

T.C.
SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI

THE PAKISTANI DIASPORA IN HANIF
KUREISHI'S THREE SHORT STORIES:
WE'RE NOT JEWS, WITH YOUR TONGUE DOWN MY THROAT
AND MY SON THE FANATIC

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

DANIŞMAN
YRD. DOÇ. DR. GÜLBÜN ONUR

HAZIRLAYAN
T. ESİN ÖZTÜRK (BAĞCI)

KONYA - 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.INTRODUCTION	1
2.POSTCOLONIALISM.....	6
2.1.The Concepts of Colonialism and Postcolonialism.....	6
2.2.Theories about Postcolonialism.....	8
2.3.The Concepts of Diaspora, Home and Hybridity	14
3. WE'RE NOT JEWS	22
3.1.The Attacks of English Neighbours.....	22
3.2.The Father's Struggle to be Accepted and His Mishap	34
3.3.The Wretchedness of the Feelings.....	38
3.4.The Irony of the Search for a Better Place	45
3.5.Azhar's Discovery of His Eastern Self.....	48
4.WITH YOUR TONGUE DOWN MY THROAT	51
4.1.Nina's Awaiting for Her Half-Sister	51
4.2.Nadia's Arrival to England and Her Disillusionment	54
4.3.Nina's Going to Pakistan and Her Disillusionment	65
4.4.Nina's Discovery of True Love in Pakistan	72
4.5.Nina's "Necessary Return" to London and The Trick in the Narration	75
5.MY SON THE FANATIC.....	78
5.1.The Changes in Ali and the Father's Hopeless Search for Truth	78
5.2.The Father's Discovery of the Truth	83
5.3.The Conflict of the Father and the Son.....	86
5.4.Bettina's Escape and Parvez's Loss	101
5.5. Father's Act of Violence and the Paradoxical Question.....	103
6.CONCLUSION	106
7.WORKS CITED	109

1. INTRODUCTION

Hanif Kureishi is one of the most prolific writers of contemporary English Literature. He has a Pakistani father and an English mother who he uses as characters in many of his works. He is productive in many ways and renowned as a film-director and playwright as well as an author. His works generally appear to be autobiographical. In most of his works, he uses the perspective of being a “half-caste” in England. The historical and cultural conflict between East and West, the psychological conditions of the people in postcolonial societies, racial abuse and discrimination, the sense of alienation and belonging, sexuality, drug-usage and hybrid identities are his themes. Colin MacCabe in his interview with Kureishi relates that his work has almost all been set in London and is, arguably, the most significant body of work which investigates, interrogates and celebrates the realities of post-colonial London. Therefore, London is a place of imagination for Kureishi who sees it as a “playground” in which he can create his stories. His father’s experience of coming to England as a Paki immigrant, the hardship and alienation Kureishi encountered as a diaspora identity in his youth are all involved in his works. He does not seem to force himself to write especially about those subjects as a half-blood but he “just tell[s] the stories that [are] close to [him]... that [is] just the world around [him] ”. Therefore he finds the focal elements in culture to employ them in his works. He searches for the bizarre and impressive that is caused by a kind of confrontation and loves its dynamic and vigorous outcome. Although he states in his essay “The Rainbow Sign” that “[he] tried to deny [his] Pakistani self” as it was like a “curse” what brought humiliation, he, later on, learns to reconcile with his “Pakistani self” (4). He suffers insult, violence, discrimination and debasement but still loves England.

In his first visit to Pakistan, he finds the chance to compare Pakistan and England through which he realizes the deficiencies and efficiencies of both countries. Although his roots are in Pakistan, he still feels belonging to England. As an immigrant, being in England is a mode of existing in the world for him. Therefore, he makes use of his “in-between” situation and utilizes all the advantages it brings into his life. “Home” and “belonging” seem to be complex notions to be dealt with and these terms express more than they do to anybody, for those diaspora writers. McLeod sees the migrant in a better position than others to realize that all systems of knowledge, all views of the world, are never totalizing, whole or pure, but incomplete, muddled and hybrid (215). For that reason, “in-betweenness” provides a space for great fertility and inspiration as well as opportunity.

It leads to new perspectives and understandings of the world. From this novel standpoint, all the long-standing thoughts and judgements seem challengeable. The state of being a hybrid is an errantry posture in the world which does not have dependable roots while offering touch to more than one place and nation both physically and imaginatively. For McLeod, Kureishi alleges that “meaning could be made from the discontinuous scraps and fragmentary remains of [his] different Indian and Pakistani inheritances, bringing the resources of the past to bear upon [his life] in the present” (218). It is the sense of living in somewhere but looking through to a different place by way of time and space. The effect of immigration goes on even for the children who were born and brought up in England. Therefore, being diaspora identities, their emotional ties with their native countries are not broken. They are the parts of the “shared history” between their old and new countries. But this shared history does not allow them to involve in a full belonging. They are connected with both countries while belonging to neither of them.

In this study, “postcolonialism” as a literary term as well as a political and historical one is discussed. Its meaning is presented through different point of views of various postcolonial theorists and critics. While some of them perceive postcolonialism as an extending process of colonialism, some others see it is as a challenge to colonialism giving the prefix “post” a meaning of “against” or “anti”. The common point in the opinions is that they grasp the notion of postcolonialism related with colonialism. Edward Said’s work “Orientalism” is one of the most noteworthy sources which casts light on the subject. In his book, he mentions the terms “Orient”, “Oriental”, “Orientalist” and “Orientalism” for the first time and asserts the view that “West” and “East” are inseparable parts of each other. While West is a dominator over East, East is always thought to be inferior which is bound to submission. Therefore West’s authoritative existence is only possible with a vulnerable East that is always feeble against its magnificence. Said states in his book that East’s features has always attracted West and in the consequence it has always been the analyzed part.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Homi Bhabha, Frantz Fanon and many others are theorists and critics whose views are mentioned in this work. Spivak is pessimistic about East’s posture before west. She evaluates it as disparity that East can not transfer its real ideas towards West and always doomed to be the “subaltern”. While Spivak deals with the voice of East in colonial and postcolonial writing, Fanon is much more interested in the psychological effects as a black academic and psychiatrist. He relates his theory that black

people have always worn masks to veil their thoughts as well as their skins to flatter the white West. West's perception that East is evil and despicable has been stuck on East like a curse and Fanon advises his people to get rid of that impression by expressing themselves competently, determinedly and persuasively in their texts. So he also emphasizes the importance of the works of postcolonial writers that make it possible for the colonized to be heard. According to him if they can not enunciate what they believe in and what they are subjugated by, they are exposed to be assimilated.

Assimilation, doubleness, the state of being "in-between", hybridity, and otherness are all concepts that help to characterize the meaning of diaspora and what a diaspora community is. As a term of Greek origin, diaspora is a key expression and a forceful concept embodying all the postcolonial position. Diaspora people who live away from their native countries experience a foreign culture through which they establish new identities. These new identities are the outcome of the clash between two societies' characteristics and they are always alive and active as the conflict goes on breeding discord. With the newly-gained identities, diaspora people certainly encounter problems and suffer identity crisis. While some of them long for the native land that survives in their imaginative world to turn out to be illusion, some of them are entirely captured by the allure of the new country. The ones who use this in-between identity in favour of themselves like Kureishi are rare as it needs harmony in thought and understanding. It requires a reconciliation and synthesis between the parallel attitudes and balanced approaches to both sides. The traditional dispute between East and West fosters these new identities. "Home" and "belonging" develop into obscure notions for them as they create new borders in their minds. These terms lead for a tedious dilemma that is hard to cope with.

In this study, it is aimed to convey how "Kureishi's immigrants struggle with reality: with political hypocrisy, racial and ethnic prejudice, and economic failure" (Kaleta 14) through his three short stories. Kaleta uses "liquid windows" to define Kureishi's perspective and how his story-telling is energetic and vital. "The liquid windows" is attentively chosen as "Kureishi's storytelling is illustrative and reflective of the author; that is, Kureishi perceives society from the distinct vantage point of his cultural hybridity and, as importantly, through the distanced perspective of his artistry" (4). So, Kureishi's fiction both exposes his world and mirrors him. As a director of his own films, he exhibits the universe cinematically. American cinema's influence is seen on his viewpoint and his story-telling. He seems as if he is carrying a camera while writing his stories. Kaleta

considers “Kureishi’s point of view as a filmmaker is pivotal throughout his story-telling” (12).

In the first story “We’re Not Jews”, he certainly uses his own childhood experience to create characters like Azhar, his mother and father. In his interview with Amitava Kumar, he states that his mother “hadn’t realized the consequences of marrying an Indian man [which] worked themselves out later on” and that “she found all that very hard” to put up with and he certifies that this story is about it. The story is about the innocent young child Azhar whose father is Pakistani and the mother is English. Azhar has not been aware of the long-standing conflict between English and “Paki”s till he discovers the racism through his English neighbours’ assaults. He finds himself responding to those offences at once and notices that he has lost his innocence and gained a new identity that thoroughly conveys the marks of his Eastern self. Bigotry, bias and racism are the story’s central themes.

Kureishi, like in many of his stories, uses dialogue to display the brutal reality, which leads the child character, Azhar, to a disappointment. Therefore, Azhar inherits his Pakistani father’s failure and disillusionment in West as a posture that will never be improved. In the story, even the writer’s words seem pitiless to express the faltering fact.

The second story, “With Your Tongue down My Throat”, is about Nadia and Nina whose father is Pakistani. Nina living in London with her English mother and Nadia in Pakistan in a large family imagine each other through the stories they have been told. But when Nadia comes to England, she realizes that it is completely prejudice to fantasy this country as a “gorgeous” place as her father told her. For Nina, it is the same when she goes to Pakistan. She can not find Pakistan as a purified, mystifying and exceptional place as she has long dreamed it. According to Kaleta, “Kureishi’s short story exposes both sides of twentieth-century immigration” (151) as well as it touches Kureishi’s “most recognizable themes: race, immigration, and familial conflicts” (157). In this story, the reader recognizes that Kureishi’s fictional world is not limited with the perception that only Asian characters are exposed to racial abuse. Nina representing West in her visit to Pakistan, suffers the most of this ethnical debasement and what is the most striking and pathetic is that she is mainly mortified by her own father. Kureishi also uses “the point-of-view-within-a-point-of-view device” (Kaleta 152) as a skilful writer who employs a “male author, having attempted to tell a story from a female point of view, then went on to experiment with

expanding his storytelling to include other gender, national, and racial perspectives” (Kaleta 152).

“My Son the Fanatic”, as the third and last story of this study, deals with the conflict between Asian father, Parvez and his son, Ali. When it is compared with the other two stories, it is noticed that the mother is not English, but Pakistani. So it can be inferred that Kureishi, not only employs the conventional East-West theme but adds a new dimension to this subject-matter and views it in a family whose members are all “Pakis”. Definitely, it should not be understood that it is a simple disagreement between a father and a son for the story turns out to its original East-West theme. Parvez who has migrated to England, which is perceived as a place of promises and opportunities, realizes the changes in his son, Ali, for whom he has great expectations of future. Ali’s tendency to the Eastern way of living and his indifference to his father with his brutal judgements turn into assaults towards Parvez who can not tolerate any more and beats his son at the end. The story stops with the paradoxical and critical question of Ali “So who’s the fanatic now?” exposing the flaws within Asian society in itself.

Although Kureishi’s statements are very simple and his narration sometimes lacks profundity, the reader feels an expanding excitement while reading his stories. The honesty in his perspective without taking sides, his observation of the characters is his most impressive qualities as a writer. With his determined and clear narration, he serves us the most agitating realities of life. He gains his power from the human relations. He expresses the sense of having an ethnical origin in social and psychological dimensions while exalting the simple. In his stories the conventional subjects like racism act as new matters with his humour. He depicts the moments his characters discover his true-selves from a different standpoint by excluding all the unnecessary elements. Therefore he creates fascinating works of art to be read in gratification.

2. POSTCOLONIALISM

2.1. The Concepts of Colonialism and Postcolonialism

“Postcolonialism” is an excessively evasive term to classify and define like postmodernism and poststructuralism that are used with the prefix “post”. It has been extensively engaged and instructionally popular in the last decade. There are two forms of the word although their meanings are used to express the same thing, one is with a hyphen (post-colonialism) and the other is without a hyphen (postcolonialism). Political scientists and economists used to define the “period after colonialism” with the hyphenated form until late seventies but from then on it began to be used widely in every area of research like literary criticism and nowadays there is an inclination to use the unhyphenated form as it can be seen in book titles and essays.

Postcolonialism is inclusively used to characterise the consequences and outcomes that have occurred after the colonial years in the colonized societies. Besides, Ato Quayson, in the introduction part of “Postcolonialism”, states that postcolonialism also concerns “slavery, migration, suppression, resistance, difference, race, gender, place” and “historical, philosophical, anthropological and linguistic discourses as a reply or reaction to imperial Europe”(2). What happened and was experienced or ignored in the era of colonialism and imperialism is as much connected with the meaning of postcolonialism as what has come with the end of colonialism. Quayson also suggests “perceiv[ing]” postcolonialism “as a process of postcolonializing” and she focuses on the prefix “post” as it puts “postcolonialism” into a chronological order of events “suggest[ing] that the colonial stage has been surpassed and left behind”(9). She believes that the term should be grasped as “a process of coming-into-being and of struggle *against* colonialism and its after-effects”, so the prefix gains a meaning of “anti”. The effects seen in different colonized societies would certainly be different. The notion of postcolonialism would not be the same in every colonized area. What we should do is to determine the shared standards and reduce them to a common denominator and infer an understanding of the contemporary world. Because the postcolonialism is not just a “chronological marker” but an “epistemological marker”, too (Quayson 11). Quayson also defines postcolonialism as a “second order meditation upon real (and imagined) conditions”(134) of the world we live in. It is a second order meditation because it can not be thought without the term “colonialism” and it can not be defined before the “colonialism” is ultimately understood. She quotes from Slemon, a postcolonial theorist, that postcolonialism is “a constant

interplay and slippage between the sense of a historical transition, a sociocultural location and an epochal configuration”(2). John McLeod insists on the necessity of being careful and exact while appreciating the connection between “colonialism” and “postcolonialism”. He argues that “colonialism fundamentally affects modes of *representation*”(32). What is disciplined as “truth” or “reality” are in deed brought with language in a series of notions “about the proper order of things”. Therefore as soon as a colony succeeds to reach its freedom, it is not logical and true to say that colonialism ends. Because the merits that belong to colonialism do not cease at the very moment of freedom. “Life after independence” is identified with the continuity of various colonisation impacts by Stuart Hall and according to McLeod, “colonialism’s *representations*, reading *practices* and *values* are not so easily dislodged”(32). So he focuses on the impossibility of saying that there is a postcolonial period while all the ideas, beliefs and judgements the colonialism owns, keep themselves so untouched. Therefore it can be argued that “postcolonialism” partly means a confrontation to the knowledge of colonialism and a reactionary response to its attitudes, a struggle to obtain that intact whole. Besides, “colonial ways of knowing” still continues and is current. Because as it has been stated before, it has not marvellously called a halt in the day of independence. So post-colonialism can neither be delimited with the motto “after colonialism” nor it can be characterised as a thoroughly “new historical era”. Furthermore, it is not a remedy or a healing power or a recovery to the totality of the problems and threatening ways of colonialism. It does not indicate a completely renewed and virgin heroic era. Instead, it approves to be the part of “historical *continuity* and *change*”(McLeod 33). It does not matter that the borders of the colonizer countries have been drawn once more with the “decolonisation”, for the colonial effects still circulate. The suppression was so strong that it still can not be thrown away from the minds and dislodged with favourable feelings. Postcolonialism can be thought to assure the probability of a success of a challenge despite all the contrary effects.

According to Karen Piper, “post-colonial” is not just “after colonialism” or “resisting colonialism”. She describes “post-colonialism” as “after the imprint of colonialism”. Therefore post-colonialism, making the term “colonialism” lose its meaning, started :

the moment the colonizer established his presence on foreign soil and continues through to today. ... On the contrary, I would suggest that colonialism involves all the machinations of power that lead to a post-colonial environment: it is the economic, social, and military policy which subjects one territory to another through the institution of foreign dependencies. “Colonialism” in this sense is the agent; “post-colonialism” is the result. (19)

2.2. Theories about Postcolonialism

Postcolonialism can be perceived as “formulat[ing] non-western modes of discourse as a viable means of challenging the West”(Quayson 2) .This thought may be based upon the work of Edward Said ,being one of the most important postcolonial theorists, who was born in Palestine but brought up in Egypt and the U.S.A. Said’s work “Orientalism”, published in 1978, is an essential grounding for postcolonial studies as it obtained to form many research areas. It was used in many fields from economics to mathematics and from academic to political levels in analysing disciplines. The words “Orient”, “Oriental” , “Orientalist” and “Orientalism” first appeared as the key terms in this work. According to Said there were two poles (extreme points),West and East (the Orient) which cannot be true without the former. Without West ,East was nothing. West was the authorizing power and the East was expected to show allegiance. The political pressures pushed the “Orient” towards the West making it feel inferior and alien to it and identifying the “Orient” as “Other”.

The “Oriental” is the person who comes from the “Orient”. Although he was seen as feeble, unprotected, lacking and powerless, he surprisingly frightened the West and was identified as menacing to the Western concepts. There are two kinds of Orientalism mentioned in Said’s work. One of them is passive and the other is the activated form of this silent one. They are explained as below:

Latent Orientalism is the unconscious, untouchable certainty about what the Orient is. Its basic content is static and unanimous. The Orient is seen as separate, eccentric, backward, silently different, sensual and passive. It has a tendency towards despotism and away from progress. It displays feminine penetrability and supine malleability. Its progress and value are judged in terms of, and in comparison to the West, so it is always the Other, the conquerable, and the inferior. Manifest Orientalism is what is spoken and acted upon. It includes information and changes in knowledge about the Orient as well as policy decisions founded in Orientalist thinking. It is the expression in words and actions of Latent Orientalism. (<http://www.english.emory.edu/Bahri/Orientalism.html>)

Before “Orientalism” was published, many “non-economic considerations” had been on debate connected with “missiology, education and the ideology of race”. But after “Orientalism”, Said’s view that “knowledge” and “power” are related gained importance and dominance. Said’s project was to inquire the facts which build Orientalist thought. According to him, he who refuses Orientalism also refuses the “biological generalizations, cultural constructions, and racial and religious prejudices.” 19th century Orientalist scholars thought that without the knowledge of the Orient, it could not be owned by the West. They also portrayed the Arab as illogical, dangerous, dishonest, and “anti-Western”. In that

regard, “the Orient became the studied, the seen, the observed, the object; Orientalist scholars were the students, the seers, the observers, the subject. The Orient was passive, the West was active.” Orient was “feminine” and “weak” waiting for the West to dominate it. It was the helpless and unprotected match for the West. It was there to be ruled being idly and indifferent part.

Said is not the only theorist whose work has to be mentioned here. In fact, the idea of postcolonialism was uttered in 1989 in the strongest and the most effective way by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin in their work “The Empire Writes Back”. Anne McClintock, in her essay “The Angel of Progress”, stresses upon three ways that the authors of “The Empire Writes Back” focus on to express “postcolonial literature”:

- 1-It “focuses on that relationship which has provided the most important creative and psychological impetus in the writing”
 - 2-It expresses the “rationale of the grouping in a common past”
 - 3-It “hints at the vision of a more liberated and positive future”
- (255)

McClintock extends her view about the aforementioned three authors’ distinguishing decision on the term “postcolonialism”. In her point of view the three authors thought that “postcolonialism should not be” accepted “as everything that has happened since European colonialism but rather ‘all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day’” (256). Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin also identify the postcolonial with “the former British Empire” and Deborah L. Madsen in her essay “Beyond The Commonwealth: Post-Colonialism and American Literature” comments on this view that “the post-colonial then describes the condition of a national culture once the imperial rulers have departed and the effect upon the totality of the culture as a consequence of the experience of imperial domination.”(4)

Furthermore, Bart Moore-Gilbert explored many authors and critics who were connected with postcolonial thought. Postcolonial theory can be considered to emerge because of the fact that many Oriental academicians came into view in the Western universities and schools or as Bruce King states, in “The Commonwealth Writer in Exile”, the extension of the Western borders and the encounter and confrontation of many cultures have been the crucial cause of postcolonial discourse. Like Said, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Homi Bhabha, Frantz Fanon and Stephen Slemon are all names that are identified with postcolonial theory. For instance, Spivak’s fame came with her translation of Derrida’s “Of Grammatology”. She, born in Calcutta, West Bengal, studied in many research areas and is mentioned in many fields from Feminism to Marxism, from Literary Criticism especially in comparative literature to, lately, Postcolonialism.

In her essay “Can The Subaltern Speak?”, she asks a number of questions beginning with the title itself. She tries to find answers to the questions such as “Who speaks in postcolonial writings? Can the colonized people speak in those writings? Do they have a right to speak? If no, what is written and who is defended in them?” She argues that the history of the colonized people are learned through colonial texts and although the native and the postcolonial writers represent the “subaltern subjectivity” and know that the first to read and appreciate their writings will be the colonizing West, they continue to produce texts. She supports that the “subaltern subjectivity”, which is performed in language, is made to fall into a trap in “Western colonial discourse”. According to her, reality and trust can only be preserved by way of being silent. When it is once undone, the reality disappears. The subaltern, the colonized people try to communicate and want to speak but “the subaltern cannot speak” she underlines. Spivak’s effort to put forward that the subaltern occupies a hopeless place and must be ready to encounter injustice and inequality like everything postcolonial does wherever it is produced gains a fine and strong voice with the negative answer she gives to her title question.

Frantz Fanon is another name to be cited here for his two impressive works “Black Skin, White Masks” and “The Wretched Of The Earth” contributed eminently to postcolonial studies. He has been famous and taken the most attention in the last few decades. Being a black academic and a psychiatrist, Fanon realized and observed the communication and the association between the black and the white, the colonized and the colonizer, the subjugator and the subjugated. So he psychologically approached what colonialism had left behind. He felt himself French because of the education he had. But as soon as he had met French nationalism and racism and seen the French colonization in Algeria, he developed the idea that it was unpleasant and had a destructive effect on the minds of black men. In “Black Skin, White Masks”(1952), he pointed out the “racism”, “sexual desire” and “colonialism”. In “The Wretched Of The Earth”(1961), he highlighted the policies for “decolonization and movement towards native autonomy”(Singh and Schmidt 20). He was affected by Marxism and psychoanalysis, which deals with the human psychology and behaviour and this influence helped him produce “comprador” theory. “Comprador” refers to the natives in the Far East working on behalf of the foreign colonizing countries. He also used the phrase “intellectual native bourgeoisie” for those indigenous people who were wearing white masks over their black skins and trying to please the colonizing white Western people. According to the Marxist theory, which Fanon identified himself with, a criticism should be based upon and explored with the economical

conditions and the class clashes of a society. In other words, the social structure, class distinctions, the powers of conflict are all merits of Marxist criticism. Marxism does not want a suppressed and abject class and can not be on the side of the colonizing, dominating and controlling class while they are making profits. Furthermore, Fanon thought and added to the theory that speaking a language makes one carry the burden of that language and culture. Because what you utter is culturally constructed and with those utterances, one reflects the fragments of a culture. So, according to Fanon, when a black man speaks the language of white, he changes his apprehension through the words and towards the knowledge of white, which relates “blackness with evil and sin”. The black man accepts this judgement and although he carries the body of a black man, he wears a mask of mind belonging to white and he consequently recedes into a distance from himself and diverts from what he is. Besides, Fanon emphasizes the dependence of the two poles like day and night to each other for the survival of both cannot continue if one of them vanishes. So the “imperial conquest” makes the white express themselves strongly, feeling superior to black and the black subjugated and inferior. Both find and experience their countenance in that “imperial conquest” and Fanon attains the subject of psychologically abused and suppressed black. Fanon’s view is supported with Boehmer’s belief that “colonialist discourse” sees the colonized “abject”, “weak”, “feminine” and “inferior to Western European culture”. Fanon suggests the black “to resist the psychological complexes, inferiority and paranoia that are created by the colonial system in order to perpetuate itself.”(8) Because, for him, if a literature is born in consequence and as a constituent of such prominent patriotic and racial fights, then it will genuinely and certainly be called “post-colonial literature”, for only this literature will instill the essential realisation of oneself. In spite of a life span of thirty-six years, he has had a great influence on the recent postcolonial theorists such as Bhabha and Said.

In postcolonial writings, we become aware of how the colonizer and the colonized see and judge each other and themselves. We also realize how the colonized keep and renew a distinctive cultural identity. The postcolonial writings creates a new discovery area towards the mystery of the Orient. We dig up what the colonial writings overlooked and understand how and why the “colonized other” was given such a position of low status. What is against power or dominion and unknown and uncommon to that controlling force is perceived as subordinate and inferior. This is how the colonizer views the colonized. So, Boehmer’s wise argument can be added here that “the colonial relationship, mediated through discourse, is not then a simple opposition between the colonizer and the colonized

but a complex network of discursive, power, relationships” (Boehmer, cited in Madsen 8). The mentioned power of the colonizer was even experienced in government schools with the ban of native language of the colonized. It was, of course, a show of authority and the colonizer tried to destroy the “Other” with that culturally constructed language. Because they knew that a culture and therefore a nation can be annihilated first by destroying its language. So we may infer that postcolonial writers are the ones who know that they can not speak through their own words and they choose the language of the master to be heard. They try to cry out what they have been exposed to with that, in its simplest term “offered” but in deed “forced” language. Madsen underlines that postcolonial writers use the language very skillfully and they still keep their originality and she adds “that the voices should speak is more important, ultimately, than that of which they speak”(11)

In 1960’s and 1970’s Fanon’s ideas and writings so much influenced the “black consciousness movements” in France, the U.S.A. and Great Britain that his name was thought related to some African and Caribbean black writers who also contributed to black movements. In 1920’s there were some strict laws to restrain the rights of immigrants in the U.S.A.. For example, South Asian immigrants were not allowed to return to South Asia to get married. Besides, gaining citizenship was impossible for South Asian immigrants for they were not white. So the other South Asian people who were discouraged with those limitations mainly chose to migrate to Canada to work in sawmill industry. Canada’s laws were unlike the U.S.A.’s. But the attitudes of the white in both places were alike as they did not want a black population among themselves. They humiliated those black people. In 1960’s the rate of people immigrating from South Asia to the U.S.A. increased. Because the strict immigration laws were mitigated with some reform acts. The immigrating people were especially professionals and as it was stated before this is one of the most important factors of the emergence of postcolonial studies. With the coming of those professionals and academics began a recognition of the subaltern cultures. There occurred a tendency to know and learn the minority literature in which the polyphony was created. The dominated could be heard and if the multicultural ideals and humanitarian approaches of the U.S.A. were realized or could not be questioned only with this polyphony. Multiculturalism which “encourage[s] an understanding of and appreciation for the contributions and cultural identities of various groups in a society” (The New Webster’s Dictionary 656) promises these subaltern groups an intactness in their cultures. Although he finds it “almost an impossible task”, Jean-Pierre Durix uses the term “multicultural in the creative sense of the genuine interaction between several cultural forms considered equally worthy of being

preserved, developed and respected as ways of structuring social relations”(152). However Karen Piper finds multiculturalism in the U.S.A. a dangerous term for two reasons:

- 1- It attempts to preserve cultures in a primordial state as objects for analysis,
- 2- It demands, conversely, that immigrants to the US adapt to its market needs (19).

Therefore she finds America’s ideal of multiculturalism “superficial”, “problematic” and “paradoxical”. She adds “the literature of the US, therefore, should be read as a part of the global ‘post-colonial canon’ rather than as an internalized expression of multicultural difference” (19). She argues that minority literatures in the U.S.A. can not express themselves because in a “melting pot” ideology, everything is being taken from the settlers and by giving them new shapes are used in the advantage of the invaders. In fact the societies in the U.S.A. must show and underline that they are different and have separate cultural identities and therefore the literatures belonging to them must be independent and can not be under the control of any metropolis cultures. The minority literatures, therefore, must defend “heterodoxy” and refuse “imperial domination” to challenge and overwhelm “the West’s claim legitimately to speak for all the rest”(cited in Madsen, Krupat 16-17).

If the writers of the subjugated literatures do not try to voice their ideas, they are bound to be assimilated, which seems to be critical. Assimilation brings a different cultural identity, an “American identity” in the case of the U.S.A. and requires from the immigrants to take off all the indigenous belongings to become American. This means a bereavement of native history. As soon as the immigrant is settled in the dream land where s/he expects to find “global humanitarian values”, s/he encounters and experiences the converse. So the process of being globally humanitarian that is full of promises and rewards falsifies its true nature. This process turns people’s “identities as being” into “identities as becoming”. “Identity as being” is what we own from birth. It is the true face of being. “Identity as becoming” is a formation in which the identities are reshaped and this should be used in postcolonial conditions to refer the immigrants who do not feel that they are committed to a common past and can be moulded into new historical, cultural and powerful changes. These people are shaped with the knowledge, experiences and criterions of a Western pattern and called “Other” by that “Occident”. The conventions, habits and cultural frames of the East are violated and altered by the West with the ultimate submission of the former to this hegemonic malpractice. There appears a cut of identity, a break, a diversity of being. There emerges a “doubleness”. This doubleness is “suffered” (if it is the right word) in two ways: an otherness towards a distinct metropolitan center and an otherness to one’s

own self. The concept of “identity” and “otherness” or “doubleness” can also be argued with the terms “diaspora” and “hybridity” which are other ways to analyze “the nature of identity”. It is known that British Empire also experienced a great deal of immigration from Eastern countries as well as America, Canada and Australia. The immigrants were first forced to come as workers or servants and they remained there for the rest of their lives. Colonized countries passed through several changes, but a transformation was also observed in Britain because of the settler immigrants. That is to say, not only the colonized but also the colonizer have been affected with that colonial process for its population consists of various “races” and “cultures” from many Eastern societies. According to John McLeod, immigration of the societies to European countries have not taken place only after 1950’s and it is not true to say that England and other colonizing countries were homogeneous before the Second World War. But it is a fact that those countries have accepted many people as immigrants from “once-colonized” countries for many reasons. Some of them came to work, some came to study or run away from the deficiencies of their homelands and some came after their relatives who moved before them. Therefore, by the end of the millenium, Britain was not a colonizer country anymore but a host territory to many “diaspora communities”.

