

Chapter 8

THE COLONIAL IDEOLOGY IN *MIDNIGHT'S CHILDREN* BY SALMAN RUSHDIE

Derya BİDERCİ DİNÇ¹

INTRODUCTION

This article aims to analyze the colonial ideology in *Midnight's Children* by Salman Rushdie. It explores how the colonial ideology, which is the dominant force in shaping the history and the present world of the nations, has been reviewed in the novel by Salman Rushdie. This article applies to Louis Althouser's ideological and repressive apparatuses, it probes how these apparatuses are used to stimulate the colonization of the mind and construct the colonized as subjects. In the novel, various everyday practices such as language, education, and cultural rituals are used as apparatuses to stimulate ideology in maintaining the exercise of power, putting people in the subject positions, and controlling, and subjugating the colonized people.

Colonial ideology implies a set of beliefs, attitudes, and practices that underpinned the European colonial expansion and domination of various regions across the world from the fifteenth century to the twentieth century. Colonial powers believed in their inherent superiority, they considered their culture, lifestyles, and manners as superior to those of the colonized societies. Their ethnocentric perspective was used to justify their imposing European values and systems onto indigenous populations. They adopted the civilizing mission which is a political rationale for intervention or colonization. They proposed to contribute to the spread of civilization and bring progress and enlightenment to the supposedly backward societies. This justification aimed to mask the exploitative nature of colonialism. Economic exploitation was the main purpose of colonial ideology, colonial powers sought to extract valuable resources from colonies for their own industrial development and wealth accumulation.

¹ Asst. Prof. Dr., İstanbul Topkapı University, deryabidercidinc@topkapi.edu.tr,
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-9443-7136

Cultural ideology is used to impose European cultural norms and values, thereby suppressing or erasing the identities, cultural practices, traditions, values, and languages of the colonized people. Colonial ideology was extended to the imposition of European legal systems, administrative structures, and governance mechanisms. It fosters a sense of dependency on the colonizers. Colonial powers believed in their right to control and dominate the political, and social structures of the colonies. It provides a moral justification for their discriminatory policies and unequal treatment of the colonized to maintain order and uphold the colonial projects.

To examine how dominant ideologies have been used to justify and perpetuate colonial rule and how colonial subjects have been interpellated into specific roles within the colonial framework, it is profound to appeal to the theory of ideology proposed by Louis Althusser. He depicts the theory of ideology as a system of representation that refers to the total of a person or society's dominant ideas, values, beliefs and assumptions. It shapes people's thoughts and actions. It does not reflect the real world however, it represents the imagery of relationships between individuals and the real world. It is used to maintain the status quo of the ruling class by constructing the individuals' identities as subjects and fitting them into predefined social roles and norms. It often serves the interests of the ruling class while disguising social inequalities. It is applied to colonial politics and practices through various systems including physical, institutional, and administrative.

To contribute to the dissemination of ideology, Althusser discriminates between two types of institutions; Repressive State Apparatuses (RSAs) and Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs). RSAs operate by means of mental and physical coercion and violence consisting of the police, the army, and the judiciary. They maintain control through force, and ISAs function through non-coercive means such as education, religion, family, and culture. These ISAs have a significant role in reinforcing dominant ideologies and shaping individuals' consciousness. Althusser's theory of ideology emphasizes the autonomy of ideology in shaping individuals' subjectivities and social relations. It has an impact on the fields of philosophy, sociology, cultural studies, and political theory. It offers a framework to understand how dominant ideas are disseminated and internalized within society and contribute to the maintenance of power structures.

THESIS I: these ideologies do not correspond to reality and, accordingly, constitute an illusion, we also admit that they do make allusion to reality and that we need only 'interpret' them to discover the reality of this world beneath

the surface of their imaginary representation of it (ideology = illusion/ allusion) (Althusser, 2014, p. 181).

Althusser writes on the mechanism of ideology, ideology is an illusion that is built to escape reality. The images don't represent reality, this explicitly reveals the operation of ideology in a society, he proposes a Marxist perspective on the construction, maintenance, and perpetuation of society's dominant ideas, values, and beliefs.

All sorts of relationships find their basis in binarism which forms divisions and hierarchies among individuals. In the same way, in a capitalist society, the bourgeois stands for the Subject while the proletariat stands for the subject who is to take on the roles assigned to them by the ruling class. Therefore, ideology codifies individuals as subjects and dehumanizes them. In Althusser's viewpoint, it is not unusual to claim that the way people live is ideology; every utterance is included in ideology. As long as the people act in accord with what is prescribed to them for fostering the structure of ideology, they are ideal subjects. As Althusser states, ideology 'acts' or 'functions' in such a way to 'recruit' subjects among individuals..., or 'transforms' individuals into subjects...through the very precise operation that [he has] call 'interpellation' or hailing. It can be imagined along the lines of the most commonplace, every day by (or not by) the police (2014, p.190).

This quotation states that the transformation of the individual into the position of subject comes about in every part of his/her life. Interpellation refers to the process through which individuals are hailed or called into subjectivity by ideology. Ideology addresses individuals and constructs their identities as subjects who fit into predefined social roles and norms. His distinction between Subject and subject underscores the complex relationship between individuals and ideology. It challenges the notion of the independent self by emphasizing how ideology actively constructs the way individuals perceive themselves and their social reality. This understanding of ideology as a formative and constitutive force has influenced cultural studies in analyzing social structures and power dynamics.

Althusser lists some ideological apparatuses that are used by ideology to shape individuals and deprive them of their individuality, as if a recruitment officer and a military official line them up to sustain "order," or the colonial order in a society. The list is as follows; "the Scholastic Apparatus, the Familial Apparatus, the Religious Apparatus, the Political Apparatus, the Associative Apparatus, the Information and News Apparatus, the Publishing and Distribution Apparatus, the Cultural Apparatus" (Althusser, 2014, p. 75). This short list suggests that

regardless of whether the sphere is public or private, ideological state apparatuses pervade any social domain. Individuals are interpellated by ideology to become subjects. In other words, the subject is produced by the various Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) that exist in society such as education, family, religion, and culture. These ISAs shape the way individuals perceive themselves and their roles in society and reinforce dominant norms and values.

Althusser's theory of ideology can be applied to colonial politics and practices to understand how dominant ideologies have been used to justify and perpetuate colonial rule, as well as how colonial subjects have been interpellated into specific roles within the colonial framework. In that, the colonizer can take on the role of the Subject, and the colonized subject performs the roles that the colonial ideology and discourse prescribe to them. Colonial powers used dominant ideologies to justify their colonization of other territories. They constructed themselves as superior and enlightened and described their mission as a civilizing endeavor to bring progress, development, and modernity to the colonized societies.

THE IDEOLOGICAL APPARATUSES IN *MIDNIGHT'S CHILDREN*

The colonial ideology, which is the dominant force in shaping the history and the present world of the nations, significantly influenced *Midnight's Children* by Salman Rushdie. The novel is set in the context of India's struggle for independence and its subsequent partition. In *Midnight's Children*, Rushdie uses an innovative narrative technique. It intricately weaves India's struggle for independence and its subsequent partition together with the personal narratives of characters born at the exact moment of the country's newfound freedom on 15 August 1947. Saleem Sinai, the narrator and the protagonist of the novel, is one of the 1001 children who were born at that precise moment of India's independence and gifted with magical power. This power lets them access people's minds, apprehend their thoughts, and witness their memories. Saleem becomes aware of his power when a punishment is given by his mother to him. When he reveals that he has prophetic power to his family, his power is not appreciated by anyone in his family, his father thinks that it is blasphemy, and he is forced to keep this discovery to himself. "And there are so many stories to tell, -too many, such an excess of intertwined lives events miracles places rumors, so dense a commingling of the improbable and the mundane" (Rushdie, 1981, p. 6). Pieces of thoughts and memories he knows have had a lasting impact on his mind, body, and life. He says, "I have been a swallower of lives" (Rushdie, 1981, p. 6). He swallows the bits of memories and information

that are accumulated by clinging to these people, and through his magical power and sheer snooping. Like people's inheriting property, he inherits his predecessor's memories which shape his identity.

For historical awareness, Rushdie like his narrator inherits memories and traumatic experiences from his predecessors. He uses memories to inscribe an account of the history of the Indian subcontinent. Therefore, the novel explores the history of the subcontinent through the complex dynamic of the protagonist's memory. The independence of India as a 'free' state and then the partition of it into Pakistan and Bangladesh are narrated through the protagonist. The narrative also reveals the ongoing effect of the colonial ideology. This part explores the apparatuses that stimulate the colonization of the mind and construct the colonized subjects in the novel. To some extent, the colonization of the mind is presented through two minor characters in the novel. These characters are Emil Zagallo and Mr Methwold, they present insights into the function of colonial ideology, and how the Subject of the colonial ideology has asserted the ideological power over the colonized.

First of all, this part explores the educational apparatus that includes the system of the schools. The school has an important role in European colonization, it is one of the sites utilized for reproduction of colonial ideology. Althouser underlines the tremendous power of education as an ideal state apparatus, it is one of the institutions in which ideologies are generated and reproduced. In this way, the reproduction of ideology by using the education apparatus serves the goal of the ruling class. It transfers the interpellation of the colonized subjects into European ideology in the colonial context.

Emil Zagallo is the teacher at Saleem's school who teaches geography and gymnastics. He is "fond of calling [the native students] jungle-Indians," (Rushdie, 1981, p. 405) and mostly addresses them as "savages" (Rushdie, 1981, p. 405). Though he is not an English person nor an Indian, but claimed to be a Peruvian, he feels himself superior to the Indian. In the school scene of the novel, he acts as an agent of the ideological apparatus, he speaks to the students about the contrasts between India and the West to impose the colonial discourse upon them. He shows a "print of a stern, sweaty soldier in a pointy tin hat and metal pantaloons above his blackboard," right after calling the students "savages," stating that "[t]hees man eez civilization" (Rushdie, 1981, p. 405). Apparently, he draws a dichotomy between the Indian students and the colonial Subject, and through this imagery, he implements the colonial ideological discourse to the minds of the colonized. The critique of the colonization of the mind here is that though Zagallo himself is

not an English but a 'bastard' of some man of Anglo origin and a Goanese mother, he still carries on the perception of the Indians by the Europeans. He is one of the educators who have internalized and propagated this dangerous developmental narrative of assimilation to European models.

Moreover, he furthers this colonial argument by associating the face of Saleem with the map of the Indian subcontinent, so the nation imagines and writes Saleem's body as a symbol. His body symbolizes "in its effects and arousals, becomes both a place where meaning is enacted and a creator of meanings" (Brooks, 1993, p. 38). He intends to show what 'human geography' is and mockingly he says, "in the face of these ugly ape you don't see the whole map of India?" (Rushdie, 1981: 409). He goes on mocking "These stains, he cries are Pakistan! This birthmark on the right ear is the East Wing, and these horrible stained left cheek, the West! Remember, stupid boys: Pakistani ees a stain on the face of India!" (Rushdie, 1981, p. 409) Beforehand he calls the face "hideous" belonging to "thees primitive creature" (Rushdie, 1981, p. 408). Saleem Sina's face functions as a map that shows the whole Indian nation, his body represents his nation.

As an ideological apparatus of the colonial discourse, Mr Zagallo tries to brainwash the Indian students against the Indians so that he can colonize their minds. When he asks what that face resembles, the enthusiastic responses include the 'devil,' and 'a vegetable,' after which Zagallo calls them "sons of baboons" (Rushdie, 1981, p. 408) and Saleem as the ugly ape. This analogy of Saleem's face and India is the allegory of the colonial ideology: According to this mindset set by ideological state apparatus, the students stand for India and their ugliness is foregrounded by the ideological spokesperson and what is more is that India is dehumanized, despised and insulted.

The colonial domination was achieved, through the formation of the westernized local elite. In his statement to parliament in 1835, Lord Macaulay states "[w]e must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern, -a class of persons Indian in blood and color, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and intellect" (Macaulay, 1835, p. 8). This statement brought solution to the disputes between Orientalists and Anglicists, his statement encharged a responsibility to the colonial administration for the education of the Indian. English language and literature are instituted as the apparatuses for ideological dominance and subjugation of the colonized subjects. Emil Zagallo is an English in taste, morals, and intellect, he tries to impose these tastes, morals, and intellect upon the Indian children. In addition to him, Saleem's grandfather who was educated and Westernized visited

foreign nations, after completing his education he sees things in India differently and sees India “through traveled eyes” (Rushdie, 1981:8).

The writer uses the motif of the subdued, controlled, written body in the novel. Saleem’s birth represents the birth of a free Indian nation, his body appears as a passive entity, he states “clock-hands joined palms in respectful greeting, as I came” (Rushdie, 198:5). Saleem’s hands metaphorically symbolize his life’s being subject to his nation and his nation’ being handcuffed to the colonial history. Saleem appears as a part of the nation. As we learn from the prime minister’s letter, he is one of the 1001 midnight’s children who “are the newest bearer of that ancient face of India which is also eternally young” (Rushdie, 1981, p. 214). The distinction between subject and Subject underlines the idea that individuals who encounter ideology aren’t autonomous entities. Saleem is in the position of subject.

Saleem talks about the body as if he is talking about a nation, he says “The body...is homogeneous as anything” (Rushdie, 1981, p. 419). “Indivisible, a one-piece suit, a sacred temple... it is important to preserve this “wholeness” (Rushdie, 1981, p. 363). He talks about his body as a sacred temple when he relates it to the nation, Saleem is handcuffed to history, he is obliged to history and he becomes “the mirror-of-the-nation [that] bestowed upon them” (Rushdie, 1981, p. 762). However, he forgets that it is a subject or handcuffed part of the history and the reality of colonialism. His body wants to appear as an imagined wholeness like his nation’s desire to have wholeness. Saleem is aware that one part of the body represents the whole. In the same way, Nehru imagines that a subject is identified with a whole. The body and the subject are regarded as the allegory of the nation. “The individual is not to be conceived as a sort of elementary nucleus, a primitive atom, multiple and inert material on which power comes to fasten or against which it happens to strike, and in so doing subdues or crushes individuals” (Foucault, 1980, p. 98).

Moreover, in the novel, there are other characters whose bodies are fragments of reality, the nation. Like Saleem’s body, his grandfather Aziz’s body has been written or interpellated by a foreign nation, he sees things in India differently after completing his education, he sees India “through traveled eyes” and Saleem describes a Pakistani politician called Ayub. The politician has “an astonishingly round head, round as a tin globe although unmarked by lines of longitude and latitude; planet-headed, he was not labeled like the orb which the monkey had once squashed; not made as England” (Rushdie, 1981, p. 509). Metaphorically, his head is an empty globe and the label “made as England” on the Pakistani politician’s round head refers to England’s inscribing colonial ideologies on the

colonized world. The images coincide with the substance in the world of the symbol, “the symbol postulates the possibility of an identity or identification, allegory designates primarily a distance about its origin, and renouncing the nostalgia and the desire to coincide” (Man, *Rhetoric of Temporality*).

Then, in the ideological and colonial context, discourse and violence complement each other, as confirmed by Althusser. Therefore, we can answer the question of how ideology does all these “recruitment” and “transformation” operations. Yet, what if individuals do not submit to the hegemonic overflow of ideology? Then, the Repressive State Apparatus, composed of coercive forces of the Army, the Police, and prison houses, comes and intervenes. They function by coercion while the Ideological State Apparatuses function by ideologies. Thus, they, in cooperation, hover over the subjects as a controlling and disciplining structure belonging to the public sphere. The Repressive State Apparatus is there to lead people to full submission to ideology, which regulates the productive forces and reproduces the existing relations of production to maintain its claim over its subjects. The subjects, constructed through ideology, help to generate and reproduce it.

This ideology which is grounded on imagination confirms Althusser’s thesis of ideology aforementioned in the introduction, as it is directly related to the genuine conditions of existence, later on in the same scene, the apparatus violently harms Saleem -- the imaginary racial relations turn into violence, physical damage, which would even kill him. Emil Zagallo mutilated Saleem’s body, he punished him by pulling his hair. Saleem loses some of the hair to Emil Zagallo. Therefore, it is related to the idea that the imagination is about being an Indian and an Easterner and this myth of nation and race determines the physical welfare of a subject as well. Likewise, the colonization of the mind of Zagallo robotizes him into an enemy of the East and on the physical ground transforms him into a violence-machine, he is a subject who imposes the colonial ideology both through discourse and violence.

All these apparatuses of the colonial ideology are embodied by Zagallo, he teaches the students that they are inferior, and uncivilized through binaries and through drawing the relations between the body and geography besides the mind. Yet, the narrator is well aware of the fact that these things are not so. The narrator refers to his helplessness and ridicules him through his characteristics like his voice: “a bare, scraped voice emerging from the face of an anesthetized frog” (Rushdie, 1981, p. 406). Therefore, it is understood that the body is an allegory of the nation, which aims to define the subject, and the body allegory proves that

power “writes” the subject. Saleem represents the body of the Indian nation “My destinies indissolubly chained to those of my country” (Rushdie, 1981, p. 5). The nation inscribes itself in the body of the subject.

The narrator challenges the idea of nation which is an ideological product, derived from the Western epistemology, and Saleem is made to “become the consciousness of this new ‘nation that had never previously existed’” (Heffernan, 2000: 474). In addition, Robert P. Marzec deals with this aspect of the nation-narration as a construct: “He “drowns” this narration in the “bubbling scent-stew” that is the nomadic movement of the fluid land and its people, and thus takes the first step in challenging the normative role of the novel as an artifact for buttressing an ideologically constructed, colonized culture” (Marzec, 2016, p. 165). In this quotation, Marzec argues that Rushdie’s novel does not support the ideologically-arranged colonial discourse that the Indians are “lower” or “inferior,” as it lays bare the colonial discourse as a construct, in this respect, the nation is a construct. Through the revelation of “the loss of identity in the signifying process of cultural signification with a certain point in time and space” (Bhaba, 2014, p. 728). This leads the colonized to have the inability to associate themselves with a certain point in space and time, the narrative disrupts this ideology, creating a rupture in the colonial discourse and epistemology, and by acting in a fluid and nomadic, unsettled manner emphasizing the liquidity of identity over time and space instead of certain points; the narrative plays with the narration that gave rise to the nation and reverts the colonial novel’s role, writing back to the Empire, shedding light on to the artificiality of nations and parodying the ideological and repressive apparatuses taking place both in the imaginary and the real registers.

Furthermore, colonialism is the production of the ideology in other words, it is a state of mind, which goes beyond the political and economic annexation of a country or nation. It produces a peculiar mindset in the colonized people that leads them to perceive themselves as inferior and the colonizer as superior in all matters of civilization, political or cultural, states Mridula Garg when she talks about the effects of colonialism, she refers to “the colonial project not only as a means of robbing the colonized of their physical environment but their minds as well, which is often known as the colonization of the mind” (Garg, 2009, p. 183). Accordingly, this process of colonization of the mind, as clear in Garg’s expression, makes the colonized internalize the sense of inferiority imposed upon them by the colonizer, This leads them to look up to the colonizer and despise and even hate themselves through a certain alienation from their people and culture. These two points, the “inferiority” and “superiority” of the colonized and the colonizer

are respectively perceived and internalized by both of them. The alienation of the colonized from one another and their culture, are underlined in terms of the impact of colonization.

Zagallo represents the colonial discourse, though himself a colonized. Using the racist approach towards the Indian boys, he reveals what is projected onto him: Racism is accepted as a justification for colonization. This racist discourse finds ground in Zagallo's voice and mind through mimicry, which results from the imperial rule. Explicitly, it is the consequence of a [mis]conception that the East developed with the help of the West. According to Frantz Fanon, not only must the black man be black; he must be black about the white man," Fanon creates a binary between the white and the black, "[t]he black man among his own in the twentieth century does not know at what moment his inferiority comes into being through the other (2008, p. 83).

Explicitly, the colonial discourse has changed the way they perceive the world and this colonial language resonates via Zagallo in the novel. This serves the colonial ideology that the natives cannot define themselves on their own but in accord with the colonizer. The positive qualities of the dichotomy of black and white, the East and The West, the primitive and the civilized, are attributed to the colonizer. Therefore, the colonized people are dissociated from their own identities and leave their histories.

Mr. Methwold is the owner of the Methwold Estate, he is said to be the original descendent of one of the colonizers in the East India Company. He has a building in the British style that is comprised of four uniformed compartments. The character Mr Methwold and the Methwold Estate represent the British colonial rule in India as a microcosm of Britain. The allegory is highlighted by the names of the houses which are given after European palaces: "Versailles Villa, Buckingham Villa, Escorial Villa, and Sans Souci" (Rushdie, 1981, p. 151). He wanted to retain British culture by naming them after the palaces of Europe. Through the cultural elements of Europe, the continuation of the Western ideology and the existence of the European culture is in the scene. The power shifts from British rule to India's independent governance and this exchange of power is made obvious in the sale of the Estate. However, still a powerful figure, the Englishman sets the rules of the sale: "that the houses be bought complete with every last thing in them, that the entire contents be retained by the new owners; and that the actual transfer should not take place until midnight on August 15th" (Rushdie, 1981: 160). He desires to keep the English culture in India alive as long as possible. What can be inferred from the game of the departing colonial is that even though there is little

power he has, he still wants to keep his authority and he intends to give away the house to the Sinais like Britain's giving India back to the Indian, which makes the scene a comical point in the novel in that he still wants to exercise power due to the success of the colonial rule in his opinion as clear in his description of it and propagandizes on behalf of colonialism, "[reasoning] like the king, who, being sent on the frontier, called out 'what will become of my poor subjects without me?'" (Kropotkin, 135).

William Methold as the stereotypical orientalist, believes that the colonized are not able to govern their country without the proper guidance of the British. This reflects the struggle between the British and Gandhi during the British freedom struggle. He continues his colonial discourse. William Mr. Methwold comments on British governance to Ahmed Sinai, he reflects the orientalist approach, the orientalist approach is supported by the advancements in India brought about by the British. He says,

[h]undreds of years of decent government, then suddenly, up and off. You'll admit we weren't all bad: build your roads. Schools, railway trains, parliamentary system, are all worthwhile things. The Taj Mahal was falling until an Englishman bothered to see to it. And now, suddenly, independence. Seventy days to get out. I'm dead against it myself, but what's to be done? (Rushdie, 1981, p.139)

This statement is proof that the colonizers feel themselves as the agents of development and enlightenment. By changing the Indian institutions, they project themselves as significant servants of humanity. However, Amina, or former Mumtaz criticizes the British, "Look at the stains on the carpets, janum; for two months we must live like those Britishers?" (Rushdie, 1981, p. 161). The narrator consciously juxtaposes the power of the colonial rule and the newly-independent-to-be Indian people, this shows that an Indian woman who would have been despised and insulted by the English a few decades earlier criticizes the way the Empire acts. Yet, the colonization of the mind is not over, the colonial ideology is still at work when Ahmed Sinai talks to Mr. Methwold, his voice changes "in the presence of an Englishman [becoming] a hideous mockery of an Oxford drawl" (Rushdie, 1997, p. 161) and later calling him "a fine man," "a person of breeding," and "honour" (Rushdie, 1981, p. 162). It is not implicit that Ahmed as an Indian figure still carries the traces of the colonization of the mind, in the presence of the colonial-ideological apparatus of the Empire, he still settled in the land of the subjects.

In the voice of Ahmed Sinai, the colonial ideology's impact echoes, he tries to be similar to Mr Methwold. Methold estate represents the colonial domination and functions as the microcosm of Europe, now Mr Methwold is departing. Why is it important?

[T]he country house represents a prominent object of nostalgia in both novels and postwar British society more generally because of its long-standing associations with continuity, tradition, and Englishness. Since the eighteenth century, Virginia C. Kenny argues, the country house represents a metaphor for a good society (9). It became a central icon of British heritage in the postwar era because its presence belies the cultural turbulence caused by increasing emigration from the colonies, chronic unemployment, economic depression, and the resurgence of regionalism within Scotland, Ireland, and Wales (Su, 2002, p. 554).

From the statement above, it is understood that in British estate novels, a certain stereotype of Britain is symbolized by the house or the estate. An estate highlights the "glory" of the past, longing for the power, it is now taken by the colonized. It functions as the center of power, with the exchange of the rule, the power is given to the colonized. As the phrasing is mostly attributed to Ibn Khaldun, "geography is destiny," and any change in geography or topography can affect those who live in it, and figuratively, it can be concluded, in this sort of novel, that the estate is the geography. Moreover, the glory and stability or the decline of that geography, which, in the estate novel, is laid before our eyes within the structure of the house, which is a metaphor for the country. As such, in the English case, there is this certain type of estate, a sort of monument on which "nationalisms forge solidarity through 'invented traditions'" and which "function[s] as sites for commemorating the putative national past (Su, 2002, p. 554). That is why Methwold does not want anyone to touch anything in the house till he leaves as he cannot accept the decline of power and his cultural artifact' being nativized/Indianized. That is where he seemingly stands in the novel. A colonial is a colonial until he is no longer there, The Methwold estate, therefore, stays as an ideological state apparatus of the colonial Subject for the colonial subjects.

Furthermore, there is a constant tension between the colonizer and colonized, between the Orientals and the occidentals in the novel. The colonizers try to change postcolonial history, they attempt to invent a new history for the colonized, Mr. Methwold states that his ancestor had planned to construct Bombay City. This is the reflection of colonial ideology that buries the past under the forces of Orientalism. Ahmet Sinai questions this imperialistic strategy to efface precolonial history. He asks a question to Methwold "[w]ith our ancient civilization, can we

not be as civilized as he?” (Rushdie, 1998, p. 167).

The colonizers try to impress the minds of the natives by constructing the myth of Europeans as the civilized who bring civilization to the awkward, uncivilized, barbarian. They try to impress the natives' minds with their heroism, Evie Burness, an English girl, shoots many cats, however, she poses heroism by saving the community. She says, “[y]ou Indians c’n thank your stars you got me around, ...or you’d just’ve got eaten by these cats” (Rushdie, 1981, p. 397). Evie Burnes pretends to be the savior of the community, this presentation is taken up by natives most of the time, however, Saleem’s sister, Brass Monkey, who loves animals becomes frustrated with this English lady. Her questioning of Evie’s act represents the postcolonial spirit.

Moreover, to talk and write about Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children*, colonial ideology should be mentioned through the metaphor of rape. As it is known, Saleem Sinai’s biological father is Mr Methwold and his mother is an Indian woman. For the issue of rape, there are many different ideas and opinions about it. Some say it is up to people’s will. Yet, if there is a hierarchy and one has to make love to the “superior,” on the surface, there appears no violent rape. The rape of women symbolizes the rape of the land, the colonization of India in the novel. In *Rhetoric of English India*, Sara Suleri writes on the issue of colonial rape, she describes the trope of colonialism as rape. Even, in their anti-imperialist rhetoric of independence, Indian nationalists such as Nehru, described the colonization of the subcontinent in terms of stereotypical sexual aggression: “They seized her body and possessed her, but it was a possession of violence. They did not know her or try to know her. They never looked into her eyes, for theirs were averted and hers cast down through shame and humiliation.” While it requires a Salman Rushdie to read and to disrupt the aggression of shame-its traversals between “male” and “female” discourse in the stories of colonialism-the obsolescence of the figure of rape is too naked in its figuration to allow for a sustained reading of the valences of trauma that the sexual symbolism of colonialism indubitably implies (1992, 16-17).

Accordingly, we can create an analogy between colonialism and patriarchy. Both have been based on binary oppositions – in the colonial context, this sort of dichotomy is referred to as “the Manichean allegory” (Jonmohamed, 1995, p. 20). Through these binaries, in Structuralist terms, the colonizer is the signified and the colonized the signifier. Similarly, in patriarchy, the woman signifies the man whereas in colonialism, the colonized signifies the colonizer. In colonial ideologies, it is seen that the hierarchy is more intense and the women are lower

than the colonized man. Therefore, penetrating the country/ colony results in the penetration of the mind and the body of the colonizer. The female body is associated with the country, which can be violated in the colonial perspective and the colonial ideology. That is why Zagallo can liken the face of Saleem to the Indian map and damage it violently. In addition, colonial ideology's juxtaposition of the woman and the land is found in Fanon: "[He] describes the spatialization of colonial occupation in vivid terms. For him, colonial occupation entails first and foremost a division of space into compartments [. . .] and it is premised on the principle of reciprocal exclusivity" (Mbembe, 2003, p. 26). This way, the colonial can know where to intervene in and whom to interfere with. Through the division of space, the colonizer can assert its authority without damaging its own. As Mbembe indicates, "Colonial occupation itself was a matter of seizing, delimiting, and asserting control over a physical geographical area-of writing on the ground a new set of social and spatial relations" (Mbembe, 2003, p. 25), this sort of spatial distinction is seen in Methwold's division of his sphere, i.e., the Methwold estate when he is there from the culture and the land of the Indians, and at the same time, he rapes the native woman and still keeps a stance from her to preserve the Englishness.

Lastly, all these divisions and distances and closeness show us something: the colonial ideology presents a binary between the colonized and the colonizer, setting the latter in a higher position. On the other hand, the black-and-white juxtaposition does not work as intended for the colonizer and the racist-colonial-ideological discourse of the colonizer collapses, through the hybrid characters, it is seen that the colonial ideology tries to materialize the immaterial, repeat the unrepeatable through the superiority and inferiority discourse, which proves the discourse's and the ideology's artificiality and quality of being a narration only.

Their encounter with the colonizer influences one's recognition and reflection of his ethnicity. There are references to the conflicts that spring from disharmony in ethnicity in the novel. By using certain colonial policies, the colonizers have manipulated the ethnic differences in the colonized countries for their welfare. In the novel, there are many examples that reflect the ethnic tensions. The characters reflect their relations to a particular ideology by adhering to certain values ideals and behaviors. The rise of the ethnic conflicts has been influenced by the colonizers. There are two approaches to dealing with the ethnic differences that are personified by Aadam Aziz and Naseem Aziz, Adam Aziz adopts the other culture while Naseem Aziz tries to assert his ethnic identity against the foreign influence. While talking about the Indian freedom struggle in Amritsar, Aziz comments

that the British's acceptance of the Rowlatt Act is a mistake. He underlines the ethnic traits of Indians, he depicts Indians as fearless, brave, and rebellious to the colonizers. Aziz cannot decide to support which side. Tai considers Indians as brave and Kashmiri as cowards and also he highlights the conflict of Kashmir with India and Pakistani. Tai says, "Kashmiris are different. Cowards" (Rushdie, 1981, p. 49). There are reflections of conflicts, contradictions, and attempts of violence based on ethnic discrimination.

The first feature film the *Lovers of Kashmir* represents Western influence on Indian culture and theatre, Hanif's wife Pia acted with Nayyar, "Pia kissed an apple, sensuously, with all the rich fullness of her painted lips; then passed it to Nayyar, who planted, upon its opposite face, a virilely passionate mouth" (Rushdie, 1981:250). This represents the imperialist policy of imposing Western fashion on the societies of the Indian subcontinent. The behavioral ideals of the Indian people change. Western lovemaking takes the place of the Indian way of expressing love with shyness. It is not easy for the Indian people to adjust to foreign ways, the conflict becomes more obvious when Indians feel disturbed by their exposure to European culture. For instance, Ahmet Sinai is sarcastic about the British lifestyle while talking to his wife. "it's true my God, they wipe their bottoms with paper only!" (Rushdie, 1981, p. 161).

To sum up, this study explores cultural ideology in *Midnight's Children* by Salman Rushdie by giving examples of apparatus such as education, ethnicity, the political, the family, the communication apparatus (theater), and the cultural apparatus (Literature, the Arts, sports, etc.). These apparatuses are used by the power to impose ideologies. Various physical, institutional, and administrative systems and knowledge are used to maintain the exercise of power and to control people

CONCLUSION

Rushdie's narrative brilliantly captures the collision of cultures, the turmoil of political upheaval, and the intricate power dynamics that defined the colonial period. Through his characters, Rushdie explores the impact of colonial ideology on the lives and identities of the Indian people. The narrative critiques the colonial discourse and relations. This article explores the colonial ideology in his novel, it aims to analyze how the colonial ideology, which is the dominant force in shaping the history and the present world of the nations, significantly influenced Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*. It explores colonial ideology by making references

to Althusser's apparatuses. It analyses how colonizers and the nation-state in the novel use the educational apparatus, that is the system of the schools, the family, the legal, the communication apparatus, and the cultural apparatus. The political apparatus that is a political system, including the different parties, They use these apparatuses to impose their ideologies.

REFERENCES

- Althusser, L. (2014). *On the reproduction of capitalism: ideology and ideological state apparatuses*. London, New York: Verso.
- Bhaba, H. K. (2014). Dissemination: Time, narrative, and the margins of the modern nation. Dorothy J. Hale (Ed.), *The Novel: an Anthology of Criticism and Theory* (716–733). Blackwell
- Brooks, P. (1993). *Body work: objects of desire in modern narrative*. USA: Harvard University Press
- Fanon, F. (2008). *Black skin, white masks*. London: Pluto Press
- Foucault, M. Truth and power. C. Gordon (Ed.), *In Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings* (pp.1972-1977), New York: Pantheon Books
- JonMohamed, A. R.(1995). the economy of manichean allegory. (Eds.), in *the post-colonial studies reader*. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. (pp.19-23).New York: Routledge
- Garg, M. (2009). Literature as de-colonization. *Indian Literature*, 53(1 (249)), 183–187. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23348502>
- Heffernan, T. (2000). Apocalyptic narratives: The nation in Salman Rushdie's "midnight's children". *Twentieth Century Literature*. 46. 470. 10.2307/827843.
- Kropotkin, P. (2002). Anarchism: Its philosophy and ideal. Roger N. Baldwin (Ed.), in *Anarchism: A collection of revolutionary writings* (pp.114–144). Dover Publications
- Macaulay, T. B.(1835).Minute. <http://home.iitk.ac.in/~hcverma/Article/Macaulay-Minutes.pdf>
- Man, P. D. The Rhetoric of Temporality. <http://www.michaelbryson.net/academic/deman.html>
- Marzec, R. (2016). *Ecological and postcolonial study of literature: from Daniel Defoe to Salman Rushdie*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. Public culture. Duke University Press, *Project Muse*, 15(1), 11–40. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/39984>
- Rushdie, S. (1981). *Midnight's children*. Random House Trade Paperbacks.
- Su, J. J. (2002).Refiguring national character: the remains of the British estate novