is “literal solidarity,” a sense of kinship of other members with one’s membership groups.⁷ He assesses that the sense of unity and solidarity between groups is a key criterion that should exist in fraternalistic deprivation.

The entire group claims an empty house for themselves which the council intended to tear down. Their conditions are worsened for this, they join manifestations, where they shout out “Thatcher out, out, out!”⁸ and all the workers chanted: “the workers united should never be defeated.”⁹ All the demonstrations are to tear down their “corrupted” government. The

group talks about the state of Britain which is “rotten as a bad apple and ready for the bulldozers of history.”¹⁰ They join social protests to make Britain safe and clean, they throw eggs and fruits at Mrs. Thatcher (British prime Minister). The group reaction is to improve their individual situation and that of their group. The reaction in social movement is necessary. They used protests to rebel for their rights and justice. All over the world, manifestations and strikes are considered as a legal way for workers to express their grievances. As a result, the squatters in *The Good Terrorist* want to be together to reform the British constitution. Dube and Guimond (2002), in the theory of relative deprivation, claim that: “perceptions of intergroup inequality and feeling of group discontent as elements forming a casual chain that leads to social protest.”¹¹ As we have seen in the above passage, when dissatisfaction is expressed, it conducts people to involve regularly in manifestations.

Additionally, the characters Alice, Jasper, and Bert are a group members deprived of everything; they compare their situation to others since there are no legal opportunities at all in their society. They are in a social competition which is due to the existence of social classes. The upper and the middle classes are wealthy enough, whereas the working class (the proletariat) is the poor category in society as Clare Richardson argues in an article entitled “*Relative Deprivation Theory and Terrorism*”(2011): “class struggles are often a driving factor of any revolution as seen through the class readings.”¹² This idea means the existence of conflicts between social classes in a society result on revolution. However, class struggle leads the characters to interact violently. They are deprived of work and shelter and for this; they want to struggle as much as they can in order to reach their individual and social needs. The characters prove their individual deprivation through the group, they protest and rebel in social movement about individual and group deprivation. This idea is illustrated via the two characters Jasper and Bert who wanted to visit the IRA (Irish Republican Army) and the

Soviet Union to work with them. Unfortunately, they are rejected. As a result, they decide to work on their own as “Freeborn British Communist.”¹³

Similarly, individuality and group deprivation is developed in Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown* which portrays the sufferings of Kashmiri people in their daily lives since they are deprived of their own rights. Shalimar the clown, the protagonist of the novel, is an example of these sufferings. He suffers tremendously during his life because of poverty and the region’s conflicts, and his biggest pain is his deprivation from his beloved Boonyi who betrays him with the American ambassador Max Ophuls in Delhi. This act pushes Shalimar to a big transformation, from a good lover star and a romantic hero with a good heart into a killing machine, a cold-blooded personality. It is clear that Shalimar is a victim whose personal rage against Max is intensified as a result of his contact with terrorists. In *Does more (or less) lead to violence? Application in Relative Deprivation Hypothesis on Economic Inequality-induced Conflicts* (2013,) Nemanja Dzuverovic states that: “discontent is a call to action, and the stronger the frustration, the greater the likelihood of manifesting of violence”¹⁴ The above quotation explains that people’s feeling of dissatisfaction and the emotion of anger get bigger and the probability of the use of violence is manifested. From this, we deduce that relative deprivation is related to different reasons that lead the association of individuals with groups protesting together to obtain their rights using political violence.

Through Boonyi’s (Shalimar’s wife) deprivation, Rushdie shows the decision of Shalimar to use a type of political violence, which is terrorism to obtain power. This idea echoes Walter Korpi’s argument in his book entitled “*Conflict, Power, and Relative Deprivation*” (1974) asserting that: “the mobilization of power resources and the struggle for power as the central features in an alternative approach to conflict like revolution and collective violence”¹⁵ This means that the desire for power and the existence of different

powers incite them to violence. Shalimar joins and trains in many terrorist groups to get his target. His first phase is the initiation to the “Liberation Front Group” which soon became “Freedom Fighters Liberation” then this group changed its name and became the JKLF (Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front). For 15 years, Shalimar takes training as a terrorist, he trains from camp to camp with a heart full of revenge, and this personal affair caused a social and a global terrorist attack. He is training a lot with Bulbul Fakh nicknamed Iron Mullah who is the leader of this terrorist group. Iron Mullah is considered as the only allegorical character in the novel because he had a great strength and everyone in the village is afraid of him. Shalimar’s transformation is shown by Rushdie, when he demonstrates the defence of Shalimar’s lawyer during his judgments in America. In this sense, Rushdie declares:

[...]Dog eat dog up, there in Himalayas, the Indian army against the Pakistan sponsored fanatics...You want to know this man, my client? The defence will show that his village was destroyed by the Indian Army...His beloved wife, the greatest dancer in the village, the greatest beauty in all Kashmir. You don’t need the psych profiling to get the point of this, ladies and gentlemen the jury, this kind of thing will derange the best of us, and the best of them is what he was, a stars performer in a troupe of travelling player, a comedian of the high wire an artist whole world was shattered and his mind with it. This is exactly the kind of person; the terrorist puppet masters seek out. This is the kind of mind that responds to their sorcery. The subject’s picture of the world has been broken and a new one is painted for him brushstroke by brushstroke.¹⁶

Rushdie explains through the Lawyer’s justification on Shalimar’s acts, Shalimar’s deprivations lead him to murder Boonyi in the hills and Max in Los Angeles to comfort his desire of revenge. Max and Boonyi are the ones that destroy Shalimar’s life. He is deprived of his love and family which is seen to him as an important thing in his life. This personal deprivation pushes him to find himself within a terrorist group where he loses his mind because he is always thinking about blood, crime, and violence. Relying on an article entitled “*Application of The Relative Deprivation Hypothesis on Economic Inequality Induced Conflict*”, Robert Gurrclaims that: “if values (expectations and capabilities) are imbalanced, this might lead to relative deprivation, and to the escalation of violent conflict.”¹⁷In other words, the imbalance of values and abilities lead to deprivation and an increase of

violence. The transformation of Shalimar is used as a quest for power. He becomes bigger and strengthened with intent to be powerful in the group and to reach his desire of revenge. Shalimar accomplishes his objective through political violence; he becomes dangerous in the group by his success in fighting. As a result, relative deprivation, power, and political violence coexist with each other. The fact of being deprived pushes Shalimar to take power and; therefore, he relies on the use of political violence (terrorism) to reach his aims.

Moreover, Shalimar joins the Islamist's terrorist group to learn how to kill, so he could eventually exhaust his revenge by killing Max and Boonyi. He is fighting within terrorist groups to achieve his personal deal to take revenge and get what he is deprived of. He learns a lot from Bulbul Fakh, and he has grown taller and bigger like the growth of his leader; these changes symbolize the increased presence of Islamic Fundamentalists like Bulbul Fakh in Kashmir. The strength of Shalimar helps the Islamists to gain the force to fight the Jewish and by this way the terrorist group uses Shalimar's ambition as a tool to reach the American leaders. Shalimar uses violence to assassinate Max, in this regard, Raul Caruso and Friedrich Schneider (2011) states that: "according to economic deprivation theory, whenever the discontent turns to be wide spread within societies, individuals and groups are more likely to turn to political violence and civil strife."¹⁸ This quotation means that each time when discontent is expressed in society, groups rely on political violence; this idea resembles Shalimar's economic discontent that ends on political violence (terrorism). Shalimar uses terror to get revenge from the American ambassador Max. This allows us to understand that Shalimar revenge on Max is personal but he still uses religion and violence as a platform to cross over and to get to his target in America.¹⁹ clearly, the Islamic group solutions are always connected to terror fighting their enemies. This idea could be related to the 9/11 attacks in America which are committed by terrorists. So, Shalimar's act of revenge is a symbol of the attack that means the Islamic terrorist groups are behind this attack.

We deduced from the two novels that the feeling of Individual and group deprivation push characters to react violently to reach what they deserve. The two types of deprivations in the two works are unified together to gain strength, power to act, and fight for their rights. Both characters of the novels are oppressed as a result; they decided to join social movements so that to make change. All the characters look for radical reformation to sustain their needs. There is a competition of power, as a result, competition causes conflicts and struggles as it is the case in the two novels in which competition between social groups leads them to use terror.

The Good Terrorist and *Shalimar the Clown* reveal the detailed performance of the individual characters' engagement in group deprivation to change their countries into the positive side. Doris Lessing succeeds to present the image of England under oppression and injustice. She refers to individuals adhering to social movements; like the Communist Alice who lives in different places to construct a house, a strong group, and to work together to pull down the capitalist oppressor and live in justice. Then, Salman Rushdie demonstrates the transformation of an innocent clown into a criminal. The protagonist Shalimar gets training in a Jihadist group. On the one hand, because of his region's oppression which is a group deprivation, on the other hand this is due to his desire to revenge the American Max who destroys his love, which is an individual deprivation. The American Max's relation with Boonyi symbolizes the USA corruption in the world, so Max uses Boonyi and get what he desires from her, he destroys her life then he lets her alone. The two authors are aware about the flaws of their societies. We conclude from our analysis and according to the applied theory that interaction for justice and violence is the only way to defend and rebel for human rights in order to get out from individual and group deprivation. The deprived characters in the two novels rely on terror to retrieve their rights: bombing in *The Good Terrorist* and assassination in *Shalimar The Clown*. Consequently, terror is used by deprived

figures, individuals and groups as a solution to maintain their position in life and to get off deprivation and poverty. So, the objective of the second part of this chapter is to explain the phenomenon of political violence, and to show how and why individuals and groups commit terrorist acts. The characters of both works act violently to gain: power, revenge, wealth, status, and justice.

b. Terror

Terrorism may be defined as the use of violence for political, religious, historical, ideological, individual, and social aims. Thus, poverty and social deprivation lead people to political violence. In the theory of “Relative Deprivation”, Clare Richardson (2011) refers to Ted Robert Gurr’s study on the relation between political violence and relative deprivation in order to find the reasons behind the use of political violence: “Gurr explains political violence as the result of collective discontent caused by a sense of relative deprivation.”²⁰ This passage means that political violence is caused by group relative deprivation. However, relative deprivation and political violence are associated. The latter is considered as a reaction and outcome of people in their everyday struggle within the oppressing society. Rushdie and Lessing explain the outrage of deprived people that result in terror as violent or destructive acts (such as bombing) committed by groups in order to intimidate the government into granting their demands.²¹

People commit violence when their words don’t communicate their needs. Terrorist’s thoughts are to make the world a fair and an equitable place after terror. The two authors relate the act of terror to time and place. Doris Lessing writes her novel in relation to the IRA Bombing of Harrods Department Store in London 1983, and Salman Rushdie relates it to the 9/11 attacks in America. The two novels share the same issue of terror which is illustrated through characters but they differ in the notion of setting. The authors illustrate the development of the characters interacting and experiencing terrorism. The act of terror is used

by characters in order to be powerful. There is a competition between group's discontent so they rebel and they do their best to gain a good position in society, to live in social justice, freedom, and prosperous life. Violence is the only decision that leads and helps figures to reach their goals which are to make change in their land and to break down their oppressive forces.

Terror is performed in *The Good Terrorist* by individuals and groups of educated squatters who are deprived of their rights. They start by verbal communication and they rebel via manifestations and pickets as Rubenstein argues: "most terrorists start out attempting to communicate their programs in speeches and manifestos, yet when their words get unheeded, they turn to action meant to speak louder."²² As we have seen in the above passage, that terrorist proceeds to act just when their speech is ignored. So, in *The Good Terrorist*, the communist center union moves from relatively verbal activism such as making speeches, heckling (interrupting) politicians, painting slogans on walls into actions like bombing, because it is sensed that its members can no longer communicate with the working class. The squatters protest, rebel all the time, but the government didn't listen, and neglected them. For this, they choose to act in their way to plant a bomb in a luxurious hotel to transmit the unheeded messages.

The group's aim of bombing a London street is not only to challenge Margaret Thatcher, prime minister of Britain who is an anticommunist, but also her entrenched opposition "the IRA" (Irish Republican Army). The group questioned the IRA about the Irish's position to tell them what to do in their own country. They are rejected by the IRA, so they decided to act alone to prove themselves; this is a sufficient the reason to begin a bombing campaign. This idea is illustrated by Smith, HJ and Pettigrew, who are working on the Relative Deprivation Theory (2015): "Researchers have invoked relative deprivation to explain phenomena ranging from poor physical health to participation in collective protest

and even susceptibility to terrorist recruitment.”²³ In this case, researchers relate the participation of people in collective actions and even in terrorism to their deprivations. In this context, the squatters recourse to terrorism as a reaction to their deprivation.

Lessing starts by the description of the process and the development of the characters, and the way they managed to commit the act of terror. The first step is making the decision agreed by the entire group. Then they plan the attack in the agenda: the place, the time, and the persons that stay at home, and the ones that went to plant the bomb. The group is well organized because there is a member in the group called Jocline; who studies handbooks on how to be a “good” terrorist, and read “recipe books” on how to make explosive devices. So, she plans the entire operation and the place where the bomb should be set. The group is clever enough; they do their best to work together, and to be unnoticed. As a result, the first bomb is planted during night, and doesn’t achieve what they needed. For this; they decide to make another one during the day and plant it in a strategic area and this time, the bomb went off successfully.

In this way, the bomb will be in the front page in every newspaper and on the news night. The plan worked perfectly this time with great expertise. They are not seen by people nor caught by the police. Lessing reveals the importance of the media in terrorism, the group wait for the news on the radio, television and newspapers. Margaret Scanlan (1990) asserts that the squatters wait for the news as the authors wait for their articles to be published in the newspapers.²⁴ They want their act to be seen, and be noticed by all people from all over the world. They wait for the news with excitement to know how the politicians and the journalists interpreted the act. Media communicate and spread terror consequently, it helps to create terrorism. Alice waits all the time the news in the radio to know how the world would expound their act. So, the media is used as an advertiser which spreads terrorism. Each time when an act of terrorism is perpetuated, the terrorist could not visit the place of terror but they

stay at home waiting for news in the radio, television and newspapers. However, the media is very important for the terrorists because their purpose is to make the event seen and heard in the world to reach their goals.

The next point that Lessing wanted to show is the results of the bombing. The first bombing caused minimal damage. For this, Jocline one of the squatters' member, is upset as she is intended to cause extensive damage to the bollard and a certain area of the pavement so, her calculations hadn't been correct because of their blunder. For this, they decided to commit a second act; they targeted an up-market hotel in Knightsbridge. The second bombing results a big devastation at the park's hotel. One of their own members and four innocent people are killed and thirty people injured in the blast. The luxurious hotel is damaged and even cars are exploded. The most hurtful damage is the death of their friend after the premature detonation of the bomb in their car. The remaining comrades are shaken by what they have done and decide to leave the squat and split up. Alice is the only one who decides to not abandon the house where she puts so many efforts. As a conclusion, group's deprivation is ended on bombing (terror). As it is clarified by Clare Richardson (2011): "levels of terrorism may be explained in part as an expression of country conditions conducive to relative deprivation."²⁵ That is to say, terrorism comes from countries' deprivations. This idea is illustrated by the British deprivation which leads the squatters to terror (bombings).

Lessing clarifies the terrorist feeling of remorse as Elaine Martin states in her article *The Global Phenomena of Humanizing Terrorism in literature and Cinema* (2007): "the terrorist action experience doubts and may even repent."²⁶ The entire group is shocked by the death of their friend. Consequently, the squatters regret their act. Besides, Alice fears the loss of life when they make such harsh decisions, she is against human damage. Alice wants to break the capitalists but without murdering people. When she is in the scene waiting for their

comrade to accomplish the act of terror, she enters the hotel and calls the Samaritans to prevent damage:

“Oh quick, quick, there’s a bomb, it’s going to go off, come quickly, and it’s going to be in a car”

“Where is this car?” Enquired the Samaritans, in no way discomposed. When Alice did not at once answer, “you must tell us. We can’t get someone there until you tell us.”

Alice was thinking: but the car isn’t even there yet... and she said despondently, “well, perhaps it will be too late, anyway.”

“But where? The address, Do tell us the address?”

Alice could not bring herself to give the address. “It’s in Knightsbridge,” she said. She was going to ring off, and added, as an afterthought, it’s the IRA. Freedom for Ireland! For a united Ireland and peace for all mankind!” she rang off.²⁷

Alice is against the decision to explode the hotel; she is afraid of the damage that the bombing would cause. The hotel is full of people, and there are pedestrians on the pavement so she decides to call the Samaritans to warn them of the carnage that is about to happen. Finally, she denies the truth and declared that the barbaric act is done by the IRA. Alice is humanistic; she cannot hurt people. Even when she sees the two packages full of gun parts, she is shocked, and Jasper mocks on her intention as she sees a “ghost” instead of guns. She is afraid of those packages.

Markus Reitzenstein in an article entitled *Doris Lessing’s Narrative Strategies in Presenting Terrorist Psychology (2014)* asserts that Lessing “demonstrates the way ideologies and ideological thinking result in a distorted view of reality and endanger the mental health of the ideologist who may indeed have had a pure motive for his actions in the first place.”²⁸ In *The Good Terrorist*, The protagonist Alice’s dream in the first place is to establish a family structure, and at the same time she fights communism. She wants to break down the capitalist power; however, the squatters destroy everything she is fighting for. They broke their union, their communist party, and even their happiness disappeared because of the death of their friend Faye. Everything she fought for is ruined.

Unlike *The Good Terrorist* in which terror is exercised by a single force, in *Shalimar the Clown* it is practiced by various forces. Through the American policy, Salman Rushdie

represents the transformation of Kashmir from a peaceful paradise to a violent place of increased Islamic terrorism. Muslims of Kashmir become angry at the USA policies. As a result, they joined Islamic terrorist groups in an effort to combat the USA policies and actions, considering that their presence is the main reason behind the fall of Kashmir the land of paradise. Rushdie claims that The tragic history of Kashmir started with the coming of these three forces: the Indian army, the Pakistan forces, and the Americans. This is portrayed by Rushdie by showing the degeneration of Kashmir. This region of Kashmir sees different acts of terror by the Indian army which possess a massive military equipment like trucks, tanks and huge arms depot all over Kashmir. All these destructions weapons are operated and conducted by violent and horrible Indian generals who ordered their army to fight against Kashmiri people and causing them different kinds of terror (Killing, torture, beheading, killing children and old people...).

The second horrible act of terror is caused by Iron Mullah who inspires people of Pachigam to build a mosque and forced women to wear burkas and if they disobey they would be executed. This is what happens for some female characters in the novel: «they entered the home of Mohamed Sadiq and killed his twenty years old daughter Nosen Kausar. In the home of Khalid Ahmed, they killed young Shehnaaz Akhtar and they beheaded forty-three years old Jan Began in her own home.»²⁹ This Taliban leader orders the Kashmiri people who must obey him if not they will be tortured. He is seen as being their idol even his orders are abused.

Another trace of terror in Kashmir is the destruction of Pachigam due to many wars. People are executed, and buildings are in total ruins; the region is totally destroyed. Now Pachigam exists only on the map. The Pachigam people moved from camp to camp like animals and life conditions became unbearable. This idea reflects Clare Richardson argument “my results suggest that in nations that have experienced terrorist attacks previously, relative deprivation theory may hold some predictive power.”³⁰ This means that, deprivation prevents

the Kashmiri population from terrorist acts. Food shortage, lack of medicines and other necessities are the reasons that push Shalimar to terror. Then, the development of the terrorist act through Shalimar reflects the transformation of Kashmir from peace to violence. Minu Vettamala in *Politics and Shalimar the Clown* affirms that: “Shalimar was overcome by the most violent form of revenge as denoted by the warrior’s terrorist incidents over the world.”³¹ Shalimar’s mother saw the death of both her son Anees, and her husband, and the transformation of her loved son Shalimar into a killing machine, all these horrors would stick in her mind forever.

Furthermore, another important individual deprivation who commits the act of terror is Shalimar, who becomes a terrorist. The assassination is viewed by many of the westerners as a terrorist attack which is shown to be the case of personal revenge. For this reason, he is condemned for six years in jail. The situation becomes so dramatic due to the invasion of foreign forces in Kashmir, which pushes its people to become terrorists like Shalimar and others because they are deprived of their rights: land, peace, liberty, their own culture, and even life necessities. This may be reinforced by a research undertaken by Heather Smith, Pettigrew, Gina Pippin, and Silvana Bialosiewicz (2012) and which states that there are some outcomes as a reaction to relative deprivation, so the act of being deprived from something in life may lead the self or actor to many deviant behaviors and the worst result is the recourse to violence. Individual’s deprivations can afford people to act violently by making their own decisions.³² This is seen in the novel when the terrorist group taught Shalimar how to kill, since assassination is the only way that quenches his thirst. On his first assignment, he decides to use a knife rather than a gun because he wants to feel what is firsthand, and what is like to take someone else’s life? Shalimar’s deprivation and the desire for revenge disturbed his mind to the extent to become a great criminal. Through Rushdie’s novel we notice that the existence of different forces in Kashmir is the reason behind the conflicts, wars and

the transformation of the paradisiacal land; however, the quest for status, wealth, and revenge results in disastrous conflicts in Kashmir.

In sum, this study in the light of Samuel Stouffer, Iain Walker, and other theorists of “Relative Deprivation” has proved that people’s feeling of deprivation may react with groups to improve their life in both novels. They react either individually or collectively by the use of political violence to reach their objectives. They procure to all the existing protests and strikes to get back their rights and justice relying on terror; however, terrorism is a form of political violence, for that, it is used as an act of violence toward a group or a government. It is used to reach personal and group purposes. Terrorists turn to bombs to express themselves because words do not speak loudly enough. They decided to act violently to change the circumstances of their country.

Through their fiction, Doris Lessing and Salman Rushdie denounce the terrorist acts in their period: the 9/11 attacks in the USA and the IRA (Irish Republican Army) bombing of the Harrods department store in London 1983. They use fiction to write about contemporary scenes. They want to show that terror is a global phenomenon that exists all over the world. The authors want to show that the act of terror is done by convictions, in order to change, correct, get power, and most of all to take revenge. Relying on the theory of “Relative Deprivation”, we concluded that all types of deprivation (economic, political social, and psychosocial) push individuals and groups to the acts of terror in order to regain their strength. That is to say, terror is a dependent criterion in relative deprivation. In *The Good Terrorist*, the communist squatters want to overthrow the capitalist rulers and to change Britain. However, in *Shalimar The Clown* the protagonist wants to make revenge from the American Ambassador who transforms his life into hell. The two authors prove from the act of terror, a hurtful result in the sense that people that commit acts of terror end with mental illness. This is the case of Alice and Shalimar whose lives end with psychological troubles.

The two authors denounce the existence of the phenomenon of terrorism in both the west and the eastern countries like Pakistan, India, and Kashmir. The two authors show how the characters proceed and engage in political attitudes and participation in collective action to the act of terror to reach their quest for equality. This is to incite social change against complacency and capitalism. We also conclude that there is a close relationship between individual and group relative deprivation with the use of political violence because they use terror in purpose to acquire their rights, the only way through which they succeed to get them. The characters move from grievance to action. Both authors are aware of the flaws of their societies. For this reason, they criticize them in their novels to show to the reader the real image of their corrupted countries. Both Rushdie and Lessing develop tragic stories that end in terror, death, and psychological troubles.

End notes

1. "Iain Walker and Heather J. Smith, *Relative Deprivation: specification, Development, and Integration*(United Kingdom : Cambridge University Press,2002).url: <https://books.google.dz/books?id.25>.
2. Clare Richardson, "Relative Deprivation Theory in Terrorism: A Study of Higher Education and Unemployment as Predictors of Terrorism."(Senior Honors Thesis, New York University, 2011),6.
3. Iain Walker and Heather J. Smith, *Relative Deprivation: Specification, Development, and Integration* (United Kingdom : Cambridge University Press,2002).url: <https://books.google.dz/books?id.25>.
4. Ibid, 135.
5. Heather Smith, Thomas Pettigrew, Gina pippin, SilvanaBialosiewicz, "*Relative Deprivation: A Theoretical and Meta-Analytic Review*."Sonoma State University of California,2012, 3.
6. Lessing,*The Good Terrorist*, 77.
7. Iain Walker and Heather J. Smith, *Relative Deprivation: Specification, Development, and Integration* (United Kingdom : Cambridge University Press,2002).url: <https://books.google.dz/books?id.25>.
8. Lessing, *The Good Terrorist*, 75.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid, 153.
11. Iain Walker and Heather J. Smith, *Relative Deprivation: Specification, Development, and Integration* (United Kingdom : Cambridge University Press,2002).url: <https://books.google.dz/books?id.24>.
12. Clare Richardson, "Relative Deprivation Theory in Terrorism: A Study of Higher Education and Unemployment as Predictors of Terrorism."(Senior Honors Thesis, New York University, 2011),6.
13. Lessing, *The Good Terrorist*, 310
14. NemanjaDzuverovic, "Does more (or less) lead to violence? Application in Relative Deprivation Hypothesis on Economic Inequality-induced Conflicts," Croatian International Relations Review v19, no68. (2013): 5,Accessed September 26,2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2478/cirr-2013-0003>.
15. Walter Korpi, "Conflict, Power and Relative Deprivation," The American Political Science Review v68,no4,(1974):1, Accessed August 28th,2019.DOI: 10.2307/1959942
16. Rushdie, *Shalimar The Clown*, 126.
17. NemanjaDzuverovic, "Does more (or less) lead to violence? Application in Relative Deprivation Hypothesis on Economic Inequality-induced Conflicts," Croatian International Relations Review v19, no68. (2013):5, Accessed September 26,2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2478/cirr-2013-0003>.
18. Raul Caruso, Friedrich Schneider, "The Socio-economic Determinant of Terrorism and Political Violence in western Europe (1994-2007)," European Journal of Political Economy 27, (2011):2, Accessed September 15th,2019, doi: [100.1016/j.ejpo/eco.2011.02.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpo/eco.2011.02.003).

19. "Shodhganga," Google, url: Shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in>5Chapter VI Kashmir Conflict: as Represented in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*.
20. Clare Richardson, "Relative Deprivation Theory in Terrorism: A Study of Higher Education and Unemployment as Predictors of Terrorism." (Senior Honors Thesis, New York University, 2011),6.
21. "Merriam Webster," Google, url: <https://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/Terror>.
22. Elaine Martin, "The Global Phenomenon of "Humanizing" Terrorism in Literature and Cinema, *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* v 9, no1.(2007):9, Accessed March 25th,2019,url:<https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374-1023>>.
23. Smith, HJ, Pettigrew, TF. "AMeta-Analytic Critique of Relative Deprivation," *Social Justice Research* v28,no1.(2015):5,Accessed April 5th2019,doi:[10.1007/s11211-014-02315](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-014-02315).
24. Margaret Scanlan, "Language and Politics of Despair in Doris Lessing's "*the Good Terrorist*," *winter* v23, no2. (1990): page 183-184, Accessed March 19th, 2019, url: <https://www.Jstor.org/stable/1345737>.
25. Clare Richardson, "Relative Deprivation Theory in Terrorism: A Study of Higher Education and Unemployment as Predictors of Terrorism." (Senior Honors Thesis, New York University, 2011),7.
26. Elaine Martin, "The Global Phenomenon of "Humanizing" Terrorism in Literature and Cinema, *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* v 9, no1. (2007):9, Accessed March 25th,2019,url:<https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374-1023>>.
27. Lessing, *The Good Terrorist*, 314.
28. "Critical theory online, «Google, url:<http://etal.hu/en/archive/terrorism-and-aesthetics-2015/reitzenstein-the-good-terrorist/>
29. Rushdie, *Shalimar the Clown*, 91.
30. Clare Richardson, "Relative Deprivation Theory in Terrorism: A Study of Higher Education and Unemployment as Predictors of Terrorism." (Senior Honors Thesis, New York University, 2011),6.
31. "Academia.edu," Google, url: <https://www.academia.edu/4271543/Politics-and-Shalimar-the-Clown>.
32. Heather Smith, Thomas Pettigrew, Gina pippin, SilvanaBialosiewicz, "*Relative Deprivation: A Theoretical and Meta-Analytic Review*." (Review, Sonoma State University of California,2012), 7.

III Results

This dissertation is a binary study of Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* (1985) and Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown* (2005). Its aim is to study political violence in the two novels. To reach our aim, we have chosen to make reference of Samuel Stouffer and his colleagues' theory of Relative Deprivation. In fact, at first glance the two novels seem to be literally different from each other. They are written in two different periods and by two authors from two different backgrounds. Nonetheless, a profound analysis of the two works has permitted us to discover that both Lessing and Rushdie deal with the same theme which is political violence.

In the first chapter of our discussion, entitled "Sources of Political Violence", we came to the following results. Through the deep analysis of *The Good Terrorist* and *Shalimar the Clown*, we have deduced that the first reason that pushes characters in the two novels to act violently is social poverty. The two authors show the oppression that their population suffers from. People are deprived from everything they deserve as human rights: work, resources and food. Another important factor is the crisis of identity; people do not know to which side they belong, and they are unable to establish their own identity. This urges them to deviant behaviors like terrorism. The last reason is related to psychological troubles; as a result of social poverty and identity crisis since these characters suffer from psychological problems. We have concluded that grievance, deprivation, and oppression are the main reasons that draw the characters to psychological troubles. The characters who suffer from psychological problems are able to do anything to sustain their needs; they decide to act by their own accord to spread terror which is according to them the last solution that can bring positive results in order to make change.

In the second chapter, entitled "The Use of Political Violence," the study has revealed that terror is used by individuals and groups experiencing deprivation. They used it as a

reaction (response) to people deprivation. Terror initiates with individuals or groups who are deprived from their human rights. We have found that the characters decide to integrate into social groups to work in solidarity to reach their purposes; by doing so, they rely on terror to retrieve their rights and to live in an equitable environment. This investigation has shown that the two protagonists of the two novels are victims of a tyrannical social system. The characters shift from individuality to social groups to improve their lives conditions and to gain wealth, revenge, status, power, and justice which are decisive elements to break down their oppressive enemies. We have deduced that the characters quest of an equitable life is the main reason that draws them to act violently. Terror is chosen as a self-defense to achieve their goals and to surpass their deprivations. We assume that the terrorists view themselves as victims rather than aggressors in the struggle. We notice that they choose action because their words are unheeded so they speak by acting. By the way, Rushdie portrays the character Shalimar as a representative member of other terrorists. Through him, we see how revenge transformed him in to a terrorist.

The two authors investigate the same theme of terror even though their settings are different. They came to the same tragic end, and they treated a global phenomenon that touched the whole world. They show how terrorism shifts from individual and social traumas into political actions. Rushdie suggests that Kashmir gives birth to terrorism out of a personal hurt that turns a beautiful region to a disastrous one. Whereas, Lessing depicts the oppressive capitalists, that draw their innocent people to terrorism. As a result, the two novels develop an antiterrorist discourse. They show to the reader the danger and psychological troubles that can effect terrorists. They want to put an end to the consequences and traumas of terrorism.

V. General Conclusion

Throughout all this humble study, we have tried to provide the reader with a possibility to bring together two authors from two distinct countries, in different periods of time, but who have dealt with the same themes. This study has explored the issue of political violence by examining the two chosen works namely in the right of *The Good Terrorist* and *Shalimar the Clown* using the theory of “Relative Deprivation”. By doing so, we concluded that terror is a global phenomenon that touches each country and society. The two authors share the same view towards the devastating sources and results of terror. Both Lessing and Rushdie deal with the problems that their societies face and the existence of corruption in the world; both the British capitalists and the American power are corrupted.

In the first chapter, we have analyzed the sources and reasons of political violence in the two novels. *The Good Terrorist* is a literary representation of character’s suffering during a period of harsh capitalism, it’s the fact that leads them to be together and to build a great force to join “The Communist Center Union.” The group squatters are revolutionary members that look for their individual and social benefits. They fight in order to destroy capitalism and by doing so, they hope to change the British society into its positive side and to gain their human rights and consideration. As far as, *Shalimar the Clown* is concerned it represents also the oppressive life that the Kashmiri people faced during the twenties under the Pakistan forces, Indian army, and American power. All these forces lead to regional disorder, cultural erosion, loss of values. By comparing both works in relation to the issue of political violence, we deduced that the main reasons that lead characters to violence are social poverty, identity, and psychology.

In the second chapter, we have studied the use of political violence In *The Good Terrorist* and *Shalimar The Clown*. Both novels protagonists suffer from life conditions which push them to social groups to gain strength by using the act of terror. Terror is used

individually and collectively by experiencing deprivation and the deprived figures used terror as a mean to reach their goals. From the two works, we conclude that the purpose of acting violently is to improve life conditions, justice, and rights. We have noticed that terrorism is an anarchist work that is caused by individual or group motives. Terrorism is not a fortuitous act; it starts by minor protests to attain violence and disorder. Lessing and Rushdie succeed to give a representative image of the chaos in which their two countries lived. The two authors explore realistic events that occurred in the world so their two works represent the world and these works; we deduce that the two authors want to fight terrorism. They inform the reader about the danger that terror causes as well as the reasons and consequences that violence can result. In a word, the two novels are anti-terrorist narratives.

In the scope of this research, we could not deal with all the themes that Doris Lessing and Salman Rushdie develop in their works *The Good Terrorist* (1985) and *Shalimar the Clown* (2005). Therefore, we exhort other students interested in this kind of literature to explore and analyze the two novels further as it is filled with research issues that deserve to be explored. For instance, a research can be undertaken to study the issue of power in the two narratives.

VI. Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Doris, Lessing. *The Good Terrorist*. United States, New York: Vintage Books, 1985.
- Salman, Rushdie. *Shalimar the Clown*. New York: Random House, 2005.

Secondary Sources

Books:

- Carole, Boyce Davies. *Black Women, Writing and Identity: Migrations of the subject*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Kumamoto Robert, *International Terrorism and American Foreign Relations 1945-1976*, Northeastern University: Boston Press, 1999.
- Perinbam B. Marie. *Holy Violence: The Revolutionary Thought of Frantz Fanon*. Washington: Three Continents Press, 1982.

Electronic Books

- Iain, Walker, and Heather J. Smith, *Relative deprivation: specification, development, and integration*. United Kingdom: Cambridge university press, 2002).url:
<https://books.google.dz/books?id.>
- Randy, Borum. *Psychology of Terrorism. United States of America: University of South Florida, 2004*. Accessed September 24, 2019.
url: https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1570&context=mhlp_facpub

Journal Articles and theses:

- Richardson, Clare. "Relative Deprivation Theory in Terrorism: A Study of Higher Education and Unemployment as Predictors of Terrorism." Senior Honors Thesis, New York University, 2011.

- Rollason, Christopher. "Salman Rushdie's "Shalimar the clown": a secularist manifesto?." University of Cergy- Pontoise, 2013.
- Elaine, Martin. "The Global Phenomenon of "humanizing" Terrorism in Literature and Cinema. CLCWeb." *Comparative Literature and Culture* v 9, no1. (2007):9. Accessed March 25th, 2019. url: <https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374-1023>>.
- Ester, Gendusa. "Doris Lessing's Fiction: Literature as a Commitment." *Other Modernities*, Universita Degli Studio: Milano, 2014.
- Gabrielle, Petta, and Iain Walker, "Relative Deprivation and Ethnic Identity." *British journal of social psychology*, no31. (1992), Accessed April 20, 2019. url: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com>abs>.
- Gillian, Bright. "Paper Ink, and "the Blood-Stained Inanity": The Aesthetics of Terrorist Violence in Josef Conrad's *The Secret Agent*, Paul Theroux's *The Family Arsenal* and Doris Lessing's *The Good Terrorist*." *Critic, Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, University of Toronto, 2015.
- Heather, Smith, Thomas Pettigrew, Gina pippin, SilvanaBialosiewicz, "Relative Deprivation: A Theoretical and Meta-Analytic Review." Sonoma State University of California, 2012.
- James D. Fearon. "What is Identity (As We Now Use The Word)?" Draft, Stanford University, 1999.
- Margaret, Scanlan. "Language and Politics of Despair in Doris Lessing's "*the Good Terrorist*." *winterv23*, no2. (1990): page 183-184. Accessed March 19th, 2019. url: <https://www.Jstor.org/stable/1345737>.
- Mark, Einer Looney. "Representing Terrorism: Aesthetic Reflection And Political Action in Contemporary Germany novels." Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 2010.
- NemanjaDzuverovic, "Does more (or less) lead to violence? Application in Relative Deprivation Hypothesis on Economic Inequality-induced Conflicts." Croatian

International Relations Review v19, no68. (2013): 5. Accessed September 26, 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2478/cirr-2013-0003>.

- Nyiwul, Mabughu and Tarek Selim. "Poverty as Social Deprivation: A survey." Review of Social Economy v64, no2. (2006):1. Accessed September 28, 2019.Doi: 10.1080/00346760600072.
- Raul, Caruso, and Friedrich Schneider. "The Socio-economic Determinant of Terrorism and Political Violence in western Europe (1994-2007)." European Journal of Political Economy v27, (2011):2. Accessed September 15th, 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.ejpo/eco.2011.02.003.
- Saurabh Kumar, Singh. "Salman Rushdie's Shalimar the clown: Tragic Tale of a Smashed World." Lapis Lazuli- An International literary Journal v2, no1. (2012):11. Accessed April 3rd, 2019.url:<http://pintersociety.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Saurabh-Kumar-Singh-5.pdf>.
- Serge, Guimond. "Relative Deprivation and the Quebec Nationalist Movement: The Cognition- Emotion Distinction and the Personal Group Deprivation Issue." Journal of personality and Social Psychology v44, no3. (1983): 3, Accessed may 12th, 2019.doi: 10.1037/0022-3514, 44, 3, 526.
- Shlomo, Yitzhaki. "Relative Deprivation and the Gini Coefficient*." The Quarterly Journal of Economics(1979): 1-2. AccessedMay12th, 2019. url: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/24092604>.
- Vijeta, Gautam. "Stripping off Humanity in Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar The clown*." International Journal of English and Education v3, no1. (2014): 5. Accessed March2nd, 2019. url: [ijee.org>24.1154532.pdf](http://ijee.org/24.1154532.pdf).
- Walter, Korpi. "Conflict, Power and Relative Deprivation." The American Political science Review v68, no4. (1974):1, Accessed August 28th,2019.DOI: 10.2307/1959942.

Web sources

- "Academia.edu." Google. url: <https://www.academia.edu/4271543/Politics-and-Shalimar-the-Clown>.

- “Agent and Event Types.” Google. Last modified: 2019.url:
https://www.acleddata.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Definitions-of-Political-Violence_2015.pdf.
- “Chegg study.” Google. Last modified: 2003-2019. url:
<https://www.chegg.com/homework-help/definitions/relative-deprivation-theory-49>.
- “Compassion International.” Google. last modified: 2019. url:
<https://www.compassion.com/poverty/what-ispoverty.htm>.
- “Critical theory online. Google. url: <http://etal.hu/en/archive/terrorism-and-aesthetics-2015/reitzenstein-the-good-terrorist/>.
- “Literary article.”Google. Last modified: 2019.url: <https://literacle.com/literary-violence/>.
- “ Merriam Webster”. Google. url: <https://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/Terror>.
- “Psychology,today.”Google.Lastmodified:2019.url:
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-mysteries-love/201503/what-is-psychological-disorder>.
- “Shodhganga.” Google.url: Shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in>Chapter VI Kashmir Conflict: as Represented in Salman Rushdie’s *Shalimar the Clown*.
- “Shodhganga.” Google.url: Shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in>5 Chapter, Impact of the Neo-imperialist Strategies, Terrorism, Individual life-*Shalimar the clown*.
- “Shodhganga.” Google. url: Shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in>jspui. Chapter IV Disappointed Idealism, The Good Terrorist. Divya186. 2.