2.3.The Concepts of Diaspora, Home and Hybridity

“What does diaspora mean?” and “What is a diaspora community?” is to be answered now. The term “diaspora” is a Greek word meaning “a scattering or sowing of seeds”. When it is used without an initial capital letter, it refers to any society or cultural group compelled or persuaded to abandon their own territories and scattered extensively to different parts of the globe like seeds being dispersed on the soil. The first usage of the word “Diaspora” (now capitalized) goes back to 586 BC used by the Babylonians for the Jews and AD 135 used by the Romans for Jerusalem. The term defines the exile of Jews from Judea. But in the colonial and especially postcolonial studies, the term has been used in its modern sense since the late 20th century in which the diaspora studies expanded academically and have come up to now. Robin Cohen, in his “Global Diasporas: An Introduction” defines diasporas as “communities of people living together in one country who acknowledge that ‘the old country’-a notion often buried deep in language, religion, custom or folklore- always has some claim on their loyalty and emotions” (cited in McLeod 2007). McLeod’s commentary on Cohen’s definition calls attention to the concepts of “collectivity” and “community”. He finds the two terms important because they

emphasize “the sense of living in one country but looking across time and space to another”(207)

People in diaspora communities are the components of a global and local history. The history belonging to their own nation, which they can not mention anymore because of living away from their homelands, and the forthcoming history they are going to experience intersect in their lives and produce a new, distinct one. Amritjit Singh and Peter Schmidt find “diaspora a powerful concept for cultural critique to destabilize dominant narratives of *globalization*”(39). Furthermore, “diaspora” or “exile” are viewed as generic form of modernism by some postcolonial theorists. What is found in all definitions of diaspora is that it is a break between the place of abode and the native land. According to Gita Rajan and Radhika Mohanram, diaspora acts as a mediator, a catch-all term to house the postcolonial condition (cited in Amritjit Singh & Peter Schmidt 31). The in-betweenness and the encounter of cultures and their reciprocal relationships create concepts such as “transculturation” and “transnationalism”. That is to say, these concepts are caused by the contact and the outcome of two cultures. Therefore diaspora identities and communities are the changing wholes constantly producing and reproducing themselves anew through difference and transformation. They keep themselves alive and identity becomes a course of action or “identity as becoming” rather than a quality of being. Consequently, essentialism which is another form of identity is refused because its two forms, biological essentialism and cultural essentialism, are not changeable or fixed identities. Biological essentialism is the identity given by birth and it determines the personal characteristics of a human-being. Whether we are male or female is ascertained with it. Our concern is mostly with cultural essentialism as it is used basically for postcolonial studies. It means that we own an identity of a culture which we are born into, it is fixed by our common past and it is given to us indigenously. It is external while biological essentialism is internal. They are both fixed and static. The difference between the notions of “diaspora” and “essentialism” starts here. Because as it was stated before diaspora identities are not fixed or changeable but they are fraught with fissures which cause ebb and flows in the identity. Those rifts are sometimes filled with host culture or sometimes with native culture helping productively to the recreation of the identity. The children of the immigrant parents will unavoidably be in the diaspora communities although they are born in England or other Western countries and they will certainly be affected by the common national past of their families. So diaspora is not only related with immigrants who know their homelands but also with their descendants who may not see

their native lands even once and feel that they have an ardent link with that “old country”. McLeod, as a result, underlines that diaspora communities are “composite communities” (207). Because they are clusters of differences in a whole. They do not share much with each other except an “immigration experience”. They are not homogeneous but they form a practical “Other” to be defined as one group. Diversities of “gender”, “race”, “class”, “religion” and “language” construct an active and varying diaspora, which tends to reform itself. With those features, diaspora communities are not far from problems. “Too often diaspora peoples have been ghettoised and excluded from feeling they belong to the ‘new country’ and suffered their cultural practices to be mocked and discriminated against”(McLeod 208). Not only the immigrants but their children and grandchildren have come across the problems, that is to say, the immigration has had many after-effects.

The image of “home” in the minds of the migrants and what they expect to find in the invader country after migration should be noted here. As it was discussed before, the host country is a dream land where promises, rewards and hopes are all thought to be fulfilled. The native people wish to find better conditions of living without any deficiencies and full of chances there. Although “home” refers to “security”, “comfort”, “stability” and “shelter”, those people seek to find the features of home in their destination country. But when they arrive at the host land, they begin to long for their “hometown”. The peculiarities belonging to the West substitute for the peculiarities of the East. It becomes unreachable and imaginary like a mirage. There exists no return to home or if they return is it the same home which they left behind, is it the original, does it give the same sense and emotion? As a way of existing in the world, immigration changes the meanings of “home” and “host” countries. Migrants develop new ideas about home as they are far away from their own lands. But they can not remember that distant, faded and dull photograph of old times. This photograph of old home appears in torn pieces in an incomplete image. Yet the new home does not fulfill the expectations and it proves to be twice or more distant from the images of the immigrants. So the in-betweenness begins at this point. Trying to be away from the homeland and settle in the new home, the immigrants can not get accustomed to both conditions at once. They belong to the new home with their material possessions and all baggage but belong to the old home with beliefs, values, attitudes, traditions and habits. Therefore emergence of the imaginary borders in the minds of the migrants does not surprise us:

Although migrants may pass through the *political* borders of nations, crossing their frontiers and gaining entrance to new places, such ‘norms and limits’ can be used to exclude migrants

from being accommodated inside the *imaginative* borders of the nation. The dominant discourses of 'race', ethnicity and gender may function to exclude them from being recognized as part of the nation's people. Migrants may well live in new places, but they can be deemed not to belong there and disqualified from thinking of the new land as their home. Instead, their home is seen to exist elsewhere, back across the border (McLeod 212).

According to Gita Rajan and Radhika Mohanram, recent critical focus has shifted from exile and diaspora to borders and the crossing and recrossing of physical, imaginative, linguistic and cultural borders (cited in Amritjit Singh and Peter Schmidt 31). The "border" is a threshold that stands for a more advantageous way of living in the minds of the migrants. It helps a transition from old life to a new one. But is it possible that all about the old life can be forgotten when you step out a new territory? Is passing the borderline enough to start a new and better life? Debra A. Castillo in the essay "Border Theory and The Canon" points out the contradictions that are partly created by the borders: "the conflict capital versus province carries with it the baggage of civilization versus barbarism, culture versus desolation, national consolidation versus aborted history" (188). According to her, as soon as the border is crossed "the loss of meaning [begins] with the loss of language" (192) and the immigrant encounters with the alien words that s/he does not know and understand. Therefore "the problem of communicating across languages" (194) occurs. Speaking with the "coagulated words" are impossible to the migrant and "the image of the blood clot stands in for a choked narration" (194). An exchange of cultures and languages do not seem to come out in the "wonderful border". Because one can not cross it with his/her own cultural, national and emotional identity. There stand separate cultural identities on both sides. According to Octavia Paz, "[the subjugated] will only find [themselves] there awaiting [them] on the other side of the border" (cited in Michaelson and Johnson 133-134). For both Octavio Paz and Walter Mignolo, "the most salient quality of the border is that the act of crossing serves the psychic function of reflection. The border itself becomes a mirror exacting knowledge of the self and the other, but most importantly, as a reinscription of the self in the other, of knowledge of the self" (Castillo 185). The concrete border becomes an abstract border or a metaphor.

McLeod's commentary on Salman Rushdie's "Midnight Children" proves to be a good example revealing the feelings about crossing the border and the places on both sides of it. Rushdie wrote this novel, which is set in India and Pakistan, in north London. What inspired Rushdie to write about his homeland on the other side of the border, was a "black-and-white photograph of his childhood home in Bombay" (McLeod 210). He tries to catch and unite the images of old home in his memory. It is impossible to go back there as it is

far away “in both time and space to the present”(McLeod 210). Leaving home is identified with “ a sense of deficiency”. But when “leaving home” means “settling down in another country” and “being far away from your language”, then the feeling of loss is experienced in a more enhanced way. What Rushdie suffers is the “disjunction between past and present, between here and there, mak[ing] ‘home’ seem far removed in time and space, available for return only through an act of the imagination” (McLeod 211). So this “physical alienation from India” urges him “create fictions, not actual cities or villages, but invisible ones, imaginary homelands, Indias of the mind” (McLeod 211). In this sense, “home” tries to survive in the mind of him as a remembrance of the past. McLeod reviews the thoughts about migrancy as below:

- 1) Migrancy constructs modes of existence and ways of seeing that last beyond the actual journey between countries.
- 2) Migrancy can expose the migrant and their children to displacement, fragmentation and discontinuity.
- 3) Home is a problematic concept, both in the past and the present.
- 4) Living “in-between” can be painful, perilous and marginalising.
- 5) Migrants and their children occupy different positions due to generational differences, but they can have similar experiences of feeling rootless and displaced.
- 6) The dominant narratives of belonging and identity can not accomodate those who live “in-between” (216).

Migrancy and the “in-betweenness” it brings into the lives of the migrants and diasporic communities make us think about other terms such as “hybrid”, “hybrid identities”, “hybridity” and “hybridization”. Amritjit Singh and Peter Schmidt’s commentary on Bhabha’s thought about “hybridity” in “Location of Culture” is as following:

Homi Bhabha has highlighted the concept of “hybridity” to describe a fundamental effect of colonialism and colonialist discourses. In his analysis, Bhabha stresses the interdependence and the mutuality of subjectivities that mark the relations between the colonizer and colonized. For him, all cultural systems and stances are constructed in the ambivalent and contradictory space that he calls the “Third Space of enunciation” (23).

The “Third Space” is ambiguous and dissident. So the “cultural identity” that appears in this “Third Space” can not be intact. Some theorists and critics think like Bhabha and consider the term “hybridity” with its “negative connotations”. Jean-Pierre Durix is not so derogatory about the term and he believes that “the term ‘hybrid’ still contains enough positive potential to be used as description of a major post-colonial characteristic”(148). He adds that most postcolonial cultures are now the result of hybridization (153) and quotes from Said that “post-colonial literatures are hybrid and encumbered or entangled

with a lot of what used to be regarded as extraneous elements”(154). For Bhabha, hybridity is “primarily” an “empowering force” because it manifests the essential corruption and dislocation of all sites of intolerance and control.

“Mimicry” is another term that Bhabha thinks as serving to the colonizer since the colonizer can create “a recognizable Other” with the help of “mimicry”. Bhabha views the “mimicry” as a “process” in which the subjugated is recreated nearly the same but not like the original Western man. For the colonizer can not create a people alike themselves, which means they are “different” and “other”, it causes a perilous condition that produces a breach between “the colonizer” and “the colonized”, between “us” and “them”. Singh and Schmidt, thus, find the “mimicry” disruptive for the subjugator. Therefore postcolonial writing is also a threat to “colonial discourse” and “colonial authority” for “its mimicry is also mockery”(Singh and Schmidt 24). Robert J. M. Young thinks that mimicry forms hybridity and agrees Bhabha’s idea that it is a “challenge and resistance against a dominant colonial power”(Singh and Schmidt 24). But while Bhabha mentions about “ hybridity” as an effective term, Young takes it with its negative connotations such as “primitive” and “native” and reminds us of the usage of it in racist discourses.

Salman Rushdie finds “mimicry” and Bhabha’s “Third Space” as glorious terms since they help him create fictions. For him, the “doubleness”, “being in a diaspora community” or “being in the Third Space”, “hybridity” and “mimicry” constitute new areas to write in. Because under the auspices of these terms, a writer can be the most creative and productive. This prolific writer looks at life with “double perspectives” and so appreciates the possibilities through these perspectives. Although the above terms are usually perceived as negative in postcolonial studies, there are some postcolonial writers such as Salman Rushdie and Hanif Kureishi that make use of the terms. The multi-faceted identities they have gained expand and complicate their understanding of the world and bestow them new views. They do not yearn because of being hybrid or diasporic but celebrate their identities. What Jean-Pierre Durix states gains significance: “Unlike what some early anthropologists nostalgic of a mythic idea of cultural ‘purity’ would have us believe, most cultures have been cross-fertilized by others. The richest and most complex have generally been those which have been able to synthesize elements imported from outside”(151). Although the advantages of diaspora and transnationalism are endangered by the imperial tendencies of some dominant societies and cultures, “the preservation of this diversity is necessary throughout the world, for it conditions the permanent process of

cross-fertilization generated by exchanges” (cited in Jean-Pierre Durix, Levi-Strauss 151). When the cultures encounter and interact, an enrichment caused by the exchanges is inevitable. Thus, “acculturation”, another term, emerges referring to “the phenomena resulting from the contacts between several civilizations: elements are borrowed from other sources and integrated into the original culture” (Jean-Pierre Durix 149). Dissimilarities between classes of people have attributed to cultural factors. So “cultural purity” or “authenticity” can be regarded as unreasonable as it depends upon “dynamic interchange” (a term used by Jean-Pierre Durix). The “dynamic interchange” is also the essence of the “global village” theory. So without abjection or malpractice or repression or barbarism or any domination, the “diversity” should be preserved to be used positively to develop a better understanding of the contemporary world.

The complexities of that modern world brought by “diversity” can not be avoided by post-colonial writers. Because modern world lodges cultures which involve complicated interaction. “Hybridization” creates post-colonial cultures and it is risky and not possible to classify those writers in the same category. Edward Said stresses in his “Orientalism”:

When one uses categories like Oriental and Western as both the starting and the end points of analysis, research, public policy..., the result is usually to polarize the distinction – the Oriental becomes more Oriental, the Westerner more Western...(45-46)

Post-colonial writers try to express themselves with the means of representations, but these representations have been the enforced generalizations. They try to speak by isolating themselves from them but they can not completely do this as these generalizations are stuck on them. However, they still perform their art by dealing with hybrid and therefore problematic patterns. In one respect they probably try to annihilate the duality between white and black being on the side of the latter who has always been known as good at dancing and music, a perfect sportsman, a usually cheerful man with white teeth, but not certainly the identical of white man in more academic concerns.

It is a known and accepted view that colonialism has united many cultures and populations and made the subjugated population forget about the sense of belonging to only one place as his/her own country. Therefore, construction of splendid literary syntheses have emerged. The subjugated people dared to utter their own words and write about their own observations and experiences and they have done this with their own styles. It has not been a redeeming of their former times. They have attempted to seize the old days with their creativity. They have sought to express the suffering left on them by colonization with their own words. But the emotional words of suffering have still been

uttered in the colonizer's language. This has always been an unsafe place for postcolonial writers to be on the side of the colonizer while using the language. Because the first to read and appreciate their art has been the colonizer. But the education they have had has taught them to be calm enough while synthesising the colonizer's language with their own emotions to create new models of perspectives and accept the language as a constituent of themselves. All these aspects have helped the emergence of a distinct but certainly a post-colonial approach towards literature. The postcolonial writers have hoped to form their own perception of identity and attempted for old traditions to regain new merits. Because those old merits were nearly obliterated by the imperial powers. With all these efforts emerged the "literature of migration" in Rushdie's terms in the twentieth century. According to Rushdie, a real migrant "suffers" in three ways: the loss of his own place, the entrance into a new and strange world and the attitudes, traditions and views of the strangers in this new world constitute an affliction. But this affliction is a useful one for him which gains meaning in the literature of Eastern patterns. Jean-Pierre Durix reminds us of a poem here by Derek Walcott called "A Far Cry From Africa". The poet feels himself "poisoned with the blood of both" cultures. He can not escape anywhere to take shelter in. He feels himself damned. Because he can not even make a choice between the two languages: African or English. He is divided into two. He can not betray or be wholly adapted to both of them. He is of the "mixed blood", the "hybrid" one and a diaspora. But still he sees the advantage, the richness these two cultures bring to him. Although he rebels against this doubleness, he is aware of the fact that this is also an opportunity. One language or culture can not be disregarded by supporting the other and there should be an intercourse and an interdependency and an interaction between those languages on equal basis. Only then a richness and fertility can be mentioned. Jean-Pierre Durix also mentions about "the revolutionary potential of the multicultural imagination and the importance of a re-evaluation of storytelling" (160). Thus he notes that the postcolonial writers and especially the novelists choose various kinds of people as characters for their works. They do not serve the "popular fiction" in which many stereotypes and banalities remain unchanged. Although their works are sometimes regarded as playful and full of fantasy, this does not reduce the acuteness of their work. Behind the fanciful world they create, there lies a reality and seriousness to be understood elaborately by of age.

3. WE'RE NOT JEWS

3.1. The Attacks of the English Neighbors

"We're Not Jews", completed and published in 1996, can be regarded as an autobiographical story, because the main character of the story, Azhar has a Pakistani father and an English mother just like the writer of the story, Kureishi himself. Azhar is a recycled character because we can see characters like Azhar in many of Kureishi's stories and novels. For example, Karim of "The Buddha of Suburbia" or Nina of "With Your Tongue Down My Throat" are Azhar's versions when their family relationships and relatives are considered. They are of "mixed blood" like Kureishi. Kureishi states in an interview published in "Critical Quarterly" that "he has actually written... about being at school, about race, about being called a 'Paki', about having an Indian father and English mother..."(vol.41,no.3,p.42). Kenneth C. Kaleta refers to this story as "another story of Anglo-Asian racial prejudices... This third-person narration is Kureishi's most tender rendering of childhood disillusionment. It is another compelling look at racist London, but from a different perspective –that of an innocent young child" (Kaleta 162). The innocent young child implied by Kaleta is Azhar, the protagonist.

The story strikes us from the very beginning with the title. Since the term "diaspora" was first used to indicate the exiled Jews from Judea, we can infer that "Jews" in the title has a pivotal role in the story. Azhar and his family are subject to scornful attitudes. He has a Pakistani father and that is a sufficient cause for the English people in the neighbourhood to abject them. The writer uses "We" to refer to his English mother as well. At the same time, "We" can be regarded to include all the people or the groups in the position of Azhar and his family who are exposed to be weak, helpless and unprotected against those people known as Billys. While "We" directly points to Azhar and his family and the diaspora identities, "they" are Billys who make them feel "We", as outsiders. At the very beginning, the gap between "we" and "they", "us" and "them" is felt forcefully; therefore the title has a significant function in the concept. "Not" is written separately in the title to stress that Azhar and his family do not belong to that group of people mentioned, the Jews, and that they should not be treated as badly as they experienced. While the auxiliary verb "are" is fastened to "We" in its short form, the weight has been given to "Not" as a negative indicator. The writer has not chosen "aren't" because it would not give and leave the same sense and negativeness on the reader.

The story begins in an interior setting, in a public vehicle, “a bus”, on which people randomly get on, viewing Azhar and his English mother returning from shopping. As they are taking their places and the bus is ready to set off, Azhar notices their two neighbours, Billy and his father, shouting at the bus to stop. Till that moment, nothing seems to be unusual. But as soon as he recognizes the two “Billys”, he “close[s] his eyes and hope[s the bus is] moving too rapidly for them to get on”. With that wish, Azhar is illustrated with all his innocent identity, his real existence and his inner world. He does not want to see them. With his child psychology, the quickness and the simplicity of the wish underlines his quiet, confused and timid being and also the helplessness of his self. Because these “racist neighbours” insult the “white mother and her Anglo-Asian son” (Kaleta 162), Azhar’s wish seems to be appropriate. The wish is so loaded with reality that the reader even pities Azhar and acknowledges him to be right.

The Billys take a place where they can watch Azhar and his mother. The directness of the action, the impudent way of their “settling” foreshadow a coming assault. The mother immediately becomes uneasy and makes a rise. “So [does] Big Billy. Little Billy [springs] up”. They are just like cats ready to attack turning around each other. The name of the father and son has been deliberately chosen as “Billy” recalling “bully” and the reader wonders why they are both called “Billy” and why they have not been given different names. Because “bill” means “a beak” and “billy” is “a policeman’s nightstick” (The New Webster’s Dictionary of the English Language 96). “Big Billy” is inclined to strike like “a policeman’s nightstick” or he is ready to bill his neighbours like birds. “Little Billy” imitates whatever his father does:

Big Billy said, “Look, he’s a big boy.”
“Big boy,” echoed Little Billy.

The duplicate voice of Little Billy strenghtens his father’s voice and the echo activates Big Billy’s sarcastic words. Kureishi intentionally did not give different names to those Englishmen who exhibit their dislike towards Asian people whenever and wherever possible. The conductor is a friend of Big Billy because they share the same national identity which means favourable deeds like “let[ting] them ride for nothing” can be bestowed to them. Indeed, Azhar’s mother is an English, too. She knows Big Billy from their childhood days but what “has made her a despised intruder” is “her marriage to Azhar’s Asian father”(Kaleta 162).

The bus scene and the “bus” as a place to express hatred can be regarded as the “Third Space” of Bhabha. This “Third Space” is ambigious, the feelings and existence in

that place can not be untouched. It does not provide a security or comfort or it is full of pins for an Eastern when shared with a Western or even an English mother can feel uneasy there when she is isolated from her original community. The bus, therefore, is a place of suppression and there is no way out until a bus stop appears. The resistance does seem impossible against the group who feel like the owners of the bus. The bus is divided into the Western and Eastern hemispheres and it implies the abiding process of "Othering". All the oppression and sufferance felt by the English mother is concentrated and squeezed in the bus scene that creates a microcosm of the neighbourhood as the outer world. To begin the story with that bus scene fulfils the aim that this is a story of maltreatment, distress and sorrow. The atmosphere in the bus makes us feel the maximum restriction, limitation and depressing situation. The loneliness of the mother and the boy in the crowd is in deed what is hidden in the reality of the life. Kureishi juxtaposes this hidden world with the hidden values of writing and exposes the mystery of the human-being in that simple story world.

Mother can not look at their faces fearlessly and "look[s] straight ahead, through the window. Her voice [is] almost normal, but subdued". The "window" image supports the mother in her lonely situation or is it a way of escaping from that gloomy place or would it be different to be outside? The "subdued" voice is the signal of the tears but she still tries to be tough and tries to change the subject and call the attention to his son's success at school:

"Pity we didn't have time to get to the library. Still there's tomorrow. Are you still the best reader in the class ?" she nudged [Azhar] "Are you?"
"S'ppose so," he mumbled.

The subject has not been chosen randomly by the mother. In that suppressed atmosphere, she endeavors to demonstrate her son's superiority at reading in his class. "Are you still the best reader in the class?" she asks and repeats "Are you?" waiting for a strong "yes". Azhar's weak and mumbo jumbo voice carries a frail and subaltern tone and proves him to be an in-between Anglo-Asian. The cowardice felt in the answer "S'ppose so" is not enough to confirm his outstanding position in the class. He is conscious of the hopeless future before him and he is aware of the fact that being the best at reading will not retain him to be lost in that uncertain future and that is why his response comes out in an uncertain tone. But we understand that he is really a good student because "every evening after school Mother [takes] him to the tiny library nearby where he exchange[s] the previous day's books. His reading activity advances him among the white students and it veils the oppression of Azhar. His changing of books everyday certifies his quickness and

goodness at reading. The rapidity and the regularity of the reading activity indeed disguise an effort to catch up with and overtake his desk mate Billy and the other students who shape an Azhar “Other” than themselves. The Eastern man, little Azhar, competes with the Western men, little Billys in the class. Said emphasizes that “the relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony,...”(Orientalism 5). In this respect, Azhar’s energy is all concentrated upon this power that tries to control him and his endeavor is to shift the balances of power. Indeed, his mother wants this for him more than himself. Her attempt and eagerness are to overcome the thought about the Orient that it is “a place isolated from the mainstream of European progress in the sciences, arts and commerce” (Said, Orientalism 206). Being English in origin, she is aware of “the imbalance between East and West” and the fact that “[the] European identity as a superior one in comparison with all the non-European peoples and cultures” is an idea constructed by “Western consciousness” (Said 7). What she wants Azhar to achieve is “restructuring” this idea in favour of the East by studying hard and reading a lot and proving his worth.

In the same paragraph, mother’s anxiety intervened by a little fear is felt. “She didn’t want father asking why they were late. She wouldn’t want him to know they had been in to complain.” The Pakistani father is mentioned for the first time as a dominant figure at home. The mother and the son have to explain their causes because it is a paternal kind of family. The balance at home is the same as the balance between East and West. But the dominating power belongs to East at home. Although the two sentences quoted above seem to be written at random and ordinarily, they sufficiently allow the reader to comment on the father. Kureishi skillfully portrays an Eastern stereotype of a man possibly observing his own father and his father’s Eastern attitudes towards his Western mother. Therefore it stands as a kind of a narration in which the writer transfers his own identity into the text. The relationship between the mother and the father is the reverse version of the relationship between East and West. The mother does not want to explain the reason of their being late to father. But the reader is informed in the next paragraph that the mother and Azhar have been in headmistress’ room to complain about Azhar’s classmate, little Billy who has been “call[ing Azhar] names chip[ping] him round the head with his ruler”. The other students have also been doing what little Billy has been doing. Mother’s gladness when “Big Billy [has] been called to the headmistress’ stuffy room and been sharply informed” is noticable. It is a triumph for them. The calm stability of the mother

leads her to the glory. She wants to see Big Billy impotent and helpless against the headmistress. This becomes a pleasure for her because what hurts mother must hurt Big Billy, too. Big Billy must also experience the crushing dominion of the mother. The lively dispute between mother and Big Billy is the mini replica of the dispute between East and West:

Mother had begun to notice not only Azhar's dejection but also his exhausted and dishevelled appearance on his return from school. He looked as if he'd been flung into a hedge and rolled into a puddle-which he had. Unburdening with difficulty, he confessed the abuse the boys gave him, Little Billy in particular.

With the paragraph above, we are informed about the previous days. The paragraph summarizes the torment Azhar has been exposed to. Azhar's physically tired and bedraggled situation is also reinforced by his psychological despair. The observations of the mother lead her to an awakening about what sort of a relationship his son is having with his classmates. The second sentence starting with "He looked as if..." states a supposition that does not give the sense of reality. Because "as if" makes the situation not more than a possibility or guess. So the mother, at first, can not make out what is being done to her son. "-which he had" as an explanation whispers the reality but only the reader is aware of the fact until the next sentence in which Azhar "confesses" the truth. His mother guesses the situation, but she can not admit the cruel reality till Azhar affirms it. While concealing the reality because of his childish fear of Billy, Azhar is not capable to reflect his problematic inner world which is in complete confusion. This short paragraph above is a complete story of what he has experienced and will experience lifelong. His mother's erroneous understanding of "such pranks" as little jokes at first causes an urgent precaution to be taken late. The mother even seems to be "amused by such pranks". She approves those "little jokes" as an indicator of a good relationship between friends. She can not get why "Azhar [takes] it so hard", as well. In this respect, we see her unaware of the degree of those cruel events. Because as soon as she learns about the discursive violation, she reacts harder than she perceives Azhar and "the childish remarks" to be ignored by him. She takes all the acts more seriously later on:

Yet he couldn't make out what it was with him that made people say such things, or why, after so many contented hours at home with his mother, such violence had entered his world.

The sticky reality on Azhar which he is not old enough to conceive, "what [is] with him" everywhere and everyday arise many questions in his mind. He is in search of truth but he can not relate the happy hours at home and the wretched hours at school and why

the former can not prevent the latter. "The contented hours at home with his mother" does convey the sense of security and shelter obtained by "the mother". Nothing can make Azhar unhappy at home. But there is another point to be paid attention to: father is not mentioned in the sentence as a family member with whom Azhar shares his happiness. The small and isolated world of Azhar and his mother, excluding the father, is a limited one which goes round itself and it has a close structure eliminating everybody. Azhar is startled by the violence. It is a new thing in his life. So he is unaware of the reason of this violence. "Yet he couldn't make out what it was with him" shows this unawareness and his incompetence in perceiving the matter as a child.

Even in the shortest way and with the simplest words, Kureishi reveals a unique writer identity while telling his shocking stories with an enthusiasm in a confusing sense of reality. The next paragraph is formed in one sentence. It demonstrates the mother's greed and anger to avenge. "Mother had taken Azhar's hand and instructed him to reply, 'Little Billy, you're common- common as muck!'" Mother's holding Azhar's hand is a supportive control to touch off the matter and an encouraging influence on Azhar. As the first attack has come from Little Billy, Azhar's reaction is a reply to his violation. Azhar is taught to answer back. Because he is unable to grasp the event and he can not think of a reply by himself. The mother does not want to see his son weak and so her revengeful directive manner is exposed with the degrading words. "Common as muck" as an expression is a comparison and conveys the meaning of a resemblance. Nothing can shame and dishonour a child more than this similarity, especially when it is uttered among other children. "Azhar [holds] onto the words and repeat[s] them continuously to himself" as if reciting them like a poem. "Next day, in a corner with his enemy's taunts going at him, he close[s] his eyes and holler[s]" all the words instructed by his mother. The active words "close" and "holler" help the reader to see Azhar in action. What he has been taught theoretically operates in his mouth practically. Kureishi allows his child character to utter daily life swears and by doing this, draws his story nearer to daily life, itself. He does not hesitate while using it because he knows that the reality lies in this swear and what enlivens the story is "that swear". Because we wonder what Big Billy will do rather than Little Billy's reaction and consider that his reaction would be more truculent.

The following paragraph, which includes the childish manners of Azhar and Little Billy, is a good example that exposes their attitudes. "Little Billy was as perplexed as Azhar by the epithet. Like magic it shut his mouth." The two children are surprised by Azhar's enunciation. Azhar is astonished to hear himself speaking like this in bad language

and Little Billy is confused to hear Azhar speaking courageously in a challenging manner. Azhar can neither think nor utter such words. But the mother's backing and her instructions lead Azhar to such an attitude. The two children are too young to carry the burden of such remarks. It does not matter that Billy is a white boy. He is still a child and he behaves accordingly as well. Being "common as muck" puts him in an inferior place but hearing this from Azhar, the Anglo-Asian boy, makes him "perplexed". It has a spellbinding effect and makes Little Billy unable to speak. He is speechless because of being humiliated by an Eastern boy. In deed who is speaking or uttering those swears are not Azhar or Little Billy. As they are instructed by their parents, they are the mouthpieces of them. The children are the means of attack for the parents. The white and black arrows coming out of the children's mouths are the feelings of the parents towards each other. Their hatred, their dislikes and their hostility are all vomitted through their children's throats and mouths. They exploit their children for the sake of fixed nationalistic thoughts. Little Billy's coming "back with the renewed might of names new to Azhar: sambo, wog, little coon" proves to be the instructions of Big Billy. The mother and Big Billy are like trainers or coachs guiding their children about what they have to do. They hide behind their children but the real fighters or the rivals are both of them. "Azhar returned to his mother for more words..." is a repetition, highlighting that the quarrel will go on renewing itself. The simplicity of the language with its vocabulary and the short sentences do not prevent us from experiencing the deepest and the most intensive feelings. The imaginative world functions richly. The language is so straightforward and down-to-earth that we perceive the events as if occurring in our neighbourhood or the children as ours. With his language, the reader tastes the richest enjoyment. The exchange of swears increases:

Big Billy was saying across the bus, "Common! Why don't you say it out loud to me face, eh? Won't say it, eh?"
"Nah", said Little Billy. "Won't!"
"But we ain't as common as a slut who marries a darkie."
"Darkie, darkie," Little Billy repeated. "Monkey, monkey!"

Edward Said, in his *Orientalism*, states that "... intermarriage between natives and English men and women was undesirable"(213). This undesirable marriage between the English mother and the Paki father of Azhar is a sufficient cause of humiliation. It is worse than "being a muck" for an English neighbour like Billy. His confrontation reinforced by the repetitions of his son and his selection of the words like "slut" and "darkie" directly show the feelings and thoughts of Big Billy. Little Billy just repeats his father's words because he is unable to produce his own words as a child like Azhar. He is unaware of

what he is doing or what it means or what this racial quarrel is for. He just echoes his father and makes up a rhyme with “darkie” and “monkey”. What he has learned from his father has a connotation of “monkey” in his mind or he may be uttering these words unconsciously. The words “slut”, “darkie” and “monkey” are belligerent and truculent and in spite of sharing a single “common past” with Billy, the mother, now in the diaspora edge, feels sorry mingled with hatred. The sense of isolation from her own community because of marrying a “darkie” makes the situation worse. The direct, short but brilliantly bitter words batter her mind. Her given identity as a wife of a black man or the “identity as becoming” reduces her allegiance to her people. Therefore alliance with blackness ceases the allegiance to whiteness. There remains no space for resistance. Because the colonizer’s belief in his own superiority and the colonized darkie’s inferiority affect the relationships negatively.

“Mother’s look didn’t deviate. But, perhaps anxious that her shaking would upset Azhar, she pulled her hand from his and pointed at a shop”. The arduous condition she is in and the effort to hide her feelings not to seem weak arise the anxiety of her. Her statue-like posture does not transmit any feelings. She even draws her hand back as the most intensive feelings are passed through hands to one. The sharp feelings condensed in the shaky hand must not be conveyed to Azhar. That is why she “pull[s] her hand”. Her pointing at a shop calls Azhar’s attention to that point so that he would not realize his mother’s frailty. But he is already confounded “by Little Billy murmuring his name”. While all these are going on, “the few other passengers, sitting like statues, [are] unaware or unconcerned”. The rarity of the travellers in the bus eases Big Billy’s assault. Because “the few other passengers” are still indifferent. They do not feel disturbed. They do not make an attempt to reconcile or mitigate the atmosphere. Their statue-like and motionless situation makes a stand against the action and the arising tension in the bus or there is an approval of Billy in their silence because they are probably English and what Big Billy is endeavouring for is for the sake of English nationality. Although they are quiet and still, there is a sense of support in their passiveness. Therefore the reader may easily infer that they acknowledge Billy to be right in what he is doing. If they were called upon to make a choice, they would take side of Big Billy in this racist contest. Big Billy belongs to that crowd of people who form a group identity and make the “others” feel discriminated. The mother and Azhar must not exist in that place full of oppression. The following paragraph is dedicated to the feelings of the mother from Azhar’s point of view:

Azhar had never seen her like this, ashen, with wet eyes, her body stiff as a tree. Azhar sensed what an effort she was making to keep still. When she wept at home she threw herself on the bed, shook convulsively and thumped the pillow. Now all that moved was a bulb of snot shivering on the end of her nose. She sniffed determinedly, before opening her bag and extracting the scented handkerchief with which she usually wiped Azhar's face, or, screwing up a corner, dislodged any stray eyelashes around his eye. She blew her nose vigorously but he heard a sob.

“Never” as an adverb of frequency in the first sentence of the paragraph implies that this is the first time they have experienced such an unpleasant event so intensively. The faded colour of the face, the tears in the eyes and the hardened body of the mother reveal the defeated feelings of her. Although she was given an “English upbringing” she is not an English any more because her life and body have been diseased and doomed by a Paki. She cries because she is regretful for marrying a Paki and because they are exposed to such a discrimination and degradation as a family. She cries because it is not her Paki husband who is in-between, but she, herself, as a wife. She is squeezed between her native people and her husband's. She is considered to betray her own community by marrying a Paki but is it not Billy and other Billys that betray their own sister. They abandon her with her own helplessness that they have created. Although they possess the same history, she, for them, is a treacherous image. She does not belong to that common history any more. She is prisoned in the other's history that she is condemned for. Therefore she descends from the colonizer's side to the colonized's side. So she has to struggle with whatever the colonized confronts. If she feels hatred and rage, she would avenge for the advantage of the colonized. “Her effort to keep still” is therefore a challenge. Because the comparison of the feelings at home and outside point out to two different personalities. The mother in the bus, out of home, has to be strong enough and must not unveil her emotions easily. If her cry is noticed, then her weakness will encourage Billy. But home is a place of comfort and you can do whatever you want without a moment of hesitation, regret and fear. “Thump[ing] the pillow thrown on the bed and shaking” all in a flutter at home is a mode of freedom and it is given in contrast to the atmosphere in the bus. But what bothers us is that mother experiences bad things not only outside but also at home. There are times she feels distressed and cries for this. “Now all that moved was a bulb of snot shivering on the end of her nose” is a distinct image. “The bulb of snot” creates a sense of loathsomeness. Indeed the weakness of the mother shivers on the end of her nose. Azhar sees it.

In fact “the bulb of snot” becomes a child and it fits Azhar. But here in this scene, the snot on the end of the nose is like mother who is shivering on the end of the bus. They are

both not wanted. They are tried to be got rid of. The snot on the nose and the mother on the bus are sticky and disgusting kinds of things. The mother therefore resembles the snot as both of them are abhorrent. In the sentence “she blew her nose vigorously but he heard a sob”, we come across a contrast with the conjunction “but”. Although her mother wipes her nose as strongly as to be heard, Azhar recognizes only a “sob”. There is an opposition between the mother’s action and Azhar’s noticing it. There is a strong sense in blowing the nose but Azhar sees it as a frail sob. Because he hears and sees whatever he wants to hear and see, at that moment.

The next paragraph displays mother’s point of view: “Now she knew what went on and how it felt. How he wished he’d said nothing and protected her...” she knows Azhar’s penitence for the swear to Little Billy. She almost wishes not to have taught such bad things to her son as it has caused bigger cases like in the bus. “To protect” the mother provides Azhar a big role. It is not what is expected from a little child. But mother thinks that he would like to protect her against those Billys. Big Billy’s aggressive manners continue with a grin. His scoffing words “Thing is...there is a smell on the bus” and holding his nose show the degree of disgust he feels towards the mother and Azhar. He goes on to speak and we learn that Azhar and his family live in a flat “all squashed together like, and stinkin’ the road out eatin’ curry and rice!”. In this deterioration also lie some peculiarities of Pakistani people. In Pakistani cuisine, curry and rice have appreciable place and Kureishi, having a Paki palate from the paternal side, has mentioned these two specialities in his books. But Big Billy despises them with what they give importance and they enjoy eating. Curry is an undesirable thing for Billy because it stinks and wherever you go, the smell comes with you. There is another point in this dislike. Living in one place but in a squashed sort of way implies the number of the people in the flat or the narrowness of the place. As indicated in “The Rainbow Sign”, the people like living together in Pakistan. Kureishi relates the first impressions of his first visit to Pakistan in “The Rainbow Sign”: “...there was warmth and continuity for a large number of people; there was security and much love. Also there was a sense of duty and community- of people’s lives genuinely being lived together, whether they liked each other or not- that you didn’t get in London”(18). The relationships of the Paki people told in this essay, in that Kureishi discovers his identity again and feels his existence as a Paki, are close and seem intimate. They take a distinct pleasure in living together. Is it caused by dependence or loyalty or enjoyment? Eventhough it is not comfortable, it does not matter for them to

stay in a crowded place. The next paragraph gives us the number of people staying in the flat:

There was no doubt that their flat was jammed. Grandpop, a retired doctor, slept in one bedroom, Azhar, his sister and parents in another, and two uncles in the living room.

Seven people, two of whom are uncles as characters taken from Kureishi's own life, live in that flat. As Kureishi writes autobiographically, we meet his two uncles who he mentions in the interview in the "Critical Quarterly"(vol.41,no.3). One of them has a laundrette, the other one is an alcoholic. The image of two uncles create "a lot to say" in his mind and he begins to consider what it is like "being just thought of as 'Pakis'" and how "the experience of coming to England" is (Critical Quarterly, vol.41, no.3,p.39). In deed their life does not seem to change much. Because they maintain their habits and traditions: "All day big pans of Indian food simmered in the kitchen so people could eat when they wanted". "Big pans" imply that the house contains a big family. "All day" and "simmer" indicate the continuity and the sequence of the act of cooking to provide for the members of that big family. It is also noticable that the mother is the only woman to cook in the house. So she deals with "big pans all day" long. What is cooked in the kitchen is "Indian food". Because except the mother, the other six members are all Pakis and so the Indian food in the kitchen is for the majority and their eating habit at any time they want also shows a disorder at home. They do not even give importance to cleanliness. Because the description of the "bubbled" and "cracked" wall-papers and their "[hanging] down like ancient scrolls" in the kitchen give the reader the impression that it is not a hygienic and tidy place but only a room of cooking and eating. Mother "deni[es] that they [are] 'like that'". In her denial, there is also a protection of her family. She does not want anybody to speak about their ways of living. "She refuse[s] to allow the word 'immigrant' to be used about Father, since in her eyes it applie[s] only to illiterate tiny men with downcast eyes and mismatched clothes". Her effort to distinguish her husband from the immigrants who are not educated and in shabby clothes tell us some about the father who is not a typical Paki. Furthermore those immigrants have miserable eyes, they do not have hope and can not adapt to the new world they have settled into. But Kureishi identifies his wealthy relatives who have come to England as "...proud, middle-aged, strong men" (Critical Quarterly, vol.41, no.3, p.39). Mother gets so outraged by the assaults that she "manage[s] to say, 'WE'RE NOT JEWS'" in coagulated words. She has difficulty while saying this. Her throat and lips are dry and she is offended. Kaleta's comment is as following:

Here, Mother reverts to invoking a hierarchy of prejudices, distinguishing her Asian husband, who writes novels, from the Jews she has been brought up to believe are intruding immigrants...(163)

She backs her husband who she believes is a sophisticated man and does not want any treatment or attitude towards him as if he is a Jew. "...Azhar, meanwhile, mistakenly thinks Jews are the blacks in South Africa whom he knows his father is prejudiced against"(Kaleta 163). Azhar meets the reality which he has not had an idea of before. He listens to his mother who dreadfully tells that "...the people with white skins [are] cruel to the black and brown people who [are] considered inferior and [are] forbidden to go where the whites [go]. The coloureds [have] separate entrances and [are] prohibited from sitting with the whites". This is the weird reality of "the living history" for Azhar. This awfully illogical truth is not a subject that he has learned at school. Azhar is shocked and what he has heard from the mother "[strikes] his head like a hammer and echoe[s] through his dreams night after night". He can not comprehend how this is probable, or what it means or how he should act from now on. His mind is confused because the reality of being a Paki and therefore inferior to the white race is too hard for him to bear as a child. Who is guilty? Is it his father or his grandfather? He is unaware of the fact that "being a white man ...mean[s] specific judgments, evaluations, gestures. It [is] a form of authority before which nonwhites, and even whites themselves, [are] expected to bend" (Said 227).

Billys' imputation of the mother and treating her as if she is "the worst kind: a traitor, someone who was one of them until she became 'worse, Goin' with the Paki'"(Kaleta 162), indicate that there will be no remedy to their bleeding wound. The selfish, vulgar and cruel nationalistic and classifying terms come in order. "All the while Little Billy [is] hissing and twisting his head in imitation of a spastic". He does not know why he is doing this or why he is imitating his father. He does this unconsciously. He is as intentional as Azhar while uttering all these words. They are both innocent and can not be responsible as children of no colour.

Azhar integrates the fragments in his mind and remembers his father once mentioning a bloodshed in which many neighbours have killed each other, but this maleficence has not ceased. "Father would poke his finger at his wife, son and baby daughter, and state, 'We're in the front line!'". In this frontage-like proximity, Father's anxiety for all his family is evident. He and his family are the focal point of every abjection

and harsh words. They are the forefronts to be assaulted first. For Azhar, Father's words have a newly-gained meaning.

3.2. The Father's Struggle to be Accepted and His Mishap

Father loves books and wants to write books. His endeavour to create articles is worthy because he writes on wherever he finds. "Even as they [eat] he scribble[s] over the backs of envelopes, rejection slips and factory stationery...". This father figure may also be taken from Kureishi's own life. He states in his interview with Colin MacCabe that "[his] father came from a literary background and wanted [him] to be a writer" (Critical Quarterly, vol.41, no.3,p.55). The common view about immigrants that they are illiterate and ignorant men can not be applied to Kureishi's therefore Azhar's father. Because their effort to exist in literary circles in England make them distinct.

Sometimes Azhar's father feels so disturbed and distressed that he "announce[s] that they [are] going 'home' to Pakistan". He believes there will not be such troubles. What is "home" for him and his Paki family is "abroad" and a very far-flung destination which is only reached after an ailing long journey for Azhar's English mother. "At this point Azhar's mother would become uneasy. How could she go 'home' when she was at home already?", her original home is England so she feels agitated with the thought of going to Pakistan. Anindyo Roy believes that "for writers of the diaspora,... home is a problematic site, since the reality of home as well as its imaginative production are vulnerably linked to an entire network of personal, national, social and cultural identifications"(104). Home gives a sense of belonging and when one goes far away from this original shelter s/he feels lost. The social and private identities that s/he bears can only be retained and renewed at home. The uneasiness of the mother is, therefore, caused by this consciousness. So the displacement can not be a delightful and comfortable act. But does the mother belong to her original native homeland anymore? Has not her emotional belonging ended because of the assaults of her childhood friends? Does not she feel a loneliness and alienation from the community she was born into? Would it be better if she went to Pakistan and settled there? Is not she losing her native home? Her opposition towards her English neighbours does not mean anything because she has once been doomed. The shared history has been lost. The sense of allegiance has been ended. The links are broken. So there seems no valid reason to stay. But the mother does not feel herself well in sweltering "hot weather" in Pakistan where food also "upset[s] her stomach". These concrete excuses are followed by a psychological third excuse: "...being surrounded by people who [don't] speak English [makes] her feel lonely". It indicates that even among the cruel and aggressive English

men she does not feel lonely because of the language they use. She at least knows and understands the swears which are uttered in English. She feels comfortable with the language she has been brought up. She is aware of the up-to-dateness of English language. She regards it as a worthwhile modern language. The loneliness and isolation generated by the language grow bigger when “Azhar’s grandfather and uncle [chatter] away in Urdu.” Because the world comprehended by the language is reduced to a mass of meaningless complex of words that remain without being understood. Communicating through different languages is a trouble and the mother does not want to experience this problem intensively. Although they live together in their English home, she knows that it would be different in Pakistan. Even walking in the street is an affliction in Pakistan. Because women have to “[walk] several paces behind [men] in the street” which implies a so-called esteem. These traditional deeds are strange to the mother. She loves her husband and wants to live with him but not with his ancient and worn-out customs and manners. The clash of cultures is not only felt in England by a Paki but may be felt in Pakistan by an English. In this paragraph which is allotted for the idea of home, the emotions are given so intimately, directly and simply in density that we admire Kureishi’s wording. He does not choose sophisticated words or form his sentences in complicated ways but still can transfer what he intends to present. There remains no single word not understood and no reality untouched. The truths of postcolonial diaspora are unveiled by his simple but artful judgements that excite the reader and provoke the feelings in him/her. The subsequent paragraph reveals father’s feelings about “home” unlike the former one does the mother’s:

Not that the idea of ‘home’ didn’t trouble Father. He himself had never been there. His family had lived in China and India; but since he’d left, the remainder of his family had moved, along with hundreds of thousands of others, to Pakistan. How could he know if the new country would suit him, or if he could succeed there? While Mother wailed, he would smack his hand against his forehead and cry, ‘Oh God, I am trying to think in all directions at the same time!’

Father is also disturbed by “the idea of home”. Because he “[has] never been there” since his family lived in China and India and after his arrival to England his family moved to Pakistan. But he has suspicions and shadowy thoughts about his homeland whether he would adapt and manage to live there while being too accustomed to England. His mind seems to be confused especially when his wife complains and weeps about not going to Pakistan. He even cries “Oh God, I am trying to think in all directions at the same time!” His confused mind can not reach a logical solution whether to go or not. Is Pakistan where he has never been or England where he has taken root “home” for him? Can he accept a

place where he has not gone yet as home? He will be contented in Pakistan because there will be no abjection or suppression. However he does not have any emotional ties with his homeland. So the inbetweenness in the act of “trying to think in all directions at the same time” does not give him comfort. “It is suicide to be abroad. But... what is it to be at home? A lingering dissolution [for him]” (cited in Aidan Arrowsmith, eds. Ashok Bery and Patricia Murray 64).

He seems to be an interesting man “parading about the flat in Wellington boots with a net curtain over his head, swinging his portable typewriter and saying he expect[s] to be called to Vietnam as a war correspondent, and [is] preparing for jungle combat”. When he is bored with the matter of both Pakistan and England, he is interested in Vietnam. Vietnam seems to be a place to flee when he can not find shelter or peace. A war district sounds more attractive than any other thing at the moment of irresoluteness. The energy to investigate and write at a war place is certainly a peculiarity that makes the father different from the others of his blood. He is so engaged in what he is doing that he does not want any of the members of his family to disturb him. The family members are not allowed to bemoan because of the “gunfire-like typing, drum[ming] into their heads”. He is persistent to be successful and he believes that he will earn money from his articles. This situation is a reminder of Kureishi’s own state which he mentions in the introduction part of “London Kills Me” that “he wasn’t making much money from writing” at first (vii). Anindyo Roy quotes from Said’s work “Reflections on Exile” the remark of Adorno who believes that the “only home truly available now, though fragile and vulnerable, is in writing” (The Politics of Identity in the Diaspora, eds. Gita Rajan and Radhika Mohanram 103). Then father’s tedious insistence to be acknowledged as a successful English writer is also a travail to harbour himself in writing. He wants to be a refugee in the borders of writing, not in England where he is despised or in Pakistan where he does not have a sense of belonging. He is an exile in writing and will be until he is noticed as a real writer. But like England, writing also betrays him. That is why writing as a home image in Adorno’s implication is “fragile and vulnerable”. In “Reflections on Exile”, Said makes “intellectual” inferences about home and writing. Roy comments on it as below:

By making an effective connection between the vulnerability of home confronted by the exiled subject and the “fragility” of writing, he establishes a kind of “modernist” paradox between loss and recovery. Indeed, he suggests that the recovery of any sense of belonging in writing differs radically from a resolute desire to reconfirm allegiance to a “prefabricated” home. For him, then, the home/writing nexus presents the new paradox of belonging in the modern world- the loss of home provides the very condition for

securing a home in writing, an activity that, while remaining vulnerable, still provides the only challenge to the world of material and intellectual commodification (103-104).

The father's hodgepodge kind of English does not prevent him. He struggles with it but does not think of giving up. Although he does not have a perfect comprehension of English language, he tries to produce in it. He does know that being able to speak is more essential than in what language you speak. Here we are reminded of the term "Englishes..." which was used by the authors of *The Empire Writes Back* to describe the multiplicity of the versions of the English language created and used by the postcolonial writers"(Madsen 10). The father's miserable but intractable attitude to produce something English to be a writer is probably Kureishi's own attempt. Kureishi certainly does not create a version of English, but the simplicity and the directness in his wording are as if implying a child's inner being who is newly-learning a language. Trying to use a language, the father also exerts himself to exist in the English society in which many English people, who abject him, live. It is a challenge for him. It is a kind of existence. He tries to determine his place among the white race. But when his writings are repudiated, he loses his temper and he even curses the English language swearing in Urdu which is a way of relief for him. Because he can not blow off steam in a language which he is not thought to be good at. So the expression of anger has to be in the mother tongue, Urdu. The mother tongue makes him feel at home. He compares it with English which restricts him. "He [is] convinced [that the English language is] barring him". He can not use English properly so he feels limited but he can not go beyond the obstacles caused by it. Is it the language or the people whose mother tongue is English that generate the limitations and hindrances? Is it the otherness that prevents him to be successful? Or can the self-expression of a Pakistani immigrant be in English? The proximity between the father's and Kureishi's situations can be easily inferred from the Kureishi's statements:

It was puzzling, hard to see why the Tories and their press supporters were getting so bad-tempered and frustrated, so angry even, and why these writers mattered to them. The Tories had won three elections, and the Labour Party, though gaining in coherence, was not a substantial threat. Much of television and the press was owned, controlled, or intimidated by the ruling ideology.

.....

This row between us and them was also an argument about language and representation. These people wanted to control the freedom of the imagination. They were afraid of anyone who saw Britain as a racially mixed, run-down, painfully divided, class-ridden place. For their fantasy was of a powerful, industrially strong country with a central, homogenous, consensual culture. There necessarily would be hinterlands, marginals, freaks, perverts, beggars, one-parent families, and dissidents. But these

didn't matter. There could not be other versions of reality escaping into the world, poisoning the purity of their vision. It was a threat, it created confusion, it wasn't the image of Britain that others should be allowed to see (London Kills Me, Introduction x).

Mother's suggestion that "he was doing something wrong and should study something more profitable" is not deterrent enough to change the father's mind but the black voice among the white ones is too low to be heard. It is not too clear to be understood whether the content of the father's writings or the English he uses is not ratified. In deed, his grammar and spelling are corrected by "a retired school teacher". But his writings are insistently rejected. Mother takes measures to hide "the returned manuscripts" as if they are "an alcoholic's bottles" so that they can result in a mishap.

3.3. The Wretchedness of the Feelings

After seven informative paragraphs about the father, Kureishi's camera turns again to the bus scene where the extreme tension is felt:

At every stop Azhar hoped someone might get on who would discourage or arrest the Billys. But no one did and as they moved forward the bus emptied. Little Billy took the jumping up and twanging the bell, at which the conductor only laughed.

Azhar's childish and innocent hopes are worn out because contrary to his wishes, nobody gets on the bus and even the available travellers get off which gets Azhar down. Searching for somebody is the hope that he can redeem Azhar and his mother. But as the bus empties, the hopes die and the anxiety of Azhar arises. "Every stop", coming up to, does convey a hope but they are also the stops at which the hopes cease. Someone who will come out at one spot will be a conscientious savior and punish Billys for what they are doing. Black Azhar's dying hopes are contrasted with white Billy's joy. Azhar is sunk deeply in his black sorrow while Little Billy is very contented with the twanging bell. The colour of their skins also reflect their moods in this scene. "Only" in the last sentence of the paragraph quoted above indicates that the conductor in charge of the bus does not do what he has to do but laugh. What he has to do is to tell off Little Billy but his white skin saves him from being scolded. While the sound of the bell is a pleasure for Billy, it clicks in Azhar's head veiling all the expectations. The movement of the bus forward is an advance of Azhar's closeness to his inner being. Little Billy's joy is completed with his sudden action when he flings a marble towards the window between Azhar and his mother's head. His impertinent behaviour and rudeness are centered in the stone and when he throws it, Little Billy vomits all he has been taught. But we are convinced that it is an unpredicted act for Big Billy as well as Azhar and his mother. "When Big Billy notice[s]

this even his eyes [widen]”. “Even” exists in the sentence as a satisfactory adverb for the reader to believe in his unawareness of the marble. The reaction he gives is in deed surprising as his simulating son displays what he has been filled with. All the cruel oral assaults are pointed with the marble hit. The “window” image in the first bus scene of the story is repeated in this paragraph. The window stands as a break for the limited space of the bus. It is a link between the inside and outside. But when it is cracked and chipped, the outside view is blurred, therefore the way of escaping, at least spiritually, is destroyed. Big Billy’s late attempt to hold Little Billy’s wrist is for preventing a naughtiness, not for the sake of the mother and her son. Little Billy’s act can also be taken to indicate that the forthcoming generations will be more cruel. Because while Big Billy only abjects his Pakistani neighbours orally, his little son of next generation uses his physical power and turns this minimal place into a frontline. Of course it does not mean that being orally degraded is acceptable. Its distressing effects are not undeniable. It can even be thought to be more wicked. But the physical assault is prone to kill while the mental assault is only to offend and dishonour. Mother’s scream “Stop it, stop it! Won’t anyone help! We’ll be murdered!” had to be uttered at the very beginning or “at every bus stop” or “at every word of humiliation”. It is at that stage a late but a strong one. “The noise she made came from hell or eternity. Little Billy blanched and shifted closer to his father; they went quiet.” The voice comes from so deep inside the mother that “hell” or “eternity” are considered to be the origin of it. “Hell” implies suffering, pain and torment. “The voice coming from the hell” is therefore generated by this affliction. The bus is then an inferno where all the hellish facts are experienced. “Eternity”, on the other hand, is an image which includes the meaning of “hell”, too. It remarks the endlessness, it is “a state of existence that is outside time, especially the state which some people believe they will pass into after they have died”(Metro Collins Cobuild Essential Dictionary 337). So the mother’s physical being does not signify a real existence. She is in the bus but her mind does not want to be there. It is better to be in hell, outside time and space. So her voice conveys traces of hell. With this voice, Little Billy’s white face turns pale; he is startled and confused and shaded by his father. They are silent now because they have gone too far and been too rude. They are even stunned by what they have been doing. The marble hit on the window is a point of awakening for them. They can not say and do anything for they are astonished at the end. Azhar stands up to quarrel but the conductor prevents him. The conductor like a bar before Azhar proves to be on the side of Billys. His indifference to Billys’ ferocious attacks and reaction to Azhar’s rising is another verification that whatever Billys do he will connive at

and act with them. In fact the conductor's blocking his way is a symbol of the other blockings he will go through all his life. His ways are all blocked and he seems not to be able to break through them.

The mother and Azhar get off the bus before their common stop comes. The mother's quickness while getting off before the bus halts is an endeavour to recede into a distance as swiftly as possible. She does not want to be in the bus anymore and does not want to breathe the same air with them. Because it gives pain and makes her suffer from the hellish feelings. Getting off the bus Azhar "wasn't going to look at the Billys, but he did give them the eye, straight on, stare to stare, so he could see them and not be so afraid. They could hate him but he would know them. But if he couldn't fight them what could he do with his anger?" Azhar's glare at Billys from outside to the inside of the bus, the shift of the place imply a gulf. He has the guts to look straight into their eyes to frighten them. As a child, he hates their guts and his hatred is so strong that he takes courage and does not feel afraid of them. Their hatred seems to be unimportant when compared with Azhar's, now. The bad-blood between them does create a sense of equity and balance, because they extremely hate each other and their revulsion is at the same extent. They can not endure each other. The first glare in the first bus scene from Billys at the beginning of the story are settled into Azhar's eyes. "Stare to stare" also expresses a balance. The looks are met by looks to declare that they are not afraid of each other. The symmetry in "stare to stare" tells us the equality on the eye level. The powers are equal and the degree of powers are transferred through eyes in which the real feelings are hidden. "Could not be so afraid" conveys a certainty and impossibility. Having the knowledge of the enemy in "but he would know them" beside the consciousness of their hatred is also an expression of fearlessness. Although the story is told in third person narration, the writer enables us to read what is inside the character's mind with the help of the actions and despite the fact that there is not a single adjective in the quotations above to describe the situation and they are formed in a simple clause structure, the feeling of enmity with all its agitating reality is revealed so clearly. It must also be admitted that the active feelings occupy much place rather than the actions. It does not mean that there is no action but even the actions serve to highlight those active feelings. The directness of the actions and the objectivity in the narration make it easier for us to interpret the actions. The if clause "But if he couldn't fight them, what could he do with his anger?" allows no way other than "fighting". Azhar has to "fight" to overcome his anger thoroughly otherwise he will not be able to discharge himself. He can not think another way but to "fight". He will fight on behalf of his mother

and father and all the others who are oppressed for their skin colours are different. His thought of fight is therefore symbolic because whether it will be performed or not, it will be between a Pakistani and an English, between East and West, between cultures, between belonging and unbelonging and between any opposing feelings. Whoever wins, it will be the embodiment of animosity.

The mother and Azhar have been so stunned in the bus that after getting off, they “stumble”. Outside, still England, is freedom. Although they have problems in the bus and those problems will not cease outside, it is partly a freedom for them to get off the bus. Billys “[are] already calling out, though not as loud as before”. The lowered tone of the voice, the comparison of the voices before and now indicate that Billys are a bit discouraged although there seems nothing to change their minds.

As they are “approach[ing] the top of their street”, Azhar notices “the retired teacher who assist[s] Father”. His clothing and performing the daily evening deeds given with the verbs “looked, picked, sniffed” incite a laugh in Azhar who thinks the teacher “resemble[s] a phantom”. Azhar perceives the teacher in his “three-piece suit and trilby hat”, views him through simple acts and infer he is phantom-like. The simplicity of the sentences one after another from the person to the percept is followed by a subjective judgement that is given from Azhar’s point of view. In Azhar’s knowledge of the real world, there has remained nothing like the teacher who has been observed in peace and harmony with what he is doing. The simple acts are accomplished in pleasure and they give a sense of moderation. “Sniffing the evening air” and “picking up the evening paper” are ordinary but relaxing realities of life. But Azhar who has wholly passed through an awful day in the uneasiest way does not believe the simple truths of life any more. The teacher’s actions and the teacher, himself seem like a phantom. The teacher is a daydream or a trick of mind for him now. The reality is in the assaults of Billys’, in their yelling and humiliation. Therefore the scene in the bus and the uncomplicated deeds of teacher in his garden are contrasting elements in the story. The Billys are so real while the teacher is all a lie. The sentence “he resembled a phantom” is followed by another interpretation of Azhar who believes “in a deranged world the normal appeared the most bizarre”. The unbalanced and distraught world formulated by the Billys for the subjugated people of Azhar’s kind has to be lived in whether it is good or bad. This world exploits and subdues the naturalness, conventionality and normality substituting the “bizarre” instead. Billys’ oddity is therefore substituted for the teacher’s naturalness which has been normal but is not any more for Azhar. The replacement of the values creates an illusion which causes disappointment. Azhar makes

illusionary interpretations about the real life. “Appeared” as a verb of feeling; identifying the sense of “believing something to be so” does not absolutely tell a certainty. It is only the feeling of Azhar and what has made him feel that way is what he has experienced in the bus. The subjectivity of the inference would not be given the same sense with a state verb. The variant of the sentence as “... the normal is/was the most bizarre” is impersonal. Kureishi views his protagonist’s mind and carefully chooses the verbs to transpose it to the reader. Kureishi forms his sentences very clearly and plainly. The story is not crowded with subordinate clauses. The constituents are not long but still there is the energy and tension felt. The paradoxical situation of the teacher is as if summarizing the story. What is “normal” does not work or is not “normal” anymore. But it is not the “bizarre” but “the most bizarre” which replaces it. The comparison of the situations with a superlative adjective “the most bizarre” is an expression of the harsh and extreme feelings of Azhar. The weight of the feeling has been given with an end-focus on “the most bizarre” which is the most important part of the sentence as carrying the whole meaning of the emotion. If the sentence is written “...the most bizarre appeared the normal”, then the end-focus shifts and “the normal” is emphasized strongly, but what is important in the story is “the most bizarre”, so it must be in the end to be the centre of the interest. Furthermore, “abnormal”, which is preceded with the prefix “ab” as the antonym of “normal” can not give the same sense with “bizarre”. Because “bizarre” has the meaning of strangeness and ridiculousness while “abnormal” only means “not normal or unusual”. So it is an attempt to identify the situation ironically.

“Mother immediately pulled Azhar towards his gate” is another action which the mother accomplishes unhesitatingly. The quickness of the “pulling” does not leave a moment to think and it awakens Azhar. Mother does not want to go anywhere but towards the teacher’s gate at which she probably thinks to share her uneasiness. As the teacher has been portrayed phantom-like by Azhar in a dream-like position, the gate of the garden invites them into a dream as the teacher meets them “rais[ing] his hat” and greeting them “in a friendly way”. After the nightmare in the bus, the English teacher’s attitude is a hallucination. His stereotypical gentle English manner while “raising his hat” and friendly way of speaking differ him from Billys although they are English, too. The sincerity and the intimacy of him are what the mother is longing for at that moment. The dialogue between the teacher and Azhar’s mother at the gate is about the father which Azhar can not understand at first: “At first Azhar didn’t understand what his mother was talking about. But it was father she was referring to”. He can not get the matter at first because he does

not think that his mother would speak about Father but Billys. He can not consider that the mother is uneasy with the father. She vigorously starts with a complaint: "They send them back, his writings, every day, and he gets so angry... so angry... Can't you help him?". The definite reference "they" at the beginning of the sentence as the subject pronoun can be misunderstood by Azhar whose mind is engaged with Billy's attacks. His mind is so occupied with Billys that every word sounds to refer to "them". Mother's speech also indicates that there is a shared knowledge about "father's writings" as she uses "them" first as the object pronoun and later on explains "them" to be "his writings". "Everyday" shows how insistently and frequently the "sending" occurs and this recurrence makes the mother anxious about the father and his achievement. The ellipses between "so angry" repeated twice either indicate the difficulty in finding the true word to express father's state of mood or the mother expects to be understood by the teacher. The formal repetition of "so angry" also hints at the intensity of the feeling. In the final negative question, a desperate need for help is clearly felt and met by the teacher who replies "I do help him where I can". He reminds the mother of the grammatical and spelling corrections he has made on father's writings and although the auxiliary verb "do" can not be used in the positive sentences, he uses it to support his statement and emphasize the "help" he does. Mother's reaction and desire is surprising and rebellious: "Make him stop, then!". She believes that the father's passion of writing is a pie-in-the-sky and the more he writes the more he experiences disappointment. The sentence would be uttered in its variant "Stop him, then!" but "make" has a meaning of force in itself which hints at that the father can be stopped as if they need to use "force" to prevent the father from writing and put an end to his disappointments. The teacher still can not understand the matter and when he asks, the mother "choke[s] into her handkerchief and [shakes] her head" which is an implication of cry. She is freight with negative feelings.

At that moment "Billys [pass] on silently". Eventhough they are silent, their existence in that scene of relief and purification is a violation. Their hesitation and silence are contrasted with their previous actions. While they were active in the bus till the "marble hit", they are passive and speechless now. They are disturbed by the sight they come across and can not even salute. "Azhar watch[es] them go. It [is] all right, for now. But tomorrow Azhar [will] be for it, and the next day, and the next. No mother [can] prevent it." The first sentence of the quotation offers a sense of permission and can be interpreted as "Azhar let[ting] them go". Because by looking at the course of the events, it can be inferred that Azhar is on the warpath but he for the time being keeps his cool. What

he can do as a child is disputable. But his blind ambition makes him as powerful as a man and, not to be subdued any more, he decides to challenge and avenge. “Tomorrow”, “the next day” and “the next” show his determination in his decision and “It was all right, for now” indicate that he only postpones to face them for his mother is with him. “No Mother” can be read as “No Power” can prevent him. He is ready to face the music because his feelings are so much outraged by those Billys. As a child he has discovered his postcolonial self, immediately formed new feelings and understandings of the world, become to feel himself “other” and shifted from the role of the “good child at school” to a “revenger”. No matter that they are children, but the colonizing white Little Billy and the colonized brown Little Azhar “are both irrevocably affected by [the] historical process”(Radhika Mohanram 118). They have at once found themselves in their new identities which do not fit them. They carry out the feelings of their parents and their children will do the same and this recurrence will always “[divide] the world *almost exactly* into the Eastern and Western hemispheres” (Radhika Mohanram 119). “No Mother could prevent it” instead of “His Mother couldn’t prevent it” also implies the malignity that can not be avoided by any authority.

The dialogue between the teacher and the mother has contrasting elements with the former parts of the story. The teacher’s sympathetic utterance for the father being “a good little chap” and his writings as “over hopeful” are consoling for the mother. But still there is an uncertainty about the career the father has been expected to achieve. Because when the mother asks “...will he get anywhere?”, the teacher’s twice repeated response “Perhaps” stresses upon the lack of possibility. “But he may be a touch-“ is added to reduce the unlikable atmosphere created by “perhaps”. The dash after “touch” is for expanding the idea and adding more details about the attempts of the father. The teacher’s comment and subjective approach “over hopeful” after the dash appeases the severity of “perhaps” and “may be” at that moment. Although “perhaps” and “may be” are not too harsh and have the meaning of possibility, in this scene they bear the meaning of “impossibility” and removed from the reality. The teacher’s graded expressions “perhaps”, “may be”, “over hopeful” show a descent from reality to falsehood. But he still keeps his kindness and never seems rude not to hurt the mother. The gentle manner of communication is a break of the hopeless situation the mother is in and it displays an infringement of the impudent style of Billys. The mother’s anxiety is still felt even while she is saying “yes” to the teacher. Because she is “biting her lip” trying to hide the shaky feelings. The teacher suggests mother to “tell [the father] to read more Gibbon and

Macaulay” who were well-known English historians of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries so that his thoughts would be moulded into a shape. The short and repetitive answers “yes”, “right”, “yes, yes” and “that’s all right” show the submission of the mother and that her mind is still confused as short answers indicate that the speaker does not focus on the discourse and want to take her time while her/his mind is occupied with something else. She acts like an obedient child who would accept everything. She does not add anything to the course of the dialogue. She only hears the comments and suggestions. But yet the dialogue at the gate has a relieving and a rehabilitating effect on her. She is undone.

3.4. The Irony of the Search for a Better Place

Following the dialogue between the teacher and the mother, a paragraph of condition and description is significant:

Instead of going home, mother and son went in the opposite direction. They passed a bomb site and left the road for a narrow path. When they could no longer feel anything firm beneath their feet, they crossed a nearby rutted muddy playing field in the dark. The strong wind, buffeting them sideways, nearly had them tangled in the slimy nets of a soccer goal. He had no idea she knew this place.

The subjects and objects of each sentence in the paragraph are “the mother and the son” or “they” and “them” as definite references. They are alone now. They walk by themselves. There is nobody to be with them. The preference of going somewhere “instead of going home”, the search for another place that will substitute home is the sickly decision of mind which can not judge any more. Kureishi’s comments on “home” equates with the “home” image in the mother’s mind. “It is not difficult to see how much illusion and falsity there is in this view. How much disappointment and unhappiness might be involved in going ‘home’ only to see the extent to which you have been formed by England and the depth of attachment you feel to the place, despite everything” (London Kills Me 35). The “opposite direction” of home is “unhome” implying a reversal in the meaning and references of it which means discomfort, uprootedness and exposure. “Home” is father and his Pakistani family that upset mother as well as Billys. So “home” and “outside” do not differ. “The narrow path”, “the muddy playing field”, “the strong wind”, “the slimy nets of a soccer goal”, “the darkness” and “[nothing] firm beneath their feet” serve as the symbols of mouldiness and are the manifestation of the mental entities of the mother and Azhar. The “mud” can be taken as an insecure territory where they will always have to struggle. The images are active in the way they illustrate that both characters are not able to stand on a sound ground and find comfort. The “bomb site” as a territory of violence reveals the

brutal history. They are foreigners in that muddy place. The nature and the place reveal what they feel. The wind, mud and darkness are in their feelings and minds. The “homelessness”, the pursuit for shelter, the subdued state of being are all disclosure of an incisive mishap. They do not have anything to take hold of. Their “tangled” and “buffeted” situation is an indication of the “ruttled” hearts. The unknown route they follow will lead to an unknown destination. Even the earth they stand on is not solid which indicates an unbalanced situation. They arrive at a “dismal shed” with that short but difficult journey. The narration makes us penetrate into the dim and dramatic nature of the place. It is a “public toilet, rife with spiders and insects”. That is to say, it is a site of dirt. The parallelism between the quality of the place and the “Pakis” is striking. Almost all the English people who are like Billy see the Pakistani people as dirt. This is the common attitude. Kureishi, in the interview with Colin MacCabe states that “Asian people were not seen as part of Britain”(Critical Quarterly, vol.41, no.3, p.40) and while he is creating such a scene in his mind, he is captivated by that thought of the affinity between dirt and Pakistani people. He also repeats his thought in his “Rainbow Sign”: “The British were doing the assimilating: they assimilated Pakistanis to their world view. They saw them as dirty, ignorant and less than human- worthy of abuse and violence”(7). The isolation of Pakistanis is juxtaposed with the isolation of that filthy place. The Pakistanis deserve only unclean places. It is a place of “exile” where a Pakistani and even an English wife of a “Paki”, who has already lost her self-expression and turned it into a self-hatred, have to belong. The belonging is a sense of “owning” but it also creates an “unbelonging” to the original place. The sickness of the mother, the disgusting air, the loathsome situation they are in are given so realistically that we feel the emotions so beautifully woven in the narration:

He looked up but couldn't see her face. She pushed the door and stepped across the wet floor. When he hesitated she tugged him into the stall with her. She wasn't going to let him go now. He dug into the wall with his penknife and practised holding his breath until she finished, and wiped herself on the scratchy paper. Then she sat there with her eyes closed, as if she were saying a prayer. His teeth were clicking; ghosts whispered in his ears; outside there were footsteps; dead fingers seemed to be clutching at him.

All the feelings are hidden in the gestures of face, the mother tries to veil it. Her actions are given with the verbs “push”, “tug”, “not let” and “step” which have connotations of harsh efforts. She can not be calm, she is stormy and her actions reflect this mood. She also does not allow Azhar to go. She does not want to suffer alone. Azhar's

hesitation makes her behave more austere. The small stall carries the burden of two afflicted souls. Azhar “hold[s] his breath” which implies the hardship he is in and the abominable feature of the toilet. Although there is no exact word like “vomit” for the action of mother, we understand that she vomits from the words “...she finished, and wiped herself on the scratchy paper”. “Vomiting” is a kind of a manifest of an illness. The nauseated body can not get better without “vomiting”. It is doubtlessly the expression of hatred towards the imprudent and morbid attitudes they are exposed to. It is a kind of a purification from bad-blood. It is a way of emptying the body. The paradox in the act of escaping from Billys and “home” to shelter in such a place is the consequence of a predicament. Instead of touching his mother in a way of affection, Azhar “digs” into the wall with his penknife. This is a sort of an alienation which is given with the tactile verb “dig”. The “scratchy paper” makes the situation worse. Whatever they come across is ugly. When “she finish[es]”, she closes her eyes in relief. But the place is too contaminated to console. Now it is Azhar who feels bad. The “clicking” sound of his teeth, “the whispering ghosts”, “the footsteps outside”, “the clutching dead fingers” all prepare us for an audible and tactile scene which has a poetic rhythm in itself, limited with the last four sentences of the paragraph. We are as if drawn into the scene of a horror film. The tension and anxiety of Azhar is at climax. Because of the loose sentence structure, the fear of Azhar is easily felt at every semi-colon. The last four sentences of the paragraph are not unexpectedly simple and direct. They are uncomplicated and clear to make the comprehension easier and to transfer the apprehension. The pathetic fallacy in “the ghosts’ whispers”, “the clutching dead fingers” and “the footsteps outside”- although there is nobody outside- also add a poetic quality to the scene as “descriptive poetry” usually uses it. M.H. Abrams, in his “A Glossary of Literary Terms”, claims that “such descriptions do not represent the ‘true appearances of things to us’ but ‘the extraordinary, or false appearances, when we are under the influence of emotion, or contemplative fancy’” (42). So the predicament of Azhar who sees his mother so sick makes him feel in that way. The illusion he has seen at the teacher’s gate is repeated in the worst way. He perceives his mother weak and is afraid to be in such a place of filth. He invents all of them in his mind and perhaps supposes the “footsteps” are Billys’. With that very dramatic description, the image of “place” is illustrated as unpleasant and undesirable both representing “home” for a while for Azhar and the mother and conveying the adverse qualities of “home”. While it is a shelter, it also symbolizes uneasiness and fright. The transitions between the feelings of mother and Azhar are given with the transition of pronouns from “he” to “she” and vice versa. One

sentence begins with “he” and the other with “she”. Kureishi, again uses his cinematic ability to view his characters with a camera eye on the sentences.

When the mother comes to herself, she spends a long time analysing “herself in the mirror. She makes up and tidies. There is no voice other than the “rain” on the metal roof, which dripped through onto their heads”. The “rain” image “dripping” on the roof of an unclean place is an implication of purification. If mother and Azhar go outside and walk in the rain, all their negativeness will be left behind and they will be tranquillized by it. But the rain is felt inside the toilet as an oozing which carries the dirt of the roof with itself to the inside “through onto their heads”. So there is still a sense of filth and impurity. Azhar is so bored with the situation that he cries “Mum”, but the mother’s reaction is not compassionate to console Azhar. She wants him to stop complaining emphatically. She is bored with all as well as Azhar who is now able to see his mother’s face and even her scorching eyes on his face in the yellow light. “The scorching eyes” unveil the mother’s feelings and show how much she has cried. The next sentences of the paragraph highlight that the mother and Azhar can communicate even when they do not speak.

He knew she wanted to tell him not to mention any of this. Recognizing at last that it wasn’t necessary, she suddenly dragged him by his arm, as if it had been his fault they were held up, and hurried him home without another word.

The mother believes in Azhar and he knows what his mother wants from him. What they have shared till that moment would be a secret between them and not to be mentioned to anybody even to the father. But mother does not need to explain this to Azhar because he has experienced enough and has been matured in a day and she sees that her son is able to understand everything and does not need a childish explanation to share the secret. But although Azhar is her accomplice-if it is a crime- her “drag[ging] him by his arm” and “hurry[ing] home” is surprising and not affectionate. The waste of time is not Azhar’s offence but mother’s actions reveal so. The real “home” as the last and the original destination to be arrived at is waiting for them now.

3.5. Azhar’s Discovery of His Eastern Self

The journey to home is not mentioned and the next paragraph begins with the description of the flat as “lighted and warm” which are the true adjective connotations of “home”. Father is at home but the mother does not “kiss father as she usually [does]”. She, willingly or unwillingly, accuses him for all the bad experience she has gone through. She “[goes] into the kitchen” straight away. She “[tries] to be normal, but the very effort betray[s] her”. She grits her teeth to be natural and as usual. In this scene there occurs

questions in the minds: Who is the subdued one- the Paki father or the English mother? Who is ground down? The Paki father can turn back to his original home to Pakistan not to be abject any more, but the mother can not because England is her own country and she is alienated from it and suffers the strong sense of displacement. So not only a Paki is in a miserable condition but also whoever comes into the Pakistani family shares the same fate.

The Father, Grandpop and Uncle Asif are “listening to the cricket commentary on the big radio...”. Kureishi’s first visit to Pakistan is interesting for him because he sees his uncle’s big house and all the people coming, staying and visiting them. In his “The Rainbow Sign”, he confesses that he was urged to “think about the close-bonding within the families and about the intimacy and interference of an extended family and a more public way of life. Was the extended family worse than the little nuclear family because there were more people to dislike? Or better because relationships were less intense?” (17). Azhar’s family though not as much extended as Kureishi’s, is still carrying a typical feature of a Pakistani family. The “cricket commentary” symbolizes something English. It is a way of being British. “Father’s typewriter,...surrounded by empty beer bottles” also indicates an Englishness in the way of living. Kureishi discloses the fact and notes: “ In so far as colonizers and colonized engaged in a relationship with the latter aspiring to be like the former, ...Shadowing the British, they drank whisky and read *The Times* ;they praised others by calling them ‘gentlemen’; and their eyes filled with tears at old Vera Lynn records” (The Rainbow Sign 21).The imitations of the colonizer in the most possible detailed way is seen in Azhar’s family, too. The “cricket commentary”, “beer bottles”, “smoking pipes” and the usage of “English words” sometimes among Urdu or Punjabi are peculiarities of English and it is perhaps this mimicry what makes Pakis more hybrid and impure. Father “pour[s] some beer into a glass for [Azhar]” also shows the father’s wish for his son who is a “half-caste” child, black in skin but white in manners and way of living. But the Pakistani relatives still carry the qualities of the Orient. While “ talking loudly in Urdu or Punjabi”, they “gesticulate and slap one another in a way English people never [do]”. They are intimate with each other and that closeness requires a show of feelings by touching which is an “ anti-Western” attitude.

The final paragraph of the story is only about Azhar who “has learned to live in an adult world run by adult rules that he does not understand, and whose traditions, values and prejudices he knows but does not comprehend” (Kaleta 163).

Azhar was accustomed to being with his family while grasping only fragments of what they said . He endeavoured to decipher the gist of it, laughing, as he always did, when the men laughed, and

silently moving his lips without knowing what the words meant,
whirling, all the while, in incomprehension.

Azhar imitates the men when they laugh, and try to speak like them. With the mother's secret, he "takes his place in the world he has been given" (Kaleta 163). "Fragments" do not have meanings but his effort to perceive them makes him a member of the adult world. Although in an extended family everybody feels responsible for each other, mother's keeping the secret shows that she is also alienated from his husband's Paki world. Azhar, "in incomprehension", seems to be closer to the mother, in this sense. But he is still the stranger to both of the worlds which urge him to grow up immediately. His existence in a world of oddities separates him from the others. He feels neither Paki nor English. This in-betweenness is what makes his life meaningless.

Kaleta comments on the last paragraph: "Azhar's happiness is an unthinking one. The story leaves him whirling in the childhood memories that will colour his philosophy as a grown man. The scars of prejudice will commingle with the security of family. His loss of innocence is a mark of his Anglo-Asian heritage" (164). Kaleta also states that Kureishi finds his story "quite serious...more sincere, if you value sincerity"(174). According to Kaleta, Kureishi expresses "an unadulterated... prejudice" and look "unrestricted[ly] at bigotry" which form the structure of his short story, "with its single climax". Kaleta also finds the final paragraph of the story "We're Not Jews" clear, "in which the contradictions in prejudice are choreographed" (164). Azhar's discovery of the fact that he is a misfit is an axiom of being half black and half white in the imperial metropole that does not accept him with his Asian identity.

4. WITH YOUR TONGUE DOWN MY THROAT

“With Your Tongue down My Throat” is a story of two half sisters, Nadia and Nina, whose father is a rich Pakistani. Nina lives with her English mother in England while Nadia lives in Pakistan with her Pakistani parents and sisters. It is Kureishi’s first published short story. “Half-sisters Nadia and Nina exemplify not only the paradox of Anglo-Asian politics, but the tensions between the dreams and the reality of Asian immigrants” (Kaleta 148). Although the narrator of the story is Nina till the end and the story is thoroughly read and told from her perspective, the reader unexpectedly finds that it is all invented by the male character Howard who is the lover of Nina’s mother. The structure of the story constitutes in four parts and while the first three sections take part in England, one takes part in Pakistan. Each of the four parts has sections in themselves which contribute a diary-like feature to the story. Indeed, “the radical television writer and well-known toss-pot Howard Coleman” wants Nina “to write this diary” and although the reader perceives the writer and owner of the diary as Nina, it is Howard who writes all of it as if they were told by Nina. Kaleta calls this “a point of view within a point of view” which is related with a “female voice”, “allow[ing] Kureishi a mirror look at racism.” (148)

4.1. Nina’s Awaiting for Her Half-Sister

The first part of the story, which includes four short sections, starts with a scene of abortion. The first sentence of the story “I tell you, I feel tired and dirty, but I was told no baths allowed for a few days, so I’ll stay dirty” is uttered just like a conversation between two intimate friends. The very private atmosphere of the story fascinates us from the very beginning and invites us to learn more about this privacy. At first, it is not understood what this dirtiness and tiredness is caused by and it seems as if it is just an operation but the operation room or “green room” full of ladies, the doctor’s looking at Nina is strange as if to say, ‘What are you doing here?’” because of Nina’s young age and his “pok[ing Nina] in the stomach” in the recovery room convince us that it is more than an operation. “Several awkward looking, sleepy boyfriends outside” who are waiting for their girlfriends is also an indicator that all those ladies are in the same condition having abortions. Nina tells all she has lived in hospital calmly though still a bit “aggressive” because of the operation. The first section of the first part ends with Nina’s information “I got the bus and went back to the squat” which approves that it is usual for Nina to have an abortion as she is on a

public vehicle, alone, as if nothing has happened. This scene also bears a clue about what kind of a person Nina is and how she approaches the events.

In the second section of the first part, Nina's return to her mother's house, her relation with her mother and the mother's lover are given.

A few months later we got kicked out and I had to go back to Ma's place. So I'm back here, now, writing this with my foot up on the table, reckoning I look like a painter. I sip water with a slice of lemon in it. I'm at Ma's kitchen table and there are herbs growing in pots around me. At least the place is clean, though it's shabby and all falling apart...

The detailed narration allows the reader to create vivid pictures in the mind. The paragraph above clarifies that Nina has not been living with her mother but with somebody else in the "squat" where "[they have been] kicked out". It is not clear if it is a boy or a girl who she has lived with because Nina does not tell us about that person and after she "[has] to go back to Ma's place", the reader does not hear anything about him/her. "A few months later" and "so I'm back here now" also bear the clue that Nina is away from home for a while. The "growing herbs in pots", the clean but shabby atmosphere in the kitchen are signs of liveliness and Nina's especially perceiving and telling them in details is a show of her longing for such a place. She seems relaxed at her mother's house with "[her] foot up on the table" and Howard, her mother's boyfriend is with her "reading one of his scripts". Nina does not appear to love Howard much as she says "Thank Christ Ma should be back any minute now from the Catholic girls' school where she teaches." She does not want to spend time or be with him alone, but she does what he wants-writing a diary:

It's Howard who asked me to write this diary, who said write down some of the things that happen. My half-sister Nadia is about to come over from Pakistan to stay with us. Get it all down, he said.

Requiring such a diary from Nina, Howard is aware of the fact that it would be interesting. Because Nina and Nadia's meeting is a juxtaposition of two cultures, West and East, while it is also an emotional meeting of two half-sisters who have never seen each other before. So, Howard knows it will be worth writing about it.

In the following paragraphs Nina gives the reader clues about Howard's and her mother Deborah's relationship even telling their sexual intercourse. Nina finds it "strange, hearing [her] ma doing it" as Deborah "sounds like she's having an operation." She very clearly and indecently explains all she observes or hears. The sarcastic narration also contributes the story a sense of humour as Nina claims that she "feel[s] like running in with the first-aid kit." Her tone of speech reveals her calmness and her easy-going manner. She

is not irritated or surprised finding her mother “doing it” as she experiences the same every day with different men.

In the third section, looking out of the window with Howard, Nina sees “planks and window frames everywhere-poles, cement mixers, sand, grit, men with mouths and disintegrating brick underfoot.” The disorder and confusion in the street make Nina think about the impression it will leave upon Nadia who will soon come to England and she shares this with Howard:

‘It’s rubbish, isn’t it? Nadia will think we’re right trash’
....
‘Why be ashamed of what you are?’
‘Because compared with Nadia we’re not much, are we?’
‘I’m much. You’re much. Now get on with your writing.’
He touches my face with his finger. ‘You’re excited, aren’t you?’
This is a big thing for you.’
It is, I suppose.

The first sentence of Nina above shows that she gives importance to her half-sister’s thoughts although they have not met and talked before. The “trash” image and Nina’s identifying herself with contamination is indeed caused by Nina’s feeling that Nadia is very important. She feels humiliated even with the image of Nadia. Although the story begins with a scene of dirt, Nina’s abortion, Nina is not ashamed of it, but of the dirty street. Her comparison makes her believe that she is feeble. “We’re not much, are we?” is an awareness of what she is and the question does not take the required answer. Howard’s answer shows how much he feels English. “I’m much. You’re much” is an indication of the belief in his self. The lack of confidence Nina is in is the result of the lifestyle she is leading. She can not hold onto anything so she feels herself poor in front of Nadia’s image. Indeed, she does not know if she is “excited” or not or “it is a big thing” for her that Nadia is coming. “It is [a big thing], I suppose” exposes her irresoluteness in her emotions. Though she gives so much importance to Nadia and her coming, she can not decide if it is a considerable thing for her or not. In the last three paragraphs of the section, Nina tells how she has learned about Nadia and how she has wanted her to come to England. Being “an only child, that is, until [she] was eleven, when Ma says she has a surprise for [her], one of the nicest [she’s] ever had. She has a half-sister the same age, living in another country.” This is a big surprise for Nina and she realizes that she dislikes “[her] same-age half sister” at first. But one night which Nina defines as “one of [her] worst”, she sends a letter to her father wishing Nadia to come to see her. “[She] want[s] Nadia to save [her]” in

her worst night. What she longs for is a sister who she can share everything, beside loneliness. So Nadia bears an impression of savior from the very beginning for Nina.

Nina imagines her sister far away in Pakistan as “a girl... sitting under a palm tree, reading a Bronte novel and drinking yoghurt. I see a girl being cuddled by my father. He tells stories of tigers and elephants and rickshaw wallahs.” Her fantasy, rooted somewhere between Kipling and Tagore, is an eastern version of *The Cosby Show*. Nina’s fantasy of her sister is a childhood dream of a faraway land with a loving dream daddy (Kaleta 149).

It becomes definite that Nadia is coming when the father in Pakistan sends her a letter saying “look after [Nadia], she is the most precious thing in the entire world to me”. Deborah wants Nina “to cancel the visit” as she does not feel she can put up with seeing Nadia. “She symbolizes my betrayal by your father” is not enough for Nina. She just wants to see her half-sister ignoring how much her mother will suffer. She even threatens her mother to go back to “old days” as a prostitute. Her mother is persuaded by this threat not to lose Nina once again.

4.2. Nadia’s Arrival to England and Her Disillusionment

The second part of the story is about Nadia’s coming to England and what she lives with Nina who calls Nadia her “mirror”:

You. Every day I’ve woken up trying to see your face, and now you’re here, your head jerking nervously, saying little, with us drenching you. I can see you’re someone I know nothing about. You make me very nervous.

The moment Nina sees Nadia at the airport, she feels uneasy and her expectations seem to fail at first sight. Nina’s imagination of her sister in the national Pakistani dress but finding her in jeans and sweatshirt is the first disappointment she lives about her. Nadia’s physical appearance does not attract Nina and she compares Nadia with herself. “Upon actually meeting Nadia in London, Nina sees not only that she bears no resemblance to her fantasy image, but also that her dream has been colored by bias” (Kaleta 149). Not only Nina but also her mother is nervous. Deborah driving the car home peeps at Nadia who is sitting next to her in front of the car. “She has to ask how Nadia’s father is” reflects Nina’s point of view, and clarifies how Nina feels towards her father. The common point in all these three women’s life is “the father.” But by defining him as “Nadia’s father”, Nina excludes herself and Deborah from his life and does not see herself as his daughter. It is hard for Debbie to ask Nadia a question especially about “the father” and when she asks, Nadia’s answer that he is “the same as usual” is met by the rising voice of Debbie who says that they “actually don’t know what ‘same as usual’ means” as they “rarely see him”.

While Nadia is telling them about her “father’s health”, Nina and Ma carefully observe Nadia who has come into their lives with “an accent as thick as treacle”:

Ma and I watch this sweetie compulsively, wondering who she is: so close to us and made from my substance, and yet so other, telling us about Dad with an outrageous intimacy we can never share.

“Compulsively” in the first sentence of the paragraph above reveals how hard it is for both Nina and her mother to be with Nadia. Being “so close” but feeling “so other”, “Nina realizes not only that Nadia is not the Indian miniature drawing she had fantasized her to be, but that she looks too suburban and removed to fit into Nina’s young, working class often unemployed London crowd” (Kaleta 149). The “outrageous intimacy” Nadia has to “Dad” arouses Nina’s jealousy and it seems as a feeling she will never experience about their father. In spite of the first negative emotions, Nina offers Nadia to sleep in her bed with a sense of sharing she has never felt towards anybody. Nina’s effort to come closer to Nadia and her “giving [her bed] up” for her is indeed an endeavor to hide her jealousy. It is the first time she leaves her bed for somebody and it is the first thing she does for Nadia. But when she sees that Nadia is interested in Deborah’s “method books and her opera programmes”, Nina “melt[s]” which is again a show of jealousy.

Nadia brings Nina a present from Dad “the Pakistani dress... (with open-toed sandals-handmade). It is gorgeous: yellow and green, threaded with gold, thin summer material.” Kaleta’s comment on the present Nina receives and her perceiving the present is as follows:

Nina now sees herself as part of her dream, the princess of her tradition. Since the dream of Elsewhere has eluded her as a hybrid Londoner, she dreams she can find it by accepting her Asian heritage. She can’t wait to wear the costume, and puts it on for her trip to collect her unemployment money (149).

Beside everything, Nina seems to get used to her half-sister. She is even allured with the new word “sister”. It is a new thing in her life and she discovers that “[she’s] in love. At last”. Her implication in this new relationship shows that she has dreamed of a close person for a longtime. She devotes herself to Nadia even waiting outside the room for her to wake up.

When Nina wears her Pakistani clothes, she finds herself “exotic and interior” but can not escape from the ethnical misconduct in her territory. She resembles herself to “a lost woman with village ways and chickens in the garden.” In fact, she has already been lost not in village ways but in London.

In a fast-paced episode, Kureishi first satirizes white liberals, then goes on to decry racist white bigots. Nina, ... in her national outfit, is given leaflets and assistance numbers from crusading communists when entering the community center. Nina makes out the liberals, telling them, "I'm oppressed, you see, beaten up, pig ignorant with an arranged marriage and certain suttee ahead." Then, while returning from the community center, she stops to buy white wine for dinner and meets with abuse from a passing group of toughs on a bus who see her Pakistani costume. They balance the two-sided prejudice against her by shouting racist slurs: "Curry breath, curry breath, curry breath." No longer a Londoner any more, but instead an Asian, as she walks the streets of her hometown she is ridiculed by everyone from political theorists to street gangs because of her national costume (Kaleta 149-150).

When she comes back home, she finds Nadia woken up. Nina gives her best clothes to Nadia and when she is dressed up to go out, Nina watches her as "stunning..., dangerous, vulnerable, superior, with a jewel on her nose." Nadia's timidity and anxiety about London streets seem natural and when Nina shows her the knife she is carrying to protect herself from the dangers in the streets, Nadia's "face becomes determined. She looks away." As she has been studying medicine, she states that she does not want "human harm" in her life. She sounds reasonable and serious giving importance to her education.

Nina and Nadia, both in English gear, wander around London streets. "Humming bad smells", graffiti on the walls and swearing Kids "stiffen" Nadia. As Nina tries to be calm, she also thinks that "it is the bad impression". Although she does not want to let Nadia down any more, "[she] can't help [herself]" to account for all she has lived at each corner of the streets:

...this happened here, that happened there. I got pregnant in that squat. I bought bad smack from that geezer in the yellow T-shirt and straw hat. I got attacked there and legged it through that park. I stole pens from that shop, dropping them into my motorcycle helmet... Standing on that corner I cared for nothing and no one and couldn't walk on or stay where I was or go back. My gears had stopped engaging with my motor. Then I had a nervous breakdown.

In the name of intimacy and sharing, Nina relates Nadia all her crimes. She is so carefree while telling all these that the reader naturally thinks that Nina's life is corrupted and immoral. Perplexed Nadia "listens and nods and shakes her head sometimes... without comment". She is surprised to find such a place and such a half-sister in London, all in filth. Because she has been told by her father the "gorgeous places" which now turn out to be all an illusion. Nadia sees how reverse it is and that her father has not seen that corrupted part. Nina now tries to come closer to Nadia by "tak[ing] her arm and mov[ing] her] cheek close to hers". She wants to separate Nadia from "others" and need to talk and

share things with her: "I tell you this stuff which I haven't told anyone before. I want us to know each other inside out." Her wish to be real sisters is revealed with the words "inside out". The distance, culture, jealousy, lifestyles do not matter for Nina who just wants to have a true relationship in that corrupted place. Nadia who is not used to see such bad things is now aware that West is a banishment for Eastern people. Her dreams of the modern and glamorous places that were told by her father vanish. She discovers that she is totally different. With Nadia's demand to see "something attractive", they take a bus to "Holland Park and round Ladbroke Grove". Nina describes those places "honeyed London for the rich", where "there are more stars than beggars." This part of London fulfils Nadia's imagination.

When the two sisters start speaking about Dad, Nina becomes upset by what she hears from her half-sister. She sees her father "every two or three years" which Nina likens it to a kind of a business. She wonders what her father tells about herself when he comes back to Pakistan. The curiosity lies in the effort to learn how much her father loves her. Nadia is hesitant to answer. But when Nina weirdly threatens her to pour the tea-pot over her head, she confesses that their father sees her "like a wild animal". This unexpected account disappoints Nina who feels isolated at once from her rarely-seen father's and half-sister's life. Nadia's repentance to explain such a thing is felt when she "holds [Nina's] hand" for the first time. She tries to correct her mistake and calm her down while sharing her secret:

"It's terrible, just terrible there in the house. Nina, I had to get away! And I'm in love with someone! Someone who's indifferent to me!"

'And?'

And nothing, She says no more except: 'It's too cruel, too cruel'.

I glance around. Now this is exactly the kind of place suitable for doing a runner from. You could be out the door, halfway up the street and on the tube before they'd blink. I'm about to suggest it to Nadia, but, as I've already told her about my smack addiction, my two abortions and poured a pot of tea over my head, I wouldn't want her to get a bad impression of me.

'I hope,' I say to her, 'I hope to God we can be friends as well as relations.'

Nina accepts that what she has told Nadia is only the bad experience in her life. They are all too unpleasant. But sharing them with somebody, she is relieved. Nadia seems more hesitant than Nina though now they are closer to each other.

At hearing the thoughts of her father about herself, Nina starts thinking of him and how she behaved well when he came to London:

Well, what a bastard my dad turned out to be! Wild animal! He's no angel himself. How could he say that? I was always on my best behaviour and always covered my wrists and arms. Now I can't stop thinking about him. It makes me cry.

After all day's anxiety, predictions, getting ready and cleaning before the father comes, his idea of Nina as a bad girl psychologically affects her. She can not put up with the thought that his father does not like her. Besides, whenever he comes to see her with her mother, Nina identifies him as a "prince" all in his richness. With all the presents he brings, Nina's perception of the father is great. They go to the French restaurants where Dad tells them stories at which Deborah "finds herself flying to the magnet of his charm once more". They "hold hands" which means that there is still an attraction between them and that they still love each other. Nina adores the time spent with her father:

This is all the best of life, except that, when Dad has gone and we have to slot back into our lives, we don't always feel like it. We're pretty uncomfortable, looking at each other and shuffling our ordinary feet once more in the mundane. Why does he always have to be leaving us?

The paragraph above is a comparison between the life with Dad and without him. It is perfect to be with him. Everything gives pleasure and seems to be in order. But when Nina and her mother are left alone, it is hard for them to adapt to their old ways of living. It is an emptiness that can only be fulfilled with the existence of the father. The absence of him creates a great longing. It is a period of loneliness for both of them who discover that they are not sufficient for each other. The father is needed, it is essential in Nina's life and so when he leaves, she turns back to her prostitution days, talking with him in her mind, missing him a lot and taking drugs to forget her agony. She also describes her mother as "a woman alone...in fury and despair." Their lives are confused like their minds. Nina's rotten life goes on and she even confesses to her mother that she is "involved in drugs and prostitution" defining them as "work". Her enterprise of suicide by cutting her wrists with razors and swallowing pills point to her desolation. She feels that she does not possess anything and there is nothing she can be happy with devoting herself. She is all gloomy and depressed relating her theory that "suicide is one way of saying you're sorry". She chooses suicide to express her solitude and wants others to be sorry like her with that self-murder. Indeed, what she feels about her father and how his absence affects her are the causes of Nina's psychological corruption. Why she is degenerated seems to be hidden in her family relations.

Nadia and Nina go on wandering around, this time the famous places like the Tower of London, the Monument, Hyde Park, Buckingham Palace. Nadia's demand to visit

“attractive” places is therefore fulfilled. But Nina does not tell much about the places as she finds them “cultured”. The contrast between the two parts of London, one that Nina has been involved in crimes and one which is full with famous buildings and parks, shows the two faces of England. The former is the dark and unknown side to Eastern people while the latter lies with all its magnificence and excellence before the East. Kaleta states that:

In Pakistan, Nadia sees the west as the rich, pop-culture world of the movies, a world in which expensive urban neighborhoods are tinged with a pinch of tasteful decadence: designer drugs, celebrities, and well-dressed danger. This is not, however, the London Nadia finds when she moves there (151).

Besides, Deborah’s forced “hospitality” goes on. She is still aloof and moody but “workmanlike” who thinks that it will soon end. But finding that Howard and Nadia are getting closer physically, “practically on each other’s laps... almost lips” with Nina’s words, she begins to lose her patience. Nina observes Nadia “speak to [Howard] as she hasn’t spoken to [her] once-gesticulating!” Because of jealousy, Nina compares Nadia’s attitudes to Howard and to herself. She finds Nadia telling Howard about the rotten country she has wandered around with Nina, unaware of the fact that she has almost been a part of it behaving so close to Howard. Is it a sign that she has fit in or was she like that before? Nina considers this sympathy of Nadia and Howard to each other as a “damage” in her mother’s life. Howard’s pleased manner while he is with Nadia, his touching her and Nadia’s indifference and thoughtlessness agitate Nina and arouse the thought that “Nadia has virtually ignored Ma in her own house”. This is actually an apportion between Nadia and Deborah. Deborah who once shared her husband with Nadia’s mother now shares her lover, Howard, with her step daughter, Nadia. Deborah and Nadia are presented as rivals which also evokes jealousy in Deborah who “watch[es Howard and Nadia] through the crack of the door.” This behaviour reveals a secrecy of Deborah’s attitude. She is frustrated as she can not even pass from the kitchen door to join them and can not take pleasure out of anything, anymore. Nadia entering to Nina’s and Debbie’s world suddenly disturbs Debbie. She feels herself as if she is worthless and does not mean anything to anybody. She complains “this is my home. Everything I do outside here is a waste of time and no one thanks me for it and no one cares for me and now I’m excluded from my own flat”. She just wants to be appreciated. “Exclusion” stands as a punishment or a damnation in her life. Because she was once excluded from Nadia’s father’s life while she was pregnant to Nina. In her defiance, there lies the fear to lose Howard just as she once lost her husband. To please her mother, Nina says that her supper is ready and she has done the washing and

ironing. This is an exposition of care and love and also an indication that Nina pities her mother. She knows that her mother has always “had to fight to learn” and her life has always involved a struggle. Nina is aware that she is a full “disappointment” and “tragedy” in her mother’s life. But she also finds the excuse that “it is [the] era in England”. She sees how much her mother is worried and to soothe her, she feels to hug Debbie in a compassionate way, but she at once gives this idea up not to “indulge her”. She can not help asking “Ma, why do you keep Howard on?” as she thinks Howard is of no use except that he gives pain to her mother. Debbie’s reply ‘because I love him even if he doesn’t love me!’ shows that it is not a mutual love. While Howard’s love is not true and it is known by Deborah, she only seeks somebody to hold onto, even if a sexual love. Her anger while uttering this truth is revealed with her “kick-slam[ming] the door” of the kitchen. “Her tumbler smashes on the floor and glass skids around [their] feet”. Her disappointment and realization that their love is not reciprocal is shown with that broken glass which symbolizes Debbie’s broken heart. When the glass scatters into pieces, it is Debbie’s life that cracks, wrecks altogether and perishes. It is Nina’s selfishness to bring Nadia to London which “remind[s Debbie] of all the terrible past and the struggle of being alone for so long!”. Therefore Nina is partly responsible for her mother’s mood. Actually, it is apparent that they are both responsible for each other’s depression. In reality, Debbie “need[s] someone bright to talk to!” and does not think she can talk to Nina as she would not be interested in her speech. She feels lonely and admits that she also “need[s] sex”. Howard at least has seemed to fulfill her demands till Nadia comes.

When Howard and Debbie go to their bedroom, Nina, in the name of protecting her mother, starts giving lessons to Nadia about men and especially about Howard:

‘Men are pretty selfish, bastards who don’t understand us. That’s all I know.’
 ‘Howard’s an interesting type,’ she says coolly, ‘Very open-minded in an artistic way.’
 I’m getting protective in my old age and very pissed off.
 ‘He’s my mother’s boyfriend and long-standing lover.’
 ...
 ‘So lay off him. Please, Nadia. Please understand.’
 ‘What are you, of all people, accusing me of? ... I thought you advanced Western people believed in the free intermingling of the sexes?’
 ...
 ...
 ‘It’s him,’ I explain, moving in. ‘He has all the weakness. One kind word from a woman and he thinks they want to sleep with him. Two kind words and he thinks he’s the only man in the world. It’s a form of mental illness, of delusion. I wouldn’t tangle with that deluded man if I were you!’

As a person who has experienced prostitution and abortion, Nina speaks just like an authority about men. It is ironical that she considers men as “selfish bastards” and she still makes love with them. Although Nadia has an Eastern way of thinking, expectedly more conservative, her approach to Howard is more reasonable than Nina’s. For Nina, all men are disgraceful but this thought is caused partly by her lifestyle and partly by the effort to protect her mother. Moreover, Nadia seems to credit men’s intellect and that is why she has been attracted by Howard who is a television writer. His cultured and aesthetic pleasures affect Nadia and when she is warned by Nina to leave Howard off, she is surprised to hear such an accusation from a Westernized mouth. Because she, like many Eastern people, thinks that Western people are open-minded and objective. It is their perception of the West. They believe in the Westerners’ progression and that they are free from prejudices. But Nina proves it to be the reverse by such talk. Nina accepts that all men are the same but especially speaks ill of Howard to make Nadia remove away from him. At her last statement in the quotation above, there is also a sense of threat more than a warning. She, caringly and benevolently, takes the role of protector upon herself. By doing this, she tries to keep at least one thing which her mother lives for.

A few days later, Nina and Nadia go to Howard’s house which Nina calls “Howard’s hole”. She again observes “Howard and Nadia cheek to cheek within breath-inhaling distance of each other, going through the script”. So, her warning to Nadia does not seem to affect her much. This is actually the proximity of East and West. They can not detain themselves from approaching each other. They are enchanted by each other’s difference and originality. This is the curiosity to discover new things in new people and the attraction of opposing powers. It is Howard’s, therefore West’s, interest and longing for the unknown and mystery of the East and Nadia seems to be fascinated by West’s understanding and wisdom.

When Nadia and Nina go for shopping, Nadia is again interested in and excited by the Western kind of clothes. Nina’s opinion of Nadia’s shopping is that “if she likes something, if she wants it, she buys it. The rich. Nadia bought me a linen jacket.” According to Nina, the rich can afford everything they want whenever they wish. While Nadia as an Eastern person stands for the prosperity and wealth, Nina representing West appears to be poor and inferior in front of her half-sister.

Nina leaves Nadia with Howard and goes out “for a stroll.” It is again the dirty and vulgar London streets which Nina likes to wander around. But seeing all the usual and familiar views, she now “feel[s] outside everything”. It is the alienation and isolation in a sense. Those streets where Nina has experienced and been involved in all kinds of crimes, even she pissed into a wastepaper basket at one corner, are all unknown to her. It is interesting that she sees “an Asian policewoman standing in the street who says hello to [her]”. In England, in such corrupted streets, the existence of an Asian policewoman for security and protection is ironic. This policewoman also knows Nina for she has brought trouble upon herself many times. With Nadia’s coming, Nina seems not to take the same joys of life as before. Her expectations about Nadia and thoughts that they will have a good time together cease. She enters a café where she takes drugs from a boy whom she defines as “a nice guy.” Although there are many “pigs and piggies” outside the café, they are courageous enough to sell and buy drugs. But when the boy goes out, the pigs surround him to search. Nina, at once, without hesitation goes out to defend him shouting at the policemen “It’s true! The man’s got nothing!” She has nothing to lose and be sorry for. It is also the effect of the drug, which makes her so fearless. When the boy asks her “you wanna be arrested too!”, Nina’s answer is interesting: “I don’t mind”. She does not think that she would hurt her mother again. She even considers that her mother would visit her in the prison. She is so selfish towards the mother while she is an intrepid towards policeman and self-sacrificing towards the boy who has sold him drugs. All of her missing is caused by an emptiness in her life.

When she goes back to Howard’s home, she again finds Nadia and Howard very close to each other:

Something is definitely going on, and it ain’t cultural. They’re too far apart for comfort. Beadily I shove my aerial into the air and take the temperature. Yeah, can’t I just smell humming dodginess in the atmosphere?
‘Come on,’ I say to Nadia. ‘Ma will be waiting.’
‘Yes, that’s true,’ Howard says, getting up. ‘Give her my love.’
I give him one of my looks. ‘All of it or just a touch?’

Nina’s sarcastic tone of speech is the consequence of her desire to disturb them. Her humour is also sensed with “shove the aerial into the air and take the temperature”. She is aware that they are getting more indulged in each other and this incites her to hurt Howard with her words on behalf of her mother.

While returning home on the bus, Nina, with the force of the drug does not feel well. Everything is turning around, flying in the air, “nothing keep[s] still”. But Nina is

determined to ask Nadia what she wonders: “You kiss him?” The answer of the question seems more important to Nina now, whose health is in danger. She wants to conceal her sickness from Nadia and goes on to investigate:

‘Nadia, You did, right? You did.’
‘But it’s not important.’
Wasn’t I right? Can’t I sniff a kiss in the air at a hundred yards?
‘Kissing’s not important?’
‘No,’ she says. ‘It’s not, Nina, It’s just affection. That’s normal. But Howard and I have much to say to each other.’ She seems depressed suddenly. ‘He knows I’m in love with somebody.’
‘I’m not against talking. But it’s possible to talk without r-r- rubbing your tongues against each other’s tonsils.’
‘You have a crude way of putting things,’ she replies, turning sharply to me and rising up to the roof of the bus. ‘It’s a shame you’ll never understand passion.’

Although Nadia loves somebody in Pakistan as she confessed it to Nina before, she can not keep herself away from the attraction of Howard and neither can he. Nadia calls it just “affection” and “passion” while regarding “kissing” as insignificant. The reader already knows that it is not Nina’s sort of thought to exaggerate such relations being a prostitute who has had abortions. Just as Nadia says “that’s normal” in Nina’s life as Nina can kiss anybody in the street without hesitation. But the matter for her now is not only “kissing” but “kissing Howard” which she deems a very serious crime for Nadia. Her sarcastic tone continues while speaking to Nadia who finds it very indecent. Nadia seems very open-minded and unprejudiced in her ideas while Nina is completely in defense of her mother. Her effort to protect Deborah prevents her from revealing the real thoughts. Furthermore, she becomes rude while judging Nadia of her behaviour. Her sharp tongue and cynical air touch Nadia who accuses Nina of being thoughtless and intolerant which she also considers it to be a shame.

When they get off the bus, Nina falls down on the pavement. Nadia as a medicine student puts “her hand flat on [Nina’s] forehead in a doctory way” which Nina slaps hard. She does not want her sister to touch her. They are strangers now. As Nina is angry with her sister, she begins crying. Nadia is more cold-blooded than Nina and can not understand the cause of her cry. Nina thinks: “if our father could see us now” which is an indication that Nina acknowledges herself to be right and in this thought is hidden the attempt to embarrass Nadia in front of “their” father. Because Nina thinks that their father would blame Nadia for such a shameful thing and it would not be regarded as acceptable in Pakistan. Nina uses “our father” as she has never used it before. “Our” as a possessive adjective gives the sense of “possessing” and having a relationship, which is therefore a

kind of a “belonging”. For that reason, by putting Nadia and herself in the same category by using “our”, Nina admits that they are alike. This sameness is what troubles Nina now:

‘Your bad behaviour with Howard makes me cry for my ma’
‘Bad behaviour? Wait till I tell my father-’
‘Our father-’
‘About you.’
‘What will you say?’
‘I’ll tell him you’ve been a prostitute and a drug addict.’
‘Would you say that, Nadia?’
‘No,’ she says, eventually. ‘I suppose not.’
She offers me her hand and I take it.
‘It’s time I went home,’ she says.
‘Me, too,’ I say.

The second part of the story, which only takes place in London viewing Nadia, Nina, Howard and Debbie, ends with the quarrel above. In spite of Nadia and Nina’s judgements of each other and their points of view, their fear of the father make them come together again. Nina is ashamed of her crimes as a prostitute and drug addict and does not want her father to learn them. He has already had ill-thought about Nina and she can not put up with the thought of more. While already having bad behaviour, her appraisal of Nadia’s behaviour is ironical, in that regard. “Cry[ing] for ma” is as if showing her thoughtfulness, and how much she credits Debbie. But as a badly-behaved child, it is again ironical that she thinks of her mother. What bothers her is that nobody except her can displease Debbie. “My father” in Nadia’s threat is corrected with “our father” by Nina who completely has made the father “theirs”. When Nadia gives up the thought to tell “their father” about Nina’s wrong-doings, they are reconciled again as Nadia “offers [Nina] her hand”. Nina does not rebuff or reject the hand and “take[s] it” as a sign of peace. When the reader objectively looks at the scene without taking sides, it appears to be a very typical and simple argument scene between sisters. Cries, threats, inciting, hurting with words and reconciliation at the end contribute to that characteristic scene.

When the third part starts, the reader understands that Nadia has referred to Pakistan by saying “it’s time I went home”. She knows that staying in London will make her more uneasy and disturb Nina and Debbie who are restless by her existence. The pattern starting with “it’s time” indicates that it is enough for Nadia to live with her half-sister. Her wish to go home is not caused by the longing but for it is urgent as things seem to go worse and she has been misunderstood by Nina. Nadia, while disclosing her secret to Nina once said that being in the house is awful and that she had to get away. So, now, knowing her real ideas about home, the reader can infer that “home” does not mean so much to Nadia and it limits her. She, being restricted at home in Pakistan, is free in England and does not need

to behave secretly. She comes to herself again with Nina's warnings and becomes aware that she has immediately fit in. Nina's utterance "Me, too" which means it is also the time for her to go home is again gains force in the third part as the reader learns that she is going to Pakistan with Nadia. Therefore "home" for Nina is not Debbie's house but where her father and half-sister live. She is curious to go and discover new things there. It is her turn.

4.3. Nina's Going to Pakistan and Her Disillusionment

The third part of the story opens at Heathrow Airport where Nina and Nadia are ready to fly to Pakistan. Nina finds Nadia proud and dignified before the fly, given up her philanderer-like attitudes. Howard, with "a pile of books and writing pads and... pens" in his hands, reveals his thoughts about East at that stage of the story. For Pakistan, he says "it's a Third world country... They lack the basic necessities." His thoughts are given at the airport, at a transition point where passage to both sides are possible. His idea about Pakistan is a humiliation and dishonour for Nadia who does not admit that they are inferior. It is again ironical that she defends her country in a First World Country airport. She can choose to go to that Third world country or stay in England as a modern and developed one. Although Howard says that "[he] was joking", he has already exposed the general thought of the West about East. He also announces that he is writing something that might interest [all of them]" foreshadowing the end of the story. At that time, Deborah "takes [Nina] aside" and warns her not to let the father know anything about her. In "anything", there is the hidden relationship with Howard, her state of mood, which is nearly all the time gloomy, and her longing for the father. As the mishap she is in distresses her sufficiently, she does not want the father to learn that it is all caused by him. While they are speaking, Nadia's protest "no, no, no, I don't want to go!" startles them. The freedom and comfort that she will leave behind make her bawl like that. But she knows that her theoretical decision and choice not to go will not be true practically as she has always belonged to the East. It is a must for her to go. But after seeing that "great cultural center" and "leading place" (Critical Quarterly, vol. 41, no.3, p.45), it is also hard for her to leave. She has to be satisfied with the experience of coming to England and seizing a distinctive rhythm of life, for now.

The second section of the third part begins with Nina in her room in Pakistan. She, as usual, describes the room in detail:

My room, this cell, this safe, bare box struck on the side of my father's house, has a stone floor and white washed walls. It has a single bed, my open suitcase, no wardrobe, no music. Not a frill in the grill. On everything there's a veil of khaki dust waiting to

irritate my nostrils. The window is tiny, just twice the size of my head. So it's pretty gloomy here. Next door there's a smaller room with an amateur shower, a sink and a hole in the ground over which you have to get used to squatting if you want to piss and shit.

She indirectly compares the room and its furniture with the one in England in her mother's house. The limitedness captures her from the very beginning in this small, "cell"-like place. The small window which causes a gloomy atmosphere in the room does not allow the daylight in. The smell is also irritating. But still, Nina thinks that "all this suits [her] fine." In this room, she feels "[she's] out of everyone's way, especially [her] two other half-sisters: Gloomie and Moonie [she calls] them". "Especially" in the sentence clarifies that those two other half-sisters do not like Nina and want to see her around.

In this "hot, hot, hot" country, everything seems to shine and she, at once, observes that "there aren't many women you see in shades." It is not the same as the crowded streets in England where women and men walk together, indifferently. All women seem to retire into seclusion, here in Pakistan. The conservative structure of the society makes women not to wander around a lot. Furthermore, the richness of her father attracts Nina's attention. He has three cars outside the house, and all of them are ready to be driven with the drivers in. With her rising curiosity and without waiting anybody, Nina gets on to one of the father's cars. She wants to travel around that country which is all in sunlight. She is like a spoilt child who does not listen to anybody. She behaves like in England, in freedom, without taking permission or just asking. When she is in the car, she sees her father "on the porch of [his] house in [his] pyjamas... [His] arms are waving not goodbye." In the second sentence of the quotation, the reader notices the father's coldness towards Nina. He is aware of Nina's blemishes, and does not approve such behaviour like Nina's. So he even does not raise his hand to wave at his daughter. Nina certainly feels this. Behind the father, there appears Gloomie, "[Nina's] suddenly acquired sister... shak[ing] her fists". This is again an indication of anger towards Nina and displeasure of her behavior. Nina understands that they are disturbed by her doings but laughs at them in a very cushy way and set off for a trip:

We drive slowly through the estate on which Dad lives with all the other army and navy and air force people: big houses and big bungalows set back from the road, with sprinklers on the lawn, some with swimming pools, all with guards.

The paragraph above shows how rich Nina's father is. He has an esteemed place among his people and the neighborhood he lives in is also constituted with rich people. It is ironical that while the father and his family in Pakistan live in such profusion and

affluence, Nina lives in almost a miserable condition even adopting prostitution as a job to earn money. The father is not interested in what kind of a life Nina and Debbie lead in England. He does not help them financially.

While Nina is thinking that the streets are very quiet and there is “no fun”, there becomes an accident caused by a fast-going car in front of the taxi Nina is in. Nina tells the accident in detail and in a funny way even resembling the ship-wreckeds to “Christmas puddings”. Her point of view and perceiving the events is always derisory which helps her to make fun of everything. She finds her self “cheerful.” Lulu, Nina’s driver, finds Pakistan “a wild country”. It is a comment come after the accident and he asks Nina if such kind of thing happens in England. His question shows how he is ignorant of England. He reflects the general thought that England is a very orderly country and that there occurs nothing unusual or unpleasant. While defining Pakistan as a “wild country”, he sees England as a civilized and peaceful land. It is what he has learned or heard from his ancestors. It is how the West is appreciated by the East.

In the next section Nina is “in the bazaar”. She is lonely “handling jewellery and carpets and pots” and confused as she can not decide what present to buy for whom. The bazaar is a colourful place and it has a composite feature which brings many people from different social classes together. Even as a stranger who belongs to West, Nina takes her place in the bazaar. Her existence in the bazaar on her own is actually her endurance in the world alone without any help.

Therefore, the bazaar is the microcosm of the world and it also fits with its vivid and multi-coloured quality to Nina’s personality which is also lively. Nina as a good observer who can tell everything in detail sees “everywhere the sick and the uncured...” This sight after the rich neighborhood her dad lives in does not seem good for her. When “the men standing still and nonchalant with rifles...” occur in the bazaar place, Nina thinks “[she’s] just about had enough of this country...” and shouts out to the driver to come and take her. Her confession to Lulu, the driver, touches the reader:

‘You know?’ I say. ‘I’m lonely. There’s no one I can talk to. No one to laugh with here, Lulu. And I think they hate me, my family. Does your family hate you?’

The loneliness she is in urges her to speak to a stranger like that. Indeed, Nina is good at establishing intimacy among people. But Lulu is just a driver, that is to say, a servant for her father but while sharing Nina’s loneliness, he becomes a good friend of her.

She does not discriminate between people and does not respect class differences. So it is easy for her to communicate with people from every social class. She searches for enjoyment, laughing and enthusiasm in Pakistan as they are parts of her life. “No one to talk to and laugh” is her grief which adds more to her loneliness. She is aware that she is not loved and moreover hated. With this psychology, she tries to find if there are other children who are abhorrent for their families.

When they turn back home, Nina tries to come closer with her father and wishes him to see her, but it seems useless:

I look through the wire mesh of the screen door and there you are,
my father for all these years. And this is what you were doing
while I sat in the back of the class at my school in Shepherd's
Bush, pregnant, wondering why you didn't love me.
...You... look at me now and again, ...but you say fuck all. If I
speak, you don't hear. You're one of those old-fashioned romantic
men for whom women aren't really there unless you decide we
are.
...The sight of me angers you. You wave furiously for me to come
in. No. Not yet. I walk on.

The more Nina tries to get closer, the more her father pushes her aside. She observes her father either secretly or apparently. With all her observations, she realizes how distant they have been to each other. “For all these years”, the father's indifference to her repeatedly raises a question in her mind which can not find an answer: “Why don't you love me?” In Pakistan, men do not esteem women but it is something different. Because while adoring Nadia and specifying her as “the most precious thing in the entire world to [him]”, he does not even talk to Nina or hear her. He is selfish and does not give importance to Nina's emotions. There is a great lack of communication between them. While Nina can talk to anybody, she can not even approach her father. The gulf between the father and daughter is clearly the same as the one between the East and the West. Though it is always regarded to be the West that excludes the East, it is now the opposite, the Eastern that discredits and ignores the Western. The roles are exchanged now.

As Nina goes on her observations at home, she also gives the reader information about her Dad's wife who is a typical housewife. The reader can imagine her “sewing” like Parvez's wife in “My Son the Fanatic”. “Wifey” as Nina calls her is very passive sitting, and distant. She is “crabby inside and out, doesn't speak English and disapproves of [Nina] in all languages.” Her cool manner improves Nina's humour and she makes fun of it. The reader also finds Nina enjoying to disturb Wifey and her two servants.

‘Imagine,’ I say to Wifey.

I slip the sugar cane into my mouth. The squirting juice bounces off my taste buds. I gob out the sucked detritus and chuck it in front of the screen goddess’s twigs. You can really enjoy talking to someone who doesn’t understand you.

“Imagine my dad leaving my ma for you! And you don’t ever leave that seat there. Except once a month you go to the bank to check up on your jewellery.”

As the old woman servant is sweeping the floor, Nina tries to make fuss while “chucking” the sugar in front of her. This impolite attitude of hers is the cause of her anger towards the people living in this house. Wifey and the servant do not react and so Nina does not draw back. She is delighted while speaking to them as they do not understand what she is telling. Because she can utter whatever she wants either good or bad. It is noticed that he compares Wifey and Debbie. Without being apprehended she vomits her hatred. The empathy she feels towards her mother makes Nina feel sorry for her. She finds her mother poor and miserable and disappointed while defining Wifey all in luxury and comfort. Wifey is the woman for Nina who has made her mother suffer. So now she deserves all the bad words. “Seat”, “bank”, “jewellery” as images of wealth and the usage of them in the definition of Wifey show how Nina perceives the woman as the symbol of financial power. While Debbie works hard as a teacher to afford her life, Wifey just sits at home doing nothing, servants around, counting her husband’s money. This seems unjust to Nina. To take revenge of this unjust situation, she erupts her dislike with the cynical air in her words. She even insults Wifey resembling her “a bag lady”. At that moment,

Moonie comes into the room. She’s obviously heard every word I’ve said. She starts to yell at me. Wifey’s beaky nozzle turns to me with interest now. Something’s happening that’s even more interesting than TV. They want to crush me. I think they like me here for that reason...

With this paragraph, it is certified that not only Nina is angry with Dad’s family but they also disapprove her and show their hostility. Moonie accuses Nina for she has caused the driver, Lulu, to be fired and says: “You’re always causing trouble, Nina, doing, some stupid thing, some very stupid thing!”. In this complaint, there is also the sense that Nina’s behaviour does not fit their expectations of her. In the next paragraph, we learn that Gloomie and Moonie have divorced from their husbands. According to Nina who does not like them, marrying “was their small chance in life”. They do not seem to get along with anybody and “now they’ve come back to Daddy. Now they’re secretaries. Now they’re blaming [Nina] for everything.”

In Nina's observation, there lies the judgement that they do not lead good lives but find a right to judge and blame others for their attitudes. When Nina gives Moonie the lipstick she has bought from the bazaar, Moonie seems to be fascinated and stops her accusation at once. Although it is a very small present, it is enough to "quieten her mouth." The small present symbolizes her small world in a sense and how limited and narrow her pleasures are. Nina, by the way, having the Western sort of practical mind, knows how to hunt that foolish girl.

Nina also observes that Gloomie and Moonie do not accept her like their daughter but a "cousin".

From the start there's been embarrassment about how I am to be described. Usually, if it's Moonie or Gloomie they say: "This is our distant cousin from England." It amuses me to see my father deal with this. He can't bring himself to say either 'cousin' or 'daughter' so he just says Nina and leaves it. But of course everyone knows I am his illegitimate daughter. But Nadia is the real 'daughter' here. 'Nadia is an impressive person', my father says, on my first day here, making it clear that I am diminished, the sort with dirt under her nails. Yes, she is clever, soon to be doctor, life-saver. Looking at her now she seems less small than she did in London. I'd say she has enough dignity for the entire government.

Nina's isolation and her exclusion are given with the word "cousin", which is also a word of kinship. They feel shame to have a sister but it is especially the father who is bashful to have a daughter who was born out of wedlock. The "illegitimate" relation between the father and daughter has a distancing force. Once being charmed by an English woman, the father now does not want to see and love someone of her blood. Therefore Nina is devoid of her father's love and compares herself with Nadia. From her father's point of view, "the real daughter" who totally bears the Eastern blood is Nadia. Therefore she is perfect. Furthermore, when this is uttered to Nina "on [her] first day", Nina feels "diminished." The discrimination makes her the "other" and stranger and although she comes from the West, she does not stand for the power of it. Nadia's education also increases her value as she does an acceptable thing while Nina is only a useless being. In Pakistan, Nadia seems more important to Nina because it is Nadia's territory and she is believed to be excellent here. Her respectability is what Nina will achieve neither in Pakistan nor in England.

Dad's house in Pakistan is like a stage for Nina. In every room or corridor, she feels different. She says "It is like moving from one play to another. What is happening on this

set?” in her father’s room. “On the video is an American movie” is again another detail Nina gives. The father enjoys this kind of films. Nina, at that moment, is confused about what to call him: Father or Dad. The difference between the two words is that they do not have the same cordial meaning. While “Dad” bears a more sincere air, “Father” is more formal. Indeed, the reader has noticed Nina calling him “Dad” all through the story. But now being fully aware of the inequity between Nadia and herself, Nina tries to choose the right word to call him. Her father’s caring manner and statement “you’ll get sunstroke” does not affect Nina and makes her think “as if he’s known me all my life and has the right to be high-handed.” In the father’s room, “the lights go out. The TV goes off... Power cut.” This is funny for Nina. She shuts her eyes and thinks her mother and Howard meeting today. She imagines Howard “never intentionally hurt Ma” or “undermined her” as a stranger. But now it is her own father who tries to humiliate her:

Dad turns to me: ‘What do you do in England for God’s sake?’
‘Nadia has already given you a full report, hasn’t she?’

...

‘Yes, but I want the full confession from your mouth.’

He loves to tease. But he is a dangerous person. Tell him something and soon everyone knows about it.

‘Confess to what?’

‘That you just roam around here and there. You do fuck all full time, in other words.’

...

‘And do you go with one boy or with many?’ I say nothing. ‘But your mother has a boy, yes? Some dud writer, complete failure and playboy with unnatural eyebrows that cross in the middle?’

‘Is that how Nadia described the man she tried to-’

‘What?’

‘Be rather close friends with?’

Nina has already known that Nadia and her father are talking about her. She observes them “conduct[ing her] prosecution.” Seeing them so close to each other, sharing their secrets like friends, Nina realizes that she has never tasted and will taste such a feeling. Nadia’s giving information to the father about Nina’s prostitution, abortions and drug-usage causes him to take sides against Nina. He does not approve Nina’s doings while demanding a confirmation from her. He wants to hear all she has done from her. It is not for that he does not confide in Nadia but for that he wants Nina to give herself away. Nina finds her father “dangerous” in this sense. When she learns that Nadia has also told about Howard, she is a bit surprised. She remembers how close Nadia and Howard were to each other in England. Nadia’s pretending to be a very good and well-behaved daughter and accusations about Nina and her mother urge her to confess that Howard and Nadia even kissed each other but she can not say more than that she “tried to be a close friend” of him.

She can not give Nadia away and so maintains silent. Nadia's exaggerated description of Howard also seems odd to Nina and she can not give a meaning to this attitude. Father's calling Nina as "an Englisher born and bred" is also an indicator of her difference from all the people around. As if it is a crime to be fully English, the father says "but you belong with us, ... don't worry, I'll put you on the right track. But first there must be a strict course of discipline." Belonging, according to the father, can only be realized with restraint. Therefore, Nina can belong and be part of her father as long as she behaves in the right manner. Nina, being "on the wrong track" will be improved by the training her father will apply to her. This also requires a submission which is hard for Nina. The first punishment comes with the prohibition of drink in the father's room, which is viewed with full of people. Among the guests, the father goes on abasing Nina. "Give everyone a drink except Nina. She has to get used to the pure way of life!" he utters which everyone laughs. Nina, at that time, studies all the people in the room and meets the man who Nadia loves. He is "a newspaper tycoon aged thirty-one who inherited a bunch of papers" but he does not want to marry Nadia. Nina resembles him to a "flounder".

4.4. Nina's Discovery of True Love in Pakistan

At this stage of the story, the reader is introduced to a new character, Billy, "in his puffy baseball jacket and pink plimsolls and patched jeans" who attracts Nina's attention, at once. She feels close to him in his Western kind of posture and appearance. He comes and sits next to her and says 'I've heard about you... They talk about you non-stop.' Nina as a new and distinct character in Pakistani people's life, is thought-provokingly enough to occupy all the subjects. So, people can not stop talking about this extra-ordinary girl.

Billy and Nina immediately become friends and see that they have much in common. Billy whose mother "was a Canadian [but] died and father a Pakistani, was brought up in Vancouver." So their friendship gains a new dimension with being both hybrid. Billy's suggestion to ride around can not be prevented by Moonie yelling after them: "Nina, Nina, it's late. Your father must see you now about a strict discipline business he has to discuss!" Nina does not pay attention as she has been charmed by Billy who has appeared like a savior and wants Billy to keep going. Nina who has been living limitedly since she has come to Pakistan is even attracted by Billy's black jeans and thinks that it would be very good if he kissed her. At once, she remembers that they are in Pakistan "where they cut off your arms or something for adultery." She also sees that it is "a little premature" as they

have known each other for a few hours. But still it is “luck” for Nina to meet such a person of her sort in that boring country. They chat while riding:

‘So Pop and I came home to live. Home. This place isn’t my home. But he always wanted to come home... This country was a shock after Vancouver,’ he says.
‘Same for me.’
‘Yeah?’ He gets sharp. ‘But I’d been brought here to live. How can you ever understand what that’s like?’
‘I can’t. All right, I fucking can’t’

Although their fathers are Pakistanis, home is never Pakistan in their minds, but away in the West. “Born and bred” in Western countries, it is torture for them to be here. Home is where their expectations are fulfilled. Their displacements cause them to feel “foreign” in their fathers’ countries. Therefore they identify Pakistan as a “shock” in their lives. They do not feel native in this country. They cannot fit in and so their belonging is not possible. This is valid for many of hybrid identities who falter between two cultures and can not enjoy their Eastern selves. Being at “in-between” but taking the side of Western, they go through an identity crisis. Kureishi, in his essay, “The Rainbow Sign” relates:

When I considered staying in Pakistan to regain more of my past and complete myself with it, I had to think that that was impossible. Didn’t I already miss too much of England? And wasn’t I too impatient with the illiberalism and lack of possibility of Pakistan?
So there was always going to be the necessary return to England. I came home... to my country.
This is difficult to say. “My country” isn’t a notion that comes easily. It is still difficult to answer the question, where do you come from? I have never wanted to identify with England... (33-34).

“The identity crisis” Kureishi finds himself in is certified with his last sentence of the quotation above. Although he longs for England, he does not want to be “identified with it”. He recognizes the deficiencies of Pakistan, calls England “his home and country” but still can not feel a full belonging there. John McLeod while mentioning “diaspora identities” comments on the “hybrid identities” in his book “Beginning Postcolonialism”:

The concept of hybridity has proved very important for diaspora peoples, and indeed many others too, as a way of thinking beyond exclusionary, fixed, binary notions of identity based on ideas of rootedness and cultural, racial and national purity. Hybrid identities are never total and complete in themselves, like orderly pathways built from crazy-paving. Instead, they remain perpetually in motion, pursuing errant and unpredictable routes, open to change and reinscription (219).

Billy and Nina, with their dissipated manners, riding “to the beach” at night without the fear that they would be asked to show their wedding certificate as a couple, prove

McLeod's remarks to be true. They go after adventures, on dangerous "pathways", searching for action. Nina is not afraid of her father who can not be an authority over herself as an Eastern man. She does not feel that they have the same roots with her father. It pushes her nearer to Billy. Although the beach is "utterly dark", she still feels well with him.

I guide Billy to the Flounder's beach hut. Hut-this place is bigger than Ma's flat. We push against the back door and we're in the large living room. Billy and I dance about and chuck open the shutters. Enter moonlight and the beach as Billy continues his Dad rap.

The romanticism of the moonlight in the darkness and the relief that there is nobody around incite them to make love. In this foreign country, this is Nina's first attempt to have a sexual relationship. Now, she turns into her true self and feels as free as in England. Billy is her release and independence in this sense.

While they are lying on the floor next to each other, they hear "a couple come into the hut and start to move around." Nina, who feels afraid that "[they're] going to be shot", instantly realizes that it is Nadia who is saying "Here's the condoms, Bubble!". To her surprise, they are her half-sister and the Flounder! While Nina and Billy hide themselves, Nadia and Flounder make love and start speaking about Nina. Like everyone in Pakistan who wonders about Nina, Flounder is also curious about her and Nina notices that her sister is also ready to tell him everything about her. Flounder's question to learn if Nina is "promiscuous" is ironical. Because now Nadia and Flounder are in the same condition with Nina. Their licentiousness is what they accuse Nina for. Seeing Nina a profligate for she "[does it] with just [everyone]", they find an excuse for themselves as they "do it" just with one person. Hearing all the conversation between Nadia and Flounder, Nina does not credit it. She is interested in Billy who gives her a great pleasure:

I kiss him gently instead. When I kiss him I get a renewal of this strange sensation that I've never felt before today: I feel it's Billy I'm kissing, not just his lips or body, but some inside thing, as if his skin is just a representative of all of him, his past and his blood. Amour has never been this personal for me before!

Nina discovering the sense of love for the first time is fully captured by Billy now. It is actually the proximity that is caused by being in an unfamiliar place. Billy does not only represent love but the opportunity Nina has in Pakistan. They are alone in a foreign territory and it is their privacy. In all the limitations, they feel free. Having the same yearnings, they get closer.

In the morning, Nadia and Flounder find Nina's pants and the secret that they have passed the night together in the same house is disclosed. Nina is "calm" while Billy is sarcastically telling them that they "didn't hear anything, not about the condoms or Nina's character or..." so on. This scene which puts two half-sisters on the same "wrong track" is important for it unveils Nadia's secret identity. Next day is insipid for Nina as her father maintains his antipathy:

'You fucking bitch.'
 'Goody,' I say, going a little cold. 'Now we know where we are with each other.'
 'Where the fuck were you last night?' you inquire of me. You go on: "You just fucked off and told no one. I was demented with worry. My blood pressure was through the roof. Anything could have happened to you."
 'It did.'
 'That bloody boy's insane.'
 'But Billy's pretty.'
 'No, he's ugly like you. And a big pain in the arse.'
 'Dad.'
 'No, don't interrupt! A half-caste wastrel, a belong-nowhere, a problem to everyone, wandering around the face of the earth with no home like a stupid-mistake-mongrel dog that no one wants and everyone kicks in the backside.'
 ...
 'You left us,' I say. I am shaking. You are shaking. 'Years ago, just look at it, you fucked us and left us and fucked off and never came back and never sent us money and...'

The dialogue between the father and the daughter above is significant as it thoroughly highlights the hatred between them. The father is as if caring for his daughter. But it is not for he feels sorry for her but that his authority is undermined. His warning to discipline Nina seems useless and this is what annoys him. Furthermore he accuses Billy and exposes his feelings towards him. His perception of both Nina and Billy as "ugly" is the consequence of the cultural difference between the father and them. His description of Billy as "half-caste", "a belong-nowhere", "homeless" and "a stupid-mistake-mongrel dog" can be adapted to Nina's situation. Because Nina has the same features. She is an abundance and when this is underlined by her own father who is an Eastern man, it becomes more disappointing and confounding. Nina counts her excuses to be a badly-behaved child. Her enmity is felt through her words which absolutely blame her father.

4.5.Nina's "Necessary Return" to London and the Trick in the Narration

The father is unaware of Nadia and as Nina is a labelled prostitute, he focuses on Nina's attitudes. This seems unjust and makes Nina cry for it. She can not inform the father about Nadia's crime because it would be a betrayal to her sister. Nina with this behaviour

creates a sense of a confident person. Still Nadia is not as thoughtful as Nina, she goes crazy because of the previous night and she thinks of her reputation:

‘It was an accident,’ I tell her now.
‘Well,’ she says, ‘But what impression d’you think it made on the man I want to marry?’
‘Blame me. Say I’m just a sicko Westerner. Say I’m mad.’
‘It’s the whole family it reflects on,’ she says.

Nina takes everything upon herself. She is used to be a scapegoat. She has always been blamed for various things all her life and this is not the hardest thing she has ever met. She is not afraid to be blamed one more time and she is courageous enough to stand up to all the unfortunate events. “Blame me” carries all the burden of the previous night’s crime. “A sicko Westerner” and “mad” are equalized and seem to be the cause. While Nina is identifying herself with those two phrases, she knows how she is perceived as a Westerner with the Eastern point of view. The last utterance of the quotation above shows how Nadia is proud of her family and how she is keen on the effect she leaves on other people. It is actually the lack of her self-confidence as she gives importance to other people’s opinions. Nadia thinking that her and her family’s honour is undermined by Nina -though she is a part of this dishonour- gives her “a ticket to London”. The “ticket” is a notable image as it puts an end to the adventure of Pakistan for Nina. Nobody can put up with seeing Nina around any more and everybody wants her to return to London. “The ticket”, therefore, symbolizes the common desire against Nina. “I’m to leave tomorrow morning” Nina utters at the end of the third part and the reader knows that it is the “necessary return” which Kureishi mentions in his essay “The Rainbow Sign”. But this return carries disappointment and dissatisfaction:

From her life in London,...Nina imagined Pakistan as an exotic, uncorrupted landscape, and thought of Nadia’s life there as being softened with the security of living in a westernized family touched by the mass media. This, likewise, is not the Pakistan she actually finds when she goes there. The actualities of both homelands are as different from their fantasy versions as they are from each other. And, ironically, they are, in many ways, the same. Both characters find that they cannot find a home at home. Nor can they find a better Elsewhere merely by emigrating to another country (Kaleta 151).

The fourth and the last part is a surprise for the reader as it comes out that Howard has been telling all the story:

Hello, reader. As I’m sure you’ve noticed by now, I, Howard, have written this Nina and Nadia stuff...So all along, it’s been me, pulling faces, speaking in tongues, posing and making an attempt on the truth through lies. And also, I just wanted to be Nina So I became her, entered her. Sorry.

According to Kaleta, Kureishi's purpose while applying such a method to his text is not only to reveal Howard's point of view but also especially his perception of Nina. Kaleta finds it a "trick perspective" displaying "racist, sexist, and immigrant-related prejudices, as well as racial, gender, and generational attitudes" (151). Howard, at the end of the story also proves that the fictional world he has created is his real world and that he lives in a dreamy atmosphere. The reader also notices that Howard is attracted by Nina and aware that he will never be able to enter her world wholly. His repentance is that he can not relate his thoughts directly but only in his fictional world. While saying "Don't go" to Nina and "but the place still smells of her " after her departure indicate how much he is trapped in his illusion.

To conclude, it is worth quoting Kaleta's comment on the story:

Kureishi's expanded immigrant dream matches society's expanding perspective. The comic writing masks the brutal realism, and the author's stylistic use of parenthetical intrusions linguistically supports his hybrid point of view. The hyphenated cultural identity of his insider / outsider narrator is distinctive. Although by no means the first storyteller to have done so, Kureishi's adopting various points of view underscores the universality of storytelling, beyond limiting any point of view merely by the generation, class, sexual preference, nationality, and gender of the author (151).

5. MY SON THE FANATIC

5.1. The Changes in Ali and the Father's Hopeless Search for Truth

“My Son the Fanatic” is a story of conflict between the Asian father, Parvez, and his son, Ali. The struggle between them is a clash of customs and lifestyles as well as cultures. The son's silent rebellion at first is met by the father's destitute search which leads to a violent end. The story starts with a scene of secrecy and the father's puzzled mood can be viewed at the very beginning:

Surreptitiously the father began going into his son's bedroom. He would sit there for hours, rousing himself only to seek clues. What bewildered him was that Ali was getting tidier. Instead of the usual tangle of clothes, books, cricket bats, video games, the room was becoming neat and ordered; spaces began appearing where before there had been only mess.

This beginning paragraph is not only important for it reveals the father's “confusion” but also for it hints at the changes and developing contrast in Ali's behaviour. The first word of the story “surreptitiously” as an adverb to identify how the father “go[es] into his son's bedroom” tells us that there is something making the father inquisitive about his son. The curiosity of the father is so much that he spends hours in his son's bedroom thinking of the change his son is going through. His excited suspicion adds more question marks to his confused mind. What provokes the father to inquire in such mystery in Ali's bedroom is the improvement in Ali's behaviour. Because he realizes that Ali has given up his habitual untidiness and become cleaner. This realization also arouses an anxiety in the father. Although “getting tidier” may seem a good sign of growing-up at first, the “neatness” and all the order instead of “mess” in the bedroom will create a sense of uneasiness later on:

Initially Parvez had been pleased: his son was outgrowing his teenage attitudes. But one day, beside the dustbin, Parvez found a torn bag which contained not only old toys, but computer discs, video tapes, new books and fashionable clothes the boy had bought just a few months before. Also without explanation, Ali had parted from the English girlfriend who used to come often to the house. His old friends had stopped ringing.

With this second paragraph, the reader comes across a distinct son figure whose growing - up exposes an equivalence with an isolation from the community he lives in. When Parvez realizes that his son has thrown not only his “old toys” but also “computer discs, video tapes, new books and fashionable clothes [he has recently bought]”, his contentment of his son's tidiness turns into a distress. His “pleased” manner at first seems to change with his realization about his son and this is given with the conjunction “but”. Furthermore, when Ali leaves his “English girlfriend” without any reason and the

telephone conversations with old friends stop, it foreshadows a danger for the father who has startled by all these unexpected and sudden changes. The cut between the past habits and the newly gained present habits of Ali irritates Parvez. He can not make out why all these have been happening to Ali. He is also frightened of his “developing sharp tongue” beside his “silences”. The exchange of statements below shows that he is right in his judgement:

One remark Parvez did make, “You don’t play your guitar any more,” elicited the mysterious but conclusive reply, “There are more important things to be done.”

The clear - cut and harsh response of Ali doubles Parvez’s uneasiness. He can not even “bring up the subject of Ali’s unusual behaviour” to anyone. The English girlfriend, old friends and the guitar stand for the values Ali has possessed and enjoyed before but does not want any more. Especially Ali’s excluding the guitar as an instrument of Western origin and pleasure from his life indicates that he does not have the same tastes as before. His comparative and open - ended reply “There are more important things to be done” is that he gives more value to what he is dealing with at the moment than any other thing, and he mentions about the “important things” as if they are obligatory. Ali classifies the things in his mind and playing the guitar is useless for him. The guitar and the English girlfriend are his past and the comparative adjective “more important” used for the “things to be done” at present shows how much Ali esteems them. But the “things to be done” are “mysterious” because Ali does not make any explanation about them, his statement does not give any clue or opinion. The reader can not make out if he is in trouble or not.

Parvez compares his son with “other men’s sons” who have brought trouble upon themselves “in England.” He remembers how he has worked day and night to afford Ali’s needs which he is throwing away now. So he perceives “his son’s eccentricity as an injustice.” It is a betrayal what Ali has been doing so far and can not be a substitute for Parvez’s favours. “And now the boy was throwing his possessions out!” as an exclamation sentence bears a sense of bewilderment. The exclamation mark at the end of the sentence shows how the father has been affected by this situation emotionally. It is a kind of an identity conflict for Ali but also a crisis for Parvez. Because it can not be the work of a healthy mind to throw all the possessions and it creates a trouble for a father who has worked hard to buy all those books, good suits, computer discs, video tapes and the guitar. Ali’s insensibility shocks his father.

The TV, video and sound system followed the guitar. Soon the room was practically bare. Even the unhappy walls bore marks where Ali's pictures had been removed.

Parvez couldn't sleep; he went more to the whisky bottle, even when he was at work. He realised it was imperative to discuss the matter with someone sympathetic.

As soon as the room has been "practically bare" even the walls of Ali's bedroom seem "unhappy" to the father. The personification of the walls and their description as "unhappy" from the father's point of view show that Parvez is under the influence of very strong emotions about his son's situation. Indeed, who is unhappy is Parvez and he longs for his son's previous situation. He is not able to sleep any more for the matter seriously occupies his mind. He drinks more and he feels he has to share this uneasiness with somebody. But he can not avoid being timid to his friends who are taxi - drivers like him:

But Parvez had been unable to bring this subject up with his friends. He was too ashamed. And he was afraid, too, that they would blame him for the wrong turning his boy had taken, just as he had blamed other fathers whose sons had taken to running around with bad girls, truanting from school and joining gangs.

Although Parvez "[has] been a taxi driver for twenty years" and "like him, most of the other drivers are Punjabis," which means that they come from the same background sharing the same customs and culture, he is not courageous enough to tell his friends about his son. Just like all the other fathers who have troubles with their children, Parvez knows that he will encounter the accusations. He is ashamed for two things: for this time his son has a problem and for he had blamed other fathers in their upbringing of their sons before. As the changes in Ali have occurred very suddenly and mysteriously, Parvez evaluates them as a "wrong turning" in his life. But there is something common in all the fathers' behaviours towards their children. Even though they want their children to be good, they do not lead good lives themselves. They prefer night work and sleep at daytime and do not show interest to their families and home, so there is not an order in their lives. "Together they [lead] almost a boy's life in the cabbies' office, playing cards and practical jokes, exchanging lewd stories, eating together and discussing politics and their problems." They spend more time with their friends than they do with their families. They earn money for their families but forget their responsibilities.

At the same time, Parvez can grasp that he is blameworthy about the situation and he remembers the times he became boastful to other men about Ali's abilities at school. But now his dreams about Ali's future seem to fail:

Was it asking too much for Ali to get a good job now, marry the right girl and start a family? Once this happened, Parvez would be happy. His dreams of doing well in England would have come true. Where had he gone wrong?

Like many other immigrants, Parvez has come to England with great expectations and hopes. England, for them, is a dream place where opportunities are abundant. Kureishi, in his “The Rainbow Sign”, states that “... despite everything, England was very much on the minds of Pakistanis” (24), and he also adds that the immigrants “have wanted to elevate themselves out of the maelstrom and by gaining economic power and the opportunity and dignity it brings, they have made themselves safe-safer. They have taken advantage of England” (28). Kureishi’s statement fits Parvez and many others like him who try to make use of the opportunities England offers them. They all have “dreams of doing well in England”. In the paragraph above “would have come true” also bears a meaning of “did not come true” and “have not come true”. So, Parvez sees that he has done something wrong somewhere. When he understands that he will not be able to find a solution, he can not stop talking to his two good friends one night about what he has been experiencing so far. He is so much afflicted with it that he confesses everything:

“I can’t understand it!” he burst out. “Everything is going from his room. And I can’t talk to him any more. We were not father and son-we were brothers! Where has he gone? Why is he torturing me!”
And Parvez put his head in his hands.

The verb “burst out” indicates a sudden outbreak and how the words explode forcefully in the father’s mouth because of the inner pressure he has been going through. He can not keep himself silent any more. He suffers not only because his son has been throwing his things away but also for the lack in relationship. “We were brothers!” underlines how close they were for each other. But the conversion in Ali’s behaviour is a torture for Parvez now. His “put[ting] his head in his hands” is also a sign of helplessness and failure.

“Even as he poured out his account the men shook their heads and gave one another knowing glances. From their grave looks, Parvez realised they understood the situation.” This short paragraph of two sentences shows that the men in the cabbies’ office have met such situations before. “Knowing glances” and “grave looks” indicate that they are acquainted with what Parvez has been telling them. Because almost every immigrant who has come to England with hopes experiences the same unfortunate events about their children. The men’s comment on Ali’s situation when Parvez demands a reply is “almost triumphant.”: “Ali was taking drugs and selling his possessions to pay for them. That was

why his bedroom was emptying.” The victorious voice of the men while identifying the problem of Ali does not leave a space for mistake. They seem certain about their statement as Ali’s is a very usual problem among teenagers. Parvez’s helpless require and the usage of “must” instead of “should” show that he almost sees his friends as an experienced authority to solve the problem. As a matter of fact, there seems to be nobody around him to solve this problem:

Parvez’s friends instructed him to watch Ali scrupulously and then be severe with him, before the boy went mad, overdosed or murdered someone.
Parvez staggered out into the early morning air, terrified they were right. His boy - the drug addict killer!

Parvez is so much affected by his friends’ instructions that he almost creates an image of his boy as a “drug addict killer!”. Ali’s picture in his mind changes, and this terrifying truth makes him much more uneasy. But “to his relief he [finds] Bettina sitting in his car.” With this sentence, we are introduced to a new character who is called Bettina and “to his relief” in the sentence clarifies that this person is significant enough in Parvez’s life to relieve him at once. We can infer from the next two paragraphs that they are not only close friends but also almost lovers although Bettina is a prostitute and has sexual relationships with many other men:

Bettina had known Parvez for three years. She lived outside the town and on the long drive home, where she sat not in the passenger seat but beside him. Parvez had talked to her about his life and hopes, just as she talked about hers. They saw each other most nights.
He could talk to her about things he’d never be able to discuss with his own wife. Bettina, in turn, always reported on her night’s activities. He liked to know where she was and with whom. Once he had rescued her from a violent client, and since then they had come to care for one another.

In these two typical short paragraphs, Kureishi very clearly exposes what kind of a lifestyle Parvez is leading. Although he has a family, a wife and a son, he tries to hold onto something different out of home. Indeed, Bettina symbolizes the West. According to Kaleta “Asian Parvez believes in the English tradition, and that is where his dream lies” (p.159). Bettina’s place in the car beside Parvez, and his “talk[ing] to her about things he’d never be able to discuss with his own wife” make her more than a prostitute and reduce Parvez’s wife’s role in his life. Sharing his hopes not with his wife but with Bettina indicates his aspiration of adventure. In fact, coming to England is a kind of an adventure for him. But he wants to get the utmost enjoyment out of England, and his search for everything new starts, that’s why he is relieved when he sees “Bettina sitting in his car.” She is the only close person he can talk to.

The other taxi drivers also know the “local brasses or prostitutes well, often driving them to liaisons.” They even “go with the girls”. This seems to be a usual affair among them. It is a part of their dreams to make use of England as much as possible, and being with other women is a new taste which England offers them.

When Parvez tells about Ali’s problem to Bettina, her approach to the matter is very cold-blooded and calm like a typical English person:

Though Bettina had never met the boy, she heard about Ali continually. That late night, when he told Bettina that he suspected Ali was on drugs, she judged neither the boy nor his father, but became businesslike and told him what to watch for.

With this very short paragraph again, it is certified that Parvez likes talking about his son “continually”. But although Parvez and Bettina have known each other for three years, the secrecy of their relationship prevents Bettina to meet Ali. Her intermediate attitude gives Parvez methodical clues. Now “he [knows] what to look for.” He is “grateful” to Bettina and for “he [knows] what the problem [may] be, he [feels] better.”

He watched each mouthful the boy took. He sat beside him at every opportunity and looked into his eyes. When he could he took the boy’s hand, checking his temperature. If the boy wasn’t at home Parvez was active, looking under the carpet, in his drawers, behind the empty wardrobe, sniffing, inspecting, probing. He knew what to look for: Bettina had drawn pictures of capsules, syringes, pills, powders, rocks.

5.2. The Father’s Discovery of the Truth

He thinks that “with Bettina’s help he would soon sort it out”. He tells every observation he has made to Bettina who comments and advises him. But at the end of all those efforts and searches, the boy’s “healthy, alert and watchful” appearance with “clear eyes” makes Parvez “feel that it [is] he who [is] in the wrong, and not the boy!” He can not find anything “physically different” in Ali except the beard he is growing. So, Bettina and Parvez “reluctantly abandon their only explanation, the drug theory, for Parvez [has] found nothing resembling any drug in Ali’s room.” They understand that they have been searching for the wrong thing from the very beginning. Another new discovery about Ali leads Parvez to search more carefully. Because “Ali [isn’t] selling his belongings. He [throws] them out, [gives] them away or donate[s] them to charity shops.” So the suppositions and ideas on drugs cease. But Parvez still can not feel at ease as he has not been able to find the truth. He is determined to maintain his detective manners:

Standing in the hall, Parvez heard his boy’s alarm clock go off. Parvez hurried into his bedroom where his wife was still awake, sewing in bed. He ordered her to sit down and keep quiet, though she had neither stood up nor said a word. From this post, and with

her watching him curiously, he observed his son through the crack in the door.

The boy went into the bathroom to wash. When he returned to his room Parvez sprang across the hall and set his ear at Ali's door. A muttering sound came from within. Parvez was puzzled but relieved.

Once this clue had been established, Parvez watched him at other times. The boy was praying. Without fail, when he was at home, he prayed five times a day.

With those three paragraphs above the story's direction completely alters. All the searches and assumptions turn into a misunderstanding. The realization that Ali is doing a thoroughly different thing is a cut in the story. With this realization, Parvez is once again "puzzled but relieved". It is not clear at that stage of the story if his relief is caused by finding the truth or by Ali's praying. There is another point here to be mentioned. The reactions of Parvez and his wife are completely different. While the wife is not responsive, Parvez is absolutely active. She is "sewing in bed ... quiet". This is interesting because she is indifferent to what is happening, she does not even ask a question but just watches his husband "curiously". Indeed she represents East "never speak[ing] of itself, never represent[ing] emotions..." (Said 6). It can be inferred that it is her passiveness that bores Parvez, who finds the liveliness he wants in Bettina. Parvez probably compares his wife with Bettina. That is actually the comparison between East and West. While Bettina gives advice about Ali, Parvez's wife does not show any interest about the matter. Bettina's rational attitude is more impressive for Parvez and so Bettina's help can be regarded as more trustworthy.

Due to the power of mystery in the story, at this phase, readers are also surprised to find Ali praying five times a day. Because his inclination towards the Muslim religion, therefore East, is not an expected attitude from a teenager who has been brought up in England with a Western tradition. Parvez's "puzzled" manner is very understandable because praying is what he has been ignoring because of the very strict Koran lessons he was urged to attend as a child in Lahore and so he has not taught his son in England:

Parvez had grown up in Lahore where all the boys had been taught the Koran. To stop him falling asleep when he studied, the Moulvi had attached a piece of string to the ceiling and tied it to Parvez's hair, so that if his head fell forward, he would instantly awake. After this indignity Parvez had avoided all religions. Not that the other taxi drivers had more respect. In fact, they made jokes about the local mullahs walking around with their caps and beards, thinking they could tell people how to live, while their eyes roved over the boys and girls in their care.

The first part of the paragraph is a flashback and tells much about the way the religion is taught in Lahore. Not only Parvez but also the other taxi drivers whose

childhood days passed in Punjab and Lahore experienced the same boring limitations. When compared with England, Lahore is a place of restrictions and obligations. There are do's and don't's. Learning Koran is required from all the boys who encounter strict punishments when they can not. Religious rules and deeds are tried to be taught by force which causes a common hatred towards religion. That is why Parvez "[has] avoided all religions". In Koran teaching, there are all kinds of "indignity" and abjection which result in distancing from it. It does not provide the love and security a religion must consist of. Koran learning has become a torture for the boys who also lose their "respect" for it. Such a disrespect even led them to make fun of "the local mullahs". It seems as if they are so restricted and degraded in those lessons that they long for freedom which can be found out of Lahore, only in West. Thus once they are free in England, they break all the ties with religion to be more independent. And now it is interesting that Ali is "growing a beard" like mullahs and "praying five times a day". We can infer that the things done with strictness do not work but self-discovery is always more tempting. Ali has discovered them by himself, but what if he had been a boy in Lahore, would it be the same? He would probably hate religion and all its demands. But now in England, surrounded by enjoyment and freedom, his discovery of this new thing seems very essential. He is not fascinated by the West like his father. His search adds a new dimension to his life and it is an adventure for him. In this respect his life contradicts his father's life. Because Parvez wishes to experience more modern and different things in England than he did in Lahore while Ali tries to taste a life like the one in Lahore. This contrast is between East and West, new-generation and old-generation as well as between Ali and Parvez. But it is pictured in an unusual way as it is the old-generation, that is to say Parvez here, that is expected to have a tendency to keep his traditions and religion. In this story the roles are exchanged. Ali is given the roles of his father and he tries to lead a life of Lahore tradition just like an old man who longs for past.

Parvez not only tells Bettina what he has discovered about Ali but also to his friends in the taxi office. The taxi-drivers are also so shocked that although they were "curious before", they "[become] oddly silent" when they have heard the news. Their silence is "odd" because they can not comment on it. While commenting on a teenager who has been discovered to use drugs is easy, for it is pervasive in England, it is difficult to say something about Ali's situation for them. So "they [can] hardly condemn the boy for his devotions." Ali's devotions are what they have left behind in Lahore. In Ali's dedication,

there lies their dislike and unfaithfulness to their religion. They can not blame Ali for what he is doing because it can not be compared to be like a “drug addict killer”.

To appreciate the things, “Parvez decide[s] to take a night off and go out with the boy.” He approaches Ali’s situation like a brother again:

They could talk things over. He wanted to hear how things were going at college; he wanted to tell him stories about their family in Pakistan. More than anything he yearned to understand how Ali had discovered the “spiritual dimension”, as Bettina described it.

Parvez’s endeavour to understand Ali and his wish to go out with him is rejected. It is again another “surprise” for Parvez who thinks that “no appointment [can] be more important than that of a son with his father.” It is clear that Ali not only throws his possessions away but he also tries to exclude his father from his life. His “[claim to have] an appointment” and rejection to be with his father show that his new life-style does not even allow him to be with his father who falls in step with England’s rules.

After hearing that his son does not want to go out with him, he “immediately [goes] to the street” where he is sure to find Bettina. With Bettina who “[stands] in the rain wearing high heels, a short skirt and a long mac on top, which she [will] open hopefully at passing cars”, Parvez “[drives] out across the moors”. Bettina hugs Parvez who “[is trembling]” because of “[having] had the worst experience of [his] life.” Parvez considers his son very important and the unwilling attitudes of Ali towards him makes Parvez very desperate.

5.3.The Conflict of the Father and the Son

He tells Bettina that Ali and he were at a restaurant the night before where Parvez took “his usual whisky and water”. “Whisky” as an alcohol drink attracts all the attention of the table scene. Although Parvez had prepared to ask Ali about his exams, the first to ask a question is Ali. When Parvez “[takes] a long drink” and “before [he can] speak, Ali [makes] a face”. His interrogative manner towards Parvez leads to a question: “Don’t you know it’s wrong to drink alcohol?” What irritates Parvez in the question is the harsh manner Ali has. His attitude as if talking to an enemy is cruel and heart-breaking. Parvez tells Bettina that “[he] was about to castigate the boy for being insolent, but managed to control [himself]”. He is so much hurt this time. But he never loses control and his patience to tell Ali how “he [has] worked more than ten hours a day for years” and that he has abandoned many pleasures for him. He sees a glass of whisky as a reward of hard work.

But Ali is strict about the rules of Islam religion and even starts giving lessons to his father about it:

“But it is forbidden,” the boy said.
Parvez shrugged, “I know”.
“And so is gambling, isn’t it?”
“Yes. But surely we are only human?”

Ali’s mind is so much occupied with the rules that he can not focus on the goodness of an evening with a father. He behaves like a strict father who just asks questions to judge his son. They both know the rules of Islam but Parvez admits that human beings are not perfect while saying “but surely we are only human?”. With this statement, Parvez tries to find an excuse for the things he is doing which Islam has prohibited. Islamic truths can not prevent him from drinking whisky or gambling. Therefore, he “drink[s] more quickly” ignoring the “fastidious face” Ali is making. The conversation above is a distancing power between them. While Parvez “[is] getting drunk and [can not] stop himself”, “Ali [has] a horrible look on his face, full of disgust and censure”. What they want from each other seems impossible from now on. Parvez’s effort to approach his son is hindered with Ali’s imposing manner. Ali sees his father detestable. The statement “It was as if he hated his father” indicates how his feelings were apparent on his face. “The horrible look” on the “fastidious face” is a well-defined expression of the hatred towards the father. But it is irritating for a father to notice such an abomination:

Halfway through the meal Parvez suddenly lost his temper and threw a plate on the floor. He had felt like ripping the cloth from the table, but the waiters and other customers were staring at him. Yet he wouldn’t stand for his own son telling him the difference between right and wrong. He knew he wasn’t a bad man. He had a conscience. There were a few things of which he was ashamed, but on the whole he had lived a decent life.

In this paragraph, Parvez’s anger towards Ali is seen physically. His anger does not give harm to Ali but his “[throwing] a plate on the floor” and “[feeling] like ripping the cloth from the table” imply that Parvez calms himself down by doing something harmful. His love for Ali prevents Parvez from giving harm to him. He begins to question himself. The notions of “right and wrong” appear in his mind. He is aware that he is not faultless but he also accepts not to be “a bad man”. “He [has] a conscience” which does not seem enough to be a good man according to Ali’s perception of the world. The “decent life” he has led is not satisfactory for his son as he is now judging his father for that modest life. What is right for Ali is wrong for Parvez and vice versa. But the difference between them is that Ali can not put up with a father of Parvez’s sort while Parvez undertakes to understand his son and his nonsense judgements:

“When have I had time to be wicked?” he asked Ali.
In a low monotonous voice the boy explained that Parvez had not, in fact, lived a good life. He had broken countless rules of the Koran.
“For instance?” Parvez demanded.
Ali hadn’t needed time to think. As if he had been waiting for this moment, he asked his father if he didn’t relish pork pies?
“Well...”

“Time” sense in Parvez’s question above is a repeated image as Parvez uses it to show how he has worked day and night to afford Ali’s needs. He uses the “time” sense to remind Ali of the favours he has done. This question also bears a meaning of “Do I deserve all you are doing after all that hard work?” Because Parvez’s efforts are now being degraded with Ali’s humiliations. Ali’s answer to the question comes “in a low monotonous voice”. The tone of his speech indicates his unwillingness to speak to his father. His explanation “that Parvez [has] not, in fact, lived a good life” is completely based upon the Koran rules. According to Ali, the criterions of living are determined by the Koran rules, which require more than having a conscience. Ali continues his judgements about Parvez without a moment of hesitation. The reader understands that he also does not approve eating “pork pies”. His opinion of the “pork pies” has also been shaped by the Koran rules which prohibit eating them. Parvez who knows the Koran rules, as well, just utters “Well...” to gain time in order to find the convincing answer. He “[can’t] deny that he love[s] crispy bacon...” and “[eats] this for breakfast every morning”:

Ali then reminded Parvez that he had ordered his own wife to cook pork sausages, saying to her, ‘You’re not in the village now, this is England. We have to fit in!’

The conversation gets more critical with the word “ordered” in the quotation above. With this order, Parvez associates “his own wife” to his crime. Parvez is perceived by Ali to misuse his wife. Therefore his sin is doubled. The comparison between the village lifestyle in Punjab and English life is reduced to food. Eating “pork pies” appeals to Parvez’s appetite which he uses as an excuse to fit in England. His point of view is that fitting in involves a new style of living to be accepted among English people. To be a full and equal member of the community, one has to adapt to their lifestyle. Only then the colonizer’s superiority can not subdue him anymore. Like most of the immigrants who do not want to be defined with their ethnical identities, Parvez behaves accordingly not to be isolated from the community. He does not want to be called the “other” in this foreign country and so there begins a kind of a “metamorphosis” which also includes an assimilation and resemblance. Parvez’s assimilated self is now being probed by his own son. While saying “We have to fit in!”, Parvez’s purpose is to be wholly accepted by

English community. “Have to” in the statement shows how Parvez feels obligatory to “fit in”. The community they have come into is so great that it will exclude the ones who are unsuitable. But now, it seems that England embraces Parvez more sincerely than his own son who completely opposes, disregards and rejects his father. Parvez’s anger is felt when “he call[s] for more drink”. His boy’s assaults draw him nearer to the alcohol which increases the conflict between the father and the son:

‘The problem is this,’ the boy said. He leaned across the table. For the first time that night his eyes were alive. ‘You are too implicated in Western civilization.’
Parvez burped; he thought he was going to choke.
‘Implicated!’ he said. ‘But we live here!’
‘The Western materialists hate us,’ Ali said. ‘Papa, how can you love something which hates you?’

The aliveness of Ali’s eyes while explaining what the problem is shows that he is pleased to have a chance of unfolding his thoughts. He is satisfied with telling the matter he is disturbed by. Although the energy in his eyes opposes the “low monotonous voice” he has had before, he seems to be delighted to agitate his father. His claim that Parvez is too much involved “in Western civilization” is an indication that there are degrees of implication and his father is not only “implicated” but also “too implicated” in it. He is aware that his father has forgotten his nation’s traditions by turning his face back to his native country. Being and living somewhere require an involvement and devotion which lead to belonging. Indeed, Parvez’s answer “But we live here!” is an expression of belonging. With the conjunction “but” he confronts his son and with “we live here!”, he reminds Ali of the place they live in. He feels “he [is] going to choke”, because it is surprising for him to hear Ali reacting. He has not thought before that he is “implicated”. He has once been attracted by England’s charm and now it is his own son who is telling that it is not true. The reader also comes across with the word “Papa” uttered by Ali for the first time. But it is not clear if he wants to calm his father down. Ali’s observation about “the Western materialists” and his categorization of “them” and “us” as opponents can also be seen in Kureishi’s essay “The Rainbow Sign” in which Kureishi expresses the hatred towards Pakistani people:

...People insulted me in the street. Someone in a café refused to eat at the same table with me. The parents of a girl I was in love with told her she’d get a bad reputation by going out with darkies.

Powell allowed himself to become a figurehead for racists. He helped create racism in Britain and was directly responsible not only for the atmosphere of fear and hatred, but through his influence, for individual acts of violence against Pakistanis (6).

Moreover, Kureishi also tells how English “used Pakistanis as the butt of their humour”. He sees how “racial hatred” was reduced to jokes. He feels so embarrassed and degraded that he is frightened of watching TV. Even the parents of his friends talk “heatedly, violently, about race, about ‘the Pakis’.”:

I was desperately embarrassed and afraid of being identified with these loathed aliens. I found it almost impossible to answer questions about where I came from. The word “Pakistani” had been made into an insult. It was a word I didn’t want used about myself. I couldn’t tolerate being myself (7).

He realizes the fact that he has been “racially abused” since his childhood. This makes him more scared and malevolent and he is hurt at every remark about himself being unable to identify them either as humour or as insult. He feels he is brutal although he does not “know how to be violent”. He knows how Pakistanis “are discriminated against in all areas”. He even comes across an English girl at a launderette who does not want to touch and wash his clothes because of his skin colour. This makes him feel the worst and sounds like “a spit on the face”:

I was in a rage. I thought: who wants to be British anyway? Or as a black American writer said: Who wants to be integrated into a burning house anyway? (35)

Although Kureishi seems to give up his strict opinions about being a Paki that we learn from his later interviews, the judgements in his essay, “The Rainbow Sign”, are echoed by his character Ali. Ali voices Kureishi’s boyhood observations, in that regard. Like young Kureishi, Ali is not concerned about “be[ing] British”. Ali’s statement that “The Western materialists hate [them]” is confirmed by Kureishi’s own impressions. Indeed, Kureishi’s embarrassment and fear are not felt in Ali who is rather more obstinate and full of hatred. Kureishi’s rage turns into an enmity in Ali who wants to avenge wholeheartedly. “How can you love something which hates you?” is a question that Parvez will not be able to answer. The question is logical in general. But when Parvez tries to reply, the answer does not come out logically. Because the notions of allegiance and belonging are involved in the answer. That is why Parvez can not respond. It is a kind of a boss-worker relationship. For instance; The boss hates his workers, but the workers do what he wants in loyalty although it does not fulfil the meaning of love. Being a part of something, having links make one feel a false love. Ali’s question is so sensible and Parvez’s sense of belonging to England is so much that Parvez wants Ali to answer it:

‘What is the answer then?’ Parvez said miserably. ‘According to you.’

Ali addressed his father fluently, as if Parvez were a rowdy crowd that had to be quelled and convinced. The law of Islam would rule the world; the skin of the infidel would burn off again and again; the Jews and Christians would be routed. The West was a sink of hypocrites, adulterers, homosexuals, drug takers and prostitutes.

Parvez’s demand for the answer comes “miserably”. Because the answer will awaken him from a dream which he has been fancying for so long. It will tell him the truths which he does not want to see. The dishonour, embarrassment, fear and vulgarity that Pakistanis have been experiencing must now be experienced by the Western people according to Ali. Ali’s fluency in his speech is an indication that he has thought much on the matter and that his ideas are fixed. The verb “address” instead of “speak” or “talk” creates a more formal sense. An addresser in front of a crowd must be more learned and it is clear that Ali sees his father inferior who needs to be well-informed. His addressing to his father “as if [he is] a rowdy crowd” is his effort to dominate over him. He believes both in the excellence of the Islam and his father’s poorness, and his propaganda is to assure his father of the superiority of what he credits. Being in front of Parvez, his own father, but behaving as if he is in front of a crowd, Ali performs his speech like a leader who tries to establish an enthusiastic air to motivate his people. The content of his speech exposes the cruelty in his belief. The verbs “burn off” and “route” point out to destruction and defeat. Ali outlines and tells of a kind of a riot, in that regard. “The West sink” has to be cleaned according to him. His disturbance of the hypocrites, adulterers and others can only cease with this cleaning. Ali’s destructive and negative preachment surprises Parvez once again. While Ali’s speech is going on, he “look[s] out of the windows as if to check that they [are] still in London.” He can not believe that this conversation is taking place in London. If it was in Lahore, it would not seem odd to talk like that. Because as Kureishi states in “The Rainbow Sign”, “...the old men in their clubs and the young... took great pleasure in England’s decline and decay”(25). This observation is a part of Kureishi’s first visit to Pakistan that is mentioned in the second part of his essay. Parvez knows that it is usual among Pakistani people in Lahore to speak for the disadvantages of England. But in England, while breathing its air and earning money to live, it is weird for Parvez to think in that way. Ali does not care for his father’s uneasiness and goes on:

‘My people have taken enough. If the persecution doesn’t stop there will be *jihad*. I, and millions of others, will gladly give our lives for the cause.’

‘But why, why?’ Parvez said.

‘For us the reward will be in paradise.’

‘Paradise!’

Finally, as Parvez's eyes filled with tears, the boy urged him to mend his ways.
'How is that possible?' Parvez asked.
'Pray', Ali said. 'Pray beside me.'

After all the destructive words, Ali mentions "jihad" which is believed to be a holy war defied by Muslims against anti-Muslims. "Jihad" is the last stage to defend. Ali and "millions of others" are ready to shed blood. The word "jihad" shows their stability and "gladly" as an adverb indicates how much they believe in their fight. They are determined to die and as they take no pleasure from life, they believe that they will be gratified in "heaven". Therefore, the reward in paradise can not be substituted. No enjoyment in life is equal to the value of it. If paradise is gained by war, then it will be more precious. The word "paradise!" with an exclamation mark at the end implies Parvez's bewilderment again. It also involves a sense of death in itself which Parvez does not fit Ali. So his "eyes fill[s] with tears". He is also worried about the condition Ali is in. Ali's strictness in his thoughts, his rudeness while expressing them and the irresistible self-control he has affects Parvez. Ali's last demand "pray beside me" to "mend [Parvez's] ways" is a call on behalf of Islam. He starts his struggle from his own father. He regards "praying" as the first step of Islam. Parvez can not bear all these any more and he "call[s] for the bill":

...[he] ushered his boy out of the restaurant as soon as he was able.
He couldn't take any more. Ali sounded as if he'd swallowed
someone else's voice.

"Usher" as a verb in the first sentence shows that Parvez still keeps his politeness. "As soon as" is an indicator of hastiness Parvez is in as he is bored and worried. He does not want to listen to his son any more. Because the more Ali speaks, the more the things seem worse and more complicated for Parvez. In the last sentence of the paragraph above, Parvez's supposition that it seems "as if [Ali] had swallowed someone else's voice" is a doubt that this boy may be under the impression of someone or a group. Indeed, Ali's sudden change proves that he is under control of a power that has influenced him much. In fact, Parvez does not want to believe that it is Ali's own thoughts that he is telling and he wants to consider that Ali has been affected by someone.

"On the way home the boy [sits] in the back of the taxi, as if he [is] a customer" refers to the gap and coldness between Parvez and Ali. Although Parvez has thought that it would be a good evening, Ali's utterances put up a wall between them. The back seat of the taxi visually emphasizes the break of the emotional ties of a father and a son. Ali's customer-like attitude clarifies that his father does not mean anything to him. There is nothing to share any more. Parvez is simply a taxi-driver for him. Ali sits at the back seat

to humiliate his father. He sees himself superior like a colonizer in his own territory because of his thoughts and beliefs and his father is an ignorant worker in his eyes. With this scene, it is proved that Parvez has entirely lost his dominion over his son. He can not control the direction any more. Practically he drives but theoretically he is bound to be ordered by the back-seat customer. Parvez can not help asking “What has made [Ali] like this?” He almost begs for the answer.

He tries to find out if there was a particular event which had influenced him. But still he is frightened to hear that “he [is] to blame for all this.” Ali gives the answer of what he has been affected by:

‘Living in this country.’

‘But I love England,’ Parvez said, watching his boy in the mirror.

‘They let you do almost anything here.’

‘That is the problem,’ he replied.

Ali accuses England for the previous changes he has gone through. The problem is caused by England’s unprohibitive manner. In that regard, England is just like a mother who does not limit her child and lets her child do almost everything. She does not feel responsible for the bad consequences her child will bring upon. Parvez, in that sense, is like a spoilt child who is content with what his mother permits. Parvez “love[s] England” like a child who loves his unforbidding mother and the problem for Ali is that his father is entirely captured by that love. During the conversation, Parvez’s “watching his boy in the mirror” reveals a sense of a fear and draw back. The rearview mirror showing the back seat of the car demonstrates an indirectness as Parvez can not see his boy’s face without a mirror. “Watching” as an action, therefore, is not accomplished directly. This also shows how difficult it is for Parvez to come closer and to understand his son directly. Their communication is only possible with the help of the mirror and without it, their eye contact can not be realized. The mirror image has also a function of exposing the reality that the father and son will not be seated side by side from now on. Kenneth Kaleta’s comment on this scene is as follows:

Ironically, this exchange occurs in the rearview mirror, with Parvez watching Ali while driving his taxi. The image suggests the conflict: Parvez has accepted the western work ethic and is driving a cab to provide Ali with western comforts; Ali, however, will not go along for the ride of western consumerism. He has seen his father sell himself out and he refuses to do so. The dream must tear apart as it cannot go both forward and backward – forward to include western morality, consumerism, and liberalism to satisfy Parvez, and backward to retain eastern asceticism and conservative values to pacify Ali in the back seat (158-159).

Realizing all the distant and unsympathetic air, Parvez does not feel himself well:

For the first time in years Parvez couldn't see straight. He knocked the side of the car against a lorry, ripping off the wing mirror. They were lucky not to have been stopped by the police: Parvez would have lost his licence and therefore his job. Getting out of the car back at the house, Parvez stumbled and fell in the road, scraping his hands and ripping his trousers. He managed to haul himself up. The boy didn't even offer him his hand.

The first sentence of the first paragraph above shows Parvez's distress. "For the first time in years" is an indication that he has not felt in that way for a long time. He is so much suffering in affliction that he even has an accident which is the outcome of the adversity he is in. The annihilation of his sight and the crack in the "wing mirror" are the images that function to reveal his loss of the control. The broken wing mirror now can not guide Parvez to show the back and so he can not drive in security. This also shows that he has lost his secure roots in England. Their chance that there is no police around may be regarded as ironical. Because it does not mean anything for a father to "lose his licence" and therefore the source of his living after he has lost his son. The licence and the job are necessary to supply a good life for the family, especially to afford the needs of his son. But the conversation between Ali and Parvez reduces the necessity and importance of his efforts in his job. Therefore, while the licence and the job are symbols of an affordable good life, they turn out to be nothing. They lose their meanings, so it does not matter if a policeman stops them or not.

In the second paragraph above, the verbs "stumble", "fall", "scrape", and "rip" function for expressing the bad condition Parvez is in. With the shock of all he has lived and the accident, Parvez feels physically weak and ill beside his emotional tiredness. His feet can not endure any more, his hands are hurt, his clothes are torn. Therefore, this sorrowful state reflects his wretched feelings. His falling in the road as a taxi driver is significant as the road is the means of subsistence for Parvez. He is humiliated in the place where he works and earns money. The road is his world but now it proves to convey a perilous feature for him that is not steady. Still "he manage[s]" to move himself up without any help. Although his son is with him, he succeeds in difficulty to stand up. It is odd that Ali does not help his father. The last sentence of the second paragraph reveals the merciless mood Ali has towards his father. He feels ashamed because of having such a father, so he behaves indifferently to what is happening. He maintains his customer-like attitude which means that he is not more than a stranger. But it is likely that a stranger behaves more compassionate and generous than Ali while giving his hand to a man who

has fallen. Although Ali's caring hand would have made Parvez feel relief, he does not even receive a humane reaction from his son.

While Parvez is telling all he has lived to Bettina, his submission is noticed with the statements below:

Parvez told Bettina he was now willing to pray, if that was what the boy wanted, if that would dislodge the pitiless look from his eyes.

His acquiescence only to delight and satisfy his son is what a father can do without reciprocity. His son's demands gains a priority in his life at once. He is "willing to pray" to make Ali glad which indeed does not mean anything according to Islamic rules. Because, worship which is performed by somebody's force has not a value unless it is by his/her own will. "To dislodge the pitiless look from [Ali's] eyes" means to purify him from his relentless emotions. "The pitiless look" which reflects the darkness of heart can only be avoided with the father's religious acts, in that regard.

'But what I object to,' he said, 'is being told by my own son that I am going to hell!' What finished Parvez off was that the boy had said he was giving up accountancy. When Parvez had asked why, Ali had said sarcastically that it was obvious. 'Western education cultivates an anti-religious attitude.'

It moves Parvez to be instructed by "his own son" that his end will be in 'hell'. Hearing the truths from his own son, Parvez believes that Ali really wants him to go to hell. Because Ali, whole heartedly, wants all the unbelievers to go to hell. He does not discriminate his father and puts that "hell" image like a punishment before him. It is clearly perceived that Ali condenses his hatred on his father and so utters words which Parvez would never like to hear. Furthermore as Parvez knows what a hell is like, he feels uneasy. Thus when this terrible truth is told by the closest person he has, it creates more agony. Therefore, Ali's harsh attitude is felt through his words.

It is explicitly detected that Parvez has been gradually overcome by his boy. Realizing that the things about Ali's future, even his education, which he has contributed all his efforts to, working hard, have ceased. Parvez feels "finished". There is no need to go to hell to be punished, it is already "hell" to experience what Ali says about his education. Saying "he was giving up accountancy", Ali proves that he does not have a worldly passion. His sarcastic manner while speaking the ill of Western education implies that he does not expect anything from future and want anything from this education. He believes that the colonial education will add to the enslavement expanding its effect, in pretending

to love just to assimilate and then oppress more. He has devoted his life to religious deeds. Accountancy is not a suitable job for him as “it [is] usual to meet women, drink alcohol and practice usury.” Although “it’s [a] well-paid work” for Parvez, who approaches the matter financially, Ali is determined to give it up though he has “been preparing for years”:

Ali said he was going to begin to work in prisons, with poor Muslims who were struggling to maintain their purity in the face of corruption. Finally, at the end of the evening, as Ali was going to bed, he had asked his father why he didn’t have a beard, or at least a moustache.

“Prison” as an image and setting is displayed multi-functionally where Ali chooses to work in. It actually reveals his state of mood and how he is imprisoned in his beliefs and thoughts, captured by limitations while his father has been imprisoned just by the name of the country, England. As their confinements are distinct, their custody and release will also be separate. The “prison” image also indicates a stressful life without enjoyment and comfort for Ali. But Ali’s wish is to support the “poor Muslims” with which he will taste the joys of the other world. All his greed and desire are tended to help the “poor Muslims” who endure the degeneration with rectitude. He wants to unite with his own people against West. What he wants to reveal is the spirit of unity in such a place. Ali’s final demand from his father at the end of the day is an endeavour to change Parvez physically. He tries to alter his father’s lifestyle in stages. The beard and moustache are the characteristics of radical Muslim men from the Western point of view. So, in Ali’s demand there lies his preference of a lifestyle which he also wants his father to lead.

‘I feel as if I’ve lost my son’, Parvez told Bettina. ‘I can’t bear to be looked at as if I’m a criminal. I’ve decided what to do.’

...

‘I’m going to tell him to pick up his prayer mat and get out of my house. It will be the hardest thing I’ve ever done, but tonight I’m going to do it.’

‘But you mustn’t give up on him,’ said Bettina. ‘Many young people fall into cults and superstitious groups. It doesn’t mean they’ll always feel the same way.’

She said Parvez had to stick by his boy, giving him support, until he came through.

In the meaning of “lose” in its present perfect tense conjugation, there is a sense of yearning for the previous state of Ali. With Ali’s loss, Parvez’s expectations and plans about his future are also lost. As he can not apprehend Ali any more and his approach to him grows more and more difficult, their alienation from each other has been fulfilled. His perceiving himself like a guilty man in front of his son will urge him to do the most difficult and cruel thing he has done lifelong. He was proud of being a good man who has conscience. But in the consequence of Ali’s violence of the words and acts, this docile man

has been propelled to do bad things even to his own son to whom he has devoted his life. The decision of Parvez is strengthened with “I am going to do it” to tell the reader about the plan. Ali’s inciting attitudes has spent all the feelings of Parvez who now thinks in the way he has never thought before.

Bettina’s approach to the matter is just like at the beginning, expectedly logical. Parvez’s fury prevents him from taking a sensible decision about his son which is now balanced with Bettina’s reasonable advice. Bettina’s suggestion for Parvez to resist and give up that sudden decision bestows Ali one more chance to stay at home. Bettina, in this sense, regards the matter as an illness to be cured. For Ali’s recovery, it is necessary to be patient enough to reach a sound solution. It is a whim of youth what Ali has been going through and it has to be dealt with an understanding. As Bettina knows the popularity of the “cults and superstitious groups” among young people, she is not so surprised to find Ali in such a position of a rebel. When young people search to confide in something, those “cults” and “groups” offer them to fill the emptiness they are in and cease the feeling of nothingness. It is ironical that Bettina plays a wise role when she is with Parvez although she is just a prostitute. But it is still not incredible to hear Bettina giving advice as she has experienced a lot on different stages of life. Her job which requires meeting a variety of people from different social classes has taught her to be familiar with everything she encounters and donated her with an efficiency of sharp observation. She is the woman of misery who has gone through many hardships. Parvez completely believes in Bettina’s sincerity and is convinced to give his boy another chance “eventhough he [doesn’t] feel like giving his son more love when he [has] hardly been thanked for all he [has] already given.” Ali’s rebel is a betrayal and does not deserve love more than a chance. Ali’s ungratefulness uses Parvez up and makes him believe that his son is unjust and that all his attempt to provide a good future for him is off no use. He is now absolutely assured that his invitation to love will be an invitation to be taken over and exploited by his own son. He will again be eliminated from his son’s life as if he is an abundance and will experience his son’s malevolence and treachery with infidelity once more. He tests Ali only to see that giving a chance to him is useless:

Nevertheless, Parvez tried to endure his son’s looks and reproaches. He attempted to make conversation about his beliefs. But if Parvez ventured any criticism, Ali always had a brusque reply. On one occasion Ali accused Parvez of ‘grovelling’ to the whites; in contrast, he explained, he was not ‘inferior’; there was more to the world than the West, though the West always thought it was best.

Parvez's tolerance and self-control are worthy to appreciate as he can still remain patient in spite of all the insults and contempt he is exposed to. "Endure", "attempt" and "venture" all hint at the hardship Parvez is going through. These three verbs indicate how hard it is to come closer to Ali. They also point at the failure in Parvez's acts. Whatever Parvez does, Ali maintains his tactless and uncivil manner. His impolite and sharp responses are as if infuriating his father. Ali's indignation is ascertained with the verb "grovel" which puts Parvez in the role of a flatterer. Indeed, with that verb, Ali unintentionally admits that whites are a superior race who are to be submitted and cringed. Nevertheless, he alleges not to be "inferior." The discrimination he makes between white and black is the outcome of his rage towards the former and an effort to support and protect his own people. He can be regarded right in his nationalism but the tone and way of his expressing this loyal feeling is very abrupt and his antagonizing manner while he is still among whites is unbalanced and ironical. He puts West to a distinct scale though he still lodges in there. But he feels limited and insignificant because he is not from it and trivial at the vigour of its existence. He is aware of the historical conflict between East and West, West's intentional control over East and its arrogant and proud posture in front of the Orient. His belief and consciousness does wholly bear an Oriental soul. Now, with this realization, he appears to constitute a challenge towards West's understanding, education, dominion and all it has. He can not stand the thought of West's supremacy. So, he considers his own father as if he is betraying to his native people with his Westernized lifestyle. His rage is concentrated upon his father who Ali thinks that he shadows English people. He places his father on West's side and vomits all his hatred to him. Thus he takes a part of his revenge. Parvez is confounded at how his son makes such a comparison and discrimination between East and West as Ali "[has] never left England". When he asks Ali, he only comes across "a look of contempt" on Ali's face, as usual. Yet Parvez does not give up his tolerance:

One night, having ensured there was no alcohol on his breath, Parvez sat down at the kitchen table with Ali. He hoped Ali would compliment him on the beard he was growing but Ali didn't appear to notice.

Parvez seems to fulfil Ali's aspirations. He goes on to drink alcohol but does not want to disturb and distress his son with the smell of alcohol which indicates a reverence in his act. So "having ensured" in the first sentence of the paragraph above shows his thoughtfulness and precaution. His wish to come closer to Ali is seen in his "[sitting] at the kitchen table with Ali". He wants to show his physical change which Ali has required

from him but Ali's indifference once again defeats Parvez, kills his hopes and impedes his advance. He is in complete disappointment which not only implies an alienation towards his son but also to himself. His "growing a beard" for Ali's favour is an aloofness to his self. But when his efforts are ignored and he is not admitted by his own son, his sense of isolation and alienation are magnified. This scene which views father and son side by side also makes the reader witness Ali's unsympathetic air once more. Although Parvez has met his son's insensibility, he seems to be affected by the stability of Ali's thoughts and beliefs which is revealed in the conversation he has with Bettina:

The previous day Parvez had been telling Bettina that he thought people in the West sometimes felt inwardly empty and that people needed a philosophy to live by.
'Yes', said Bettina. 'That's the answer. You must tell him what your philosophy of life is. Then he will understand that there are other beliefs.'

Parvez's speech to Bettina shows that he acknowledges Ali to be right. By saying the "people in the West", Parvez categorizes the group of people among whom he lives. He seems to be thinking in that way for the first time in his life. That is the result of the conversations with Ali. After seeing that Ali has a worldview he observes that the other people "[feel] inwardly empty". He notices Ali's devotion to his ideology and his struggle for its admission. So living without a "philosophy" seems meaningless. He almost admires Ali, in that regard. Bettina's inference shows that the answer is hidden in what Parvez is telling. They both know that their philosophies do not fit Ali's thoughts, but they hope that Ali can be tolerant to other beliefs, forgetting that Ali is strict in what he believes. This time Parvez starts his lessons:

After some fatiguing consideration, Parvez was ready to begin. The boy watched him as if he expected nothing.
Haltingly Parvez said that people had to treat one another with respect, particularly children their parents. This did seem, for a moment, to affect the boy. Heartened, Parvez continued. In his view this life was all there was and when you died you rotted in the earth. 'Grass and flowers will grow out of me, but something of me will live on.'
'How?'
'In other people. I will continue—in you?... 'And your grandchildren'... 'But while I am here on earth I want to make the best of it. And I want you to, as well!'

Parvez considers and gets ready for the conversation with Ali which shows how much importance he gives to this talk as if it will put an end to all the distress he is in. Ali's humiliation is felt at the beginning of the conversation again. He "expect[s] nothing" from his father even that he can talk well. "Haltingly" as an adverb to describe how Parvez is hesitant and a bit awkward also shows his anxiety. It is a common subject among parents

and children to talk about respect for each other. It is especially parents who demand respect and recognition. When Parvez talks about respect, it seems that Ali has been impressed. This encourages Parvez to go on talking on his philosophy of life as Bettina has instructed him. He chooses life and death as subjects to talk about. He explains what he expects from life and how he will feel after death. “This life was all there was” simplifies the meaning of life in Parvez’s eyes. “Death” is also nothing but just “rot[ting] in the earth” for Parvez. What he expects from life and death is the continuity of his lineage. This is only possible with Ali. While saying “...something of me will live on”, he directly mentions Ali although Ali pretends not to understand it by asking “how?”. This is an ordinary talk which fits the standards of a father. His desire to “live on in other people” is a widespread philosophy of all fathers around the world. Although it is usual and simply father-like, Ali feels “a little distressed”. He can not stand the thought of an expectation of his father, especially when it is about himself. It is a kind of an interference to his life. He believes that it is a decision he has to take by himself. Parvez’s intention is “to make the best of it” while living. His aspiration is the same for his son. He wants to take the advantage of everything the life serves him. He finds Ali deficient in his expectancy of life. When Ali asks the meaning of “make the best of it”, Parvez suggests him to “enjoy [himself] without hurting others.” This great advice will indeed defend Ali against the troubles he will bring upon himself. “Hurting others” who do not think in the way he does is Ali’s philosophy of life and it is hard for him to give it up at once. While considering to “burn off the skin of the infidel”, “rout the Jews and Christers” and start the holy war, Jihad, against all unbelievers and behave as tactlessly as possible to his own father, Ali can not enjoy life. Furthermore, he thinks that “enjoyment [is] a bottomless pit” in which “hypocrites, adulterers, homosexuals, drug takers and prostitutes of the West sink” inhabit. “Enjoyment” is “the beauty of living” for Parvez. But for Ali, life lacks that so-called beauty as he says “all over the world our people are oppressed”. Although Parvez does not get what Ali means by “our people”, he replies “I know.” But he still supports the view that “life is for living”. Ali has a comment for that view as he does for everything:

Ali said, ‘Real morality has existed for hundreds of years. Around the world millions and millions of people share my beliefs; Are you saying you are right and they are all wrong?’
Ali looked at his father with such aggressive confidence that Parvez could say no more.

While Ali is mentioning about the “real morality” and the uprightness of his beliefs, he again categorizes the people. He thinks he is in the right place while putting the father

on the wrong side. Knowing that “millions and millions of people share [his] beliefs”, he seems to gain power. He does not admit that there are other beliefs and philosophies in the world to be supported. He is totally austere still setting walls around himself. With his famous looks, he elevates that wall. His argumentative manner when integrated with his self-assurance even frightens Parvez who can not feel courageous enough to talk any more. Therefore, Parvez’s attempt to tell Ali something of himself turns into a failure. Ali’s enmity is thoroughly felt with that scene.

5.4. Bettina’s Escape and Parvez’s Loss

One evening, while Parvez and Bettina are driving home in the car, they meet Ali on the street. “They [are] on the other side of town, in a poor district, where there [are] two mosques.” Parvez and Bettina are in that place because Bettina has visited one of her clients and Parvez has come to pick her up. But Ali’s being in that remote area is for the two mosques. “..., where there are two mosques” in the text as a relative clause is an extra information which explains why Ali is there. Meeting in a distant area, but being there for different causes is ironical. It indicates that they may exist in the same place leading different lifestyles and having different philosophies. When Parvez sees his boy, he “set[s] his face hard”. He is not glad to meet his son with Bettina in his car and Ali’s existence in the same place disturbs him. Bettina suggests to take Ali in the car. It is the first time she has seen him:

‘Slow down then, slow down!’ She said, ‘He’s good-looking. Reminds me of you. But with a more determined face. Please, can’t we stop?’
‘What for?’
‘I’d like to talk to him.’
Parvez turned the cab round and stopped beside the boy.
‘Coming home?’ Parvez asked. ‘It’s quite a way.’
The sullen boy shrugged and got into the back seat. Bettina sat in the front. Parvez became aware of Bettina’s short skirt, gaudy rings and ice-blue eyeshadow. He became conscious that the smell of her perfume, which he loved, filled the cab. He opened the window.

Bettina compares Parvez with Ali physically. He finds Ali’s face “more determined”. As she is experienced about men, her sharp observation begins to work at the very first moment she sees him. She notices the firm looks Ali bears on his face. It is interesting that Parvez does not oppose Bettina’s suggestion to talk to Ali. As he can not solve the problem by himself, he hopes Bettina’s support will be of use. Bettina’s sincerity and help are what Parvez needs at that moment. Ali is again aloof and sulky to show that he is not pleased to see them. Bettina’s sitting at the front seat is a display of friendship and support for Parvez. It shows that she is on his side, not just a customer. Although Parvez does not notice

Bettina's clothes till that moment, he "[becomes] aware of" them when Ali gets into the car. This awareness creates a kind of a diffidence in Parvez as Ali does not approve such clothing. The reader also perceives that Parvez gives importance to Ali's thoughts or it may be caused by the fear he feels for Ali can utter bad words to Bettina. His "open[ing] the window" of the car is the consequence of that consciousness. Bettina, in that scene, with her perfume-smell Parvez loves and her very attractive clothing is a symbol of everything Parvez expects to find in England. Her charm beside her frankness and loveliness are the characteristics of England as well. He finds in Bettina what he can not find in his wife and that is the same with England which is completely different from Lahore. But the allure and desirability of Bettina and England frighten Parvez in front of Ali who absolutely detests them both. Indeed what he is frightened of is a possible argument between him and his son.

This time Bettina tries to approach Ali. But her kind questions are answered harshly with scolding:

While Parvez drove as fast as he could, Bettina said gently to Ali,
'Where have you been?'
'The mosque,' he said.
'And how are you getting on at college? Are you working hard?'
'Who are you to ask me these questions?' he said, looking out of the window. Then they hit bad traffic and the car came to a standstill.

At first, Parvez's driving his car "as fast as he [can]" shows that he wants to arrive at his destination as soon as possible since he also wants to get rid of this distressing and unpleasant situation. Bettina's gentle manner and ordinary questions fail to get good responses from Ali. The car's static position in the "bad traffic" multiplies the severity of the situation and seems to be very unfortunate for Parvez who has driven his car as fast as possible. Ali's humiliation goes on as Bettina continues speaking:

By now Bettina had inadvertently laid her hand on Parvez's shoulder. She said, 'Your father, who is a good man, is very worried about you. You know he loves you more than his own life.'
'You say he loves me,' the boy said.
'Yes!' said Bettina.
'Then why is he letting a woman like you touch him like that?'
If Bettina looked at the boy in anger, he looked back at her with twice as much cold fury.
She said, 'What kind of woman am I that deserves to be spoken to like that?'
'You know,' he said. 'Now let me out.'
'Never', Parvez replied.
'Don't worry, I'm getting out', Bettina said.

‘No, don’t!’ said Parvez. But even as the car moved she opened the door, threw herself out and ran away across the road. Parvez shouted after her several times, but she had gone.

“Inadvertently” in the first sentence of the quotation above shows Bettina’s unintentional manner while touching Parvez. But this is again misunderstood by Ali who relentlessly insults her by saying “a woman like you”. With this offense, Ali exposes his hatred towards his father who loves being with Bettina. Ali tries to offend Parvez by using Bettina. Bettina is naturally irritated, but her anger can not go beyond Ali’s exasperation for he has been strongly feeling like this for a long time. With their outraged feelings and heated looks, they are as if balancing their powers. But Ali’s effort to be dominant is seen with his “twice as much cold fury” in his eyes. After all this unpleasant dialogue, Bettina can not maintain cold-blooded and calm and when her job as a prostitute is reminded by Ali, she feels she can no longer stay in the car. In fact, the first who wants to get off is Ali who has completed his criticism and insults. But Bettina reacts faster than him and ignoring Parvez’s shouts after her, she immediately recedes into a distance. She is the outsider now and she is the one who has to leave the setting. The car as a mobile setting is just like England that is a mobile place including many people from various nations who have come as immigrants but still outsiders. So the car confirms to exclude the ones who do not belong to it. Parvez and Ali stay in the car as Eastern characters while Bettina leaves out as a Western one. She has not been as patient as Parvez about Ali and his humiliations as she is only a stranger. With her run and the last sentence of the quotation above, “but she had gone”, Parvez’s expectations and plans of England cease. The opportunities it serves him disappear as Bettina is partly a figure of England. It is Ali who is to be accused now as he has completely finished Parvez off. All is lost for Parvez now.

5.5. Father’s Act of Violence and the Paradoxical Question

Parvez brings Ali home. They do not talk any more. It is useless and impossible because of Ali’s aggressive attitudes. Ali “[goes] straight to his room. Parvez [is] unable to read the paper, watch television or even sit down. He keep[s] pouring himself drinks.” While Ali is indifferent and very cold, Parvez is nervous and uneasy. He can not even do ordinary and simple things, but finds the solution in alcohol. When he can not endure any more, he goes to Ali’s room to find that he is praying. He can not stop himself to use his physical power to overcome Ali now:

Parvez kicked him over. Then he dragged the boy up by his shirt and hit him. The boy fell back. Parvez hit him again. The boy’s face was bloody. Parvez was panting. He knew that the boy was

unreachable, but he struck him nonetheless. The boy neither covered himself nor retaliated; there was no fear in his eyes. He only said, through his split lip:
'So who's the fanatic now?'

At the end, Parvez commits violence against his son. "Kick", "drag", "hit", "strike" are verbs displaying how Parvez's accumulated hatred come out as brutality. The reader partly acknowledges him to be right in his acts as he has long been provoked by his own son who now seems to deserve this punishment. According to Kaleta, "the violence is ugly, simple, and unadorned" (159). Kaleta's comment on this final paragraph is worth quoting here:

The rhetorical question at the end, asked by Ali of his likable father—"So who's the fanatic now?"—assaults any sense of narrative resolve. The question is more than a clever paradox, it is a contradictory axiom of contemporary English society that is central to Kureishi's storytelling. Here, the hybrid author picks at the scab of Asian assimilation into an Anglo society; the wound festers. His technique simply to stop a story rather than to resolve it is appropriate and powerful in this story, whose truth is not impeded by Kureishi's biographical experience or liberal philosophy. This is a contemporary question, to which there is no simple answer: "he knew the boy was unreachable, but he struck him nonetheless." Violence is not a solution here; it is an inevitability (159).

For Kaleta, although Kureishi does not approve such cruelty, he understands both Ali's menace and Parvez's disappointment. Kureishi, himself, has experienced the ethnic ferocity and by creating such a character like Ali, he points out at "the growing violent threat of this second-generation immigrant who demands a return to the traditions of Islam" (Kaleta 159). Kureishi does not use Ali's point of view but from Parvez's point of view he relates his story. Parvez's illusion is in English tradition. On the contrary, Ali believes that the answer and salvation lie in what Parvez has neglected and abandoned in Lahore. The father and son are portrayed as very distinct figures. Ali is a heated and indignant young refractory and Kureishi by using the enmity between first and second generation immigrants manifests the fissures within the Asian population in England.

In depicting this struggle between father and son, Kureishi brings the conflict between modernism, fundamentalism, and consumerism boldly to the center and proclaims that immigrant assimilation in the west and immigrant traditions from the east constitute an important English issue. Both of his Asian characters in this story are, after all, English, and changing English society cannot therefore afford to marginalize this religious conflict, because Asian-Anglos are thus already an integral part of its newly defined English nationalism (Kaleta 160).

In this story, Kureishi abundantly uses dialogues to reveal the peculiarities of his characters. All their feelings towards each other, their philosophies of the world, their

thoughts are given through dialogues. Kureishi does not give place to long explanations or long paragraphs in his story. He knows how to make his characters speak instead of him. He draws himself back while they are speaking to watch them from a distance. Therefore true-to-life characters are created in his stories and thanks to the dialogues, the tension is highly felt. His dialogues are persuasive and exciting pieces spread all over the story. They make the reader both curious and anxious about what will happen next. Kureishi even uses dialogue to highlight the significance of the climax which gains a more energetic and forceful aspect. The dynamic structure of his story is the consequence of using dialogues. The ordinary and everyday language of the dialogues bestow a fluency to the story.

Kureishi's third-person narration exhibits an objective look at his characters. By doing this, he penetrates into the characters' minds. This also helps the reader to learn much about thoughts, judgements and realities in general. His short and simple sentences let the reader make inferences which also give great enjoyment to a reader. According to Kaleta:

Clipped simple sentences and sparse exposition give the story a lean, hard-hitting edge. The short-story genre suits Kureishi's storytelling here, since there are no subplots that might distract from the impact of its central power struggle between Parvez and Ali that implodes to its inevitable violent conclusion (158).

Indeed, to finish a short-story with a sentence between quotation marks and with an event that generates question marks in the reader's mind and to leave the end of the story open for the reader's comment are peculiarities of short-story. Putting an end-focus with his final question to his story with the notion that "Last is most important", Kureishi fulfils to create an enjoyable piece with all his plainness, control and economy over his wording.

6. CONCLUSION

This study aims to relate Kureishi's three short stories "We're Not Jews", "With Your Tongue down My Throat" and "My Son The Fanatic" to a postcolonial sense. The people who live a Pakistani diaspora in England go through an identity crisis. Their effects and consequences are the subjects that have been dealt with. It is proved in the stories that Kureishi's characters are mostly taken from his own life revealing an autobiographical aspect in his books. The metropolitan Asian characters of Kureishi struggle with many hardships in West realizing that England is an illusion that does not live up to its promises. When they want to return to their native countries, they also suffer the reality that going back is harder than staying. The notions of "home" and "belonging", therefore, lose their meanings. Like Kureishi, many of the diaspora writers find the security and comfort home provides in writing. Their sense of belonging is only possible in writing. Home is where their imagination starts. Those writers also help raise some questions about the postcolonial situations.

Kureishi, with his unique observations and the characters he creates writes impressive stories. The intimacy in his voice is peculiar to all his stories. He opens windows to metropolitan life and watches the people who are created by a metropolis. The discovery of the self and establishing new identities as exiles in the West are the central point of his stories. His exceptional writer identity is also revealed with the enthusiasm in his narration while telling the most agitating truths that hurt the human nature. He shows how the problematic and complex inner worlds can be simply unveiled through unelaborated language. His control over the economically used words in his very short sentences is crucial in his creativity. "My Son The Fanatic" stops suddenly with an unexpected end and a paradoxical question while "With Your Tongue down My Throat" surprises us with his male narrator who tells all the story with a female voice. The stories do not end but stop and they still go on in the reader's mind generating new questions.

In Kureishi's three stories, the characters all go through troubles and distress. They are limited and therefore alienated. Even in his grief, Kureishi amazes us with his humour. Kaleta comments that "Kureishi balances elements in his stories, which contain both the comic and the tragic, the appealing and the unappealing, the just and the unfounded, leaving resolution of a story too close to call" (242). His characters are ordinary people. So they can not utter long, detailed and complex sentences. They can only reflect their small,

isolated and alienated worlds through the short and clear sentences. Their universe is kept alive in dialogue pieces in these stories. The dialogues also help to reveal the complex identities of the characters and their inner worlds while making connotations and creating commentary spaces in our minds. Kaleta states that Kureishi “avoids both old stereotypical and trendy revisionist motivation for his characters. He presents them and their stories with affection and without reverence” (240). For Kaleta, as Kureishi is not concerned with “politics, propaganda or popularity” but just with “telling his story”, he is principally a story-teller (240).

Kureishi is as if weaving the sub-layers of the culture of his era. He writes with a tension and sensitivity that are bred with colonial and postcolonial facts. He invites the reader to an active reading to fill in the blanks for plural meanings. He conveys his hybrid identity to his works to probe into his past and understand his present. Kaleta sees Kureishi “both traditionally English and newly English” who is “a hybrid Englishman, a Pakistani-Briton”(p.255). He categorizes Kureishi with “the new citizens of England who, in many ways, cling more tenaciously to nationalism, even while condemning it” (255).

The first story examined in this study is “We’re Not Jews”. It is important for it shows how English prejudice against Pakistanis leads to racial abuse. Azhar, the child character of the story, discovers his in-betweenness that turns his life into a meaningless whole. He is squeezed between his Pakistani family and English neighbours. Not only Azhar but also his English mother as well suffers the most of the bias and bigotry and it is the point that makes the story pathetic. The image of “home” and “homelessness” is especially given from the English mother’s point of view who is excluded by her own people. She goes through distress and hardship more than her husband who tries to be a literary man in England as a Paki. He is so much involved in his passion of writing that he can not realize what his wife suffers for and what little Azhar has discovered as a half-caste. He actually uses writing to veil his inferiority complex. The story tells us Azhar’s inheritance of this inferiority complex through his English neighbours’ assaults.

“With Your Tongue down My Throat” view two half-sisters Nadia and Nina who at meeting each other experience disappointment and disillusionment. At the end of the story, Nadia representing the East and Nina representing the West recognize that they will never come together again. The only relationship between them is their Paki father as they are half-sisters. It is intentionally shown that their emotional ties are not so strict. Kureishi uses a different style while writing his story.

He blatantly plays a trick on his readers to underscore the divisions among realities, stories and perceptions. He draws attention to the

artfulness of his creation. Here he flaunts, through first overtly identifying, and then changing, his first-person narrator, the fact that any story is a fiction framed by its point of view. Irony further separates characters' subjective visions of their worlds from the world Kureishi creates around them (Kaleta 241).

The third story of this study "My Son the Fanatic" tells the failure of a Pakistani father, Parvez, who has had great hopes immigrating to England. His assimilation and his son's endeavour not to be like his father is crucial to the story. While the son, Ali, tries to keep his Eastern self, Parvez tends to fit in England and integrate into the English society. The conflict between the father and son grows up and results in the violence at the end of the story. Ali's rebellion and Parvez's resistance to all his son's assaults and insults show how they are determined and obstinate they are in their beliefs. The dialogues between the father and the son bestow the story an energy and force that is fully felt in the climax.

To conclude, it is worth quoting from Kaleta:

[Kureishi] is a postcolonial storyteller – he redefines English national identities. That is, his storytelling remains traditional but is unique. The language is quicksilver; the point of view is objective and observational; the vehicle is humor and tragedy; the images are new and renewed images from film, history, and legend; mass media and rock'n'roll swirl throughout his global storytelling (248).

Hanif Kureishi tells richly textured stories. His style is melodic. His subject matter is the blatantly irreconcilable. His vocabulary rings with four-letter words, poetry, doo-da patter, and literary allusions. Even if he is militant about an issue, he knows as well that his militancy is preposterous. Ribald anecdotes metamorphose from hilarity into philosophical musing (256).

This study has proved that the Oriental thought, which regards the Orient (the East) and the Occident (the West) as two distinct poles while realizing and not denying the strict bound between them, is manifested in Kureishi's three short stories in its strongest sense. Kureishi's simple sentence structure with the sharp and humorous tone in his voice awards a rhythm to his writings. His statements clearly show how he balances the East and the West and how he approaches to both of them in parallel attitudes. He makes himself heard with his postcolonial tone following Fanon's advice not to wear "white masks" over the "black skins". Kureishi proves himself with his in-between identity which he makes use of. Therefore Spivak's question "Can the Subaltern Speak?" is responded in the most optimistic and hopeful way justifying that the colonized can also communicate and express their own feelings with their own voice.

7. WORK CITED

- Abrams, M.H. A Glossary of Literary Terms. 6th ed. U.S.A.: HBJ, 1993.
- Arrowsmith, Aidan. "Inside-Out: Literature, Cultural Identity and Irish Migration to England." Comparing Postcolonial Literatures. Ed. Ashok Bery and Patricia Murray. Great Britain: MacMillan Press Ltd., 2000.59-69.
- Castillo, Debra A. "Border Theory and the Canon." Post-Colonial Literatures: Expanding the Canon. London: Pluto Press, 1999.180-205.
- Çakır, Hasan. Öykü Sanatı. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi, 2000.
- Durix, Jean-Pierre. Mimesis, Genres and Post-Colonial Discourse : Deconstructing Magic Realism. Great Britain:MacMillan Press Ltd., 1998.
- Erden, Aysu. Kısa Öykü ve Dilbilimsel Eleştiri. İstanbul: Gendaş Kültür, 2002.
- Gümüş, Semih. Öykünün Bahçesi. 2.basım. İstanbul: Adam Yayınları, 2003.
- Hornung, Alfred, and Ernstpeter Ruhe, eds. Postcolonialism&Autobiography. Amsterdam: Atlanta, GA, 1998.
- Kaleta, Kenneth C. Hanif Kureishi: postcolonial storyteller. U.S.A.: University of Texas Press, 1998.
- Kureshi, Hanif, John Savage, eds. The Faber Book of Pop. London: Faber and Faber, 1996.
- Kureishi, Hanif, Love in Blue Time. U.S.A.:Scribner, 1997.
- Kureishi, Hanif. "The Rainbow Sign." London Kills Me. U.S.A.:Penguin Books, 1992. 3-37.
- MacCabe, Colin. "Hanif Kureishi on London." (An interview with Hanif Kureishi). Critical Quarterly, vol.41, no.3.37-56.
- Madsen, Deborah L., ed. Postcolonial Literatures: Expanding the Canon. London: Pluto Press, 1999.

- McClintock, Anne. "The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term 'Postcolonialism'." Colonial Discourse/ Postcolonial Theory. Ed. Francis Barker, Peter Hulme and Margaret Iversen. Great Britain: Manchester University Press, 1994. 253-266.
- McLeod, John. Beginning Postcolonialism. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Mohanram, Radhika, Gita Rajan, eds. English Postcoloniality: Literatures from Around the World. London: Greenwood Press, 1996.
- Mohanram, Radhika, Gita Rajan, eds. Postcolonial Discourse and Changing Cultural Contexts: Theory and Criticism. U.S.A.:Greenwood Press, 1995.
- Needham, Anuradha Dingwaney. Using the Master's Tools. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.
- Newman, Judie. The Ballistic Bard: Postcolonial Fictions. Great Britain: Arnold, 1995.
- Newman, Judie. "The Colonial Voice in the Motherland." Postcolonial Discourse and Changing Cultural Contexts: Theory and Criticism. Ed. Radhika Mohanram and Gita Rajan. U.S.A.: Greenwood Press, 1995. 45-57.
- Piper, Karen. "Post-Colonialism in the United States: Diversity or Hybridity?" Post-Colonial Literatures: Expanding the Canon. Ed. Deborah L. Madsen. London: Pluto Press, 1999. 14-28.
- Quayson, Ato. Postcolonialism: Theory, Practice or Process? U.S.A.:Polity Press, 2000.
- Roy, Anindyo. "Postcoloniality and the Politics of Identity in the Diaspora: Figuring 'Home', Locating Histories." Postcolonial Discourse and Changing Cultural Contexts: Theory and Criticism. Ed. Radhika Mohanram and Gita Rajan. U.S.A.: Greenwood Press, 1995.101-116.
- Said, Edward W. Orientalism. England: Penguin Books, 2003.

Singh, Amritjit, Peter Schmidt, eds. Postcolonial Theory and the United States: Race, Ethnicity and Literature. U.S.A.: University Press of Mississippi, 2000.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “How to Read a ‘Culturally Different’ Book.” Colonial Discourse /Postcolonial Theory. Ed. Francis Barker, Peter Hulme and Margaret Iversen. Great Britain: Manchester University Press, 1994. 126-150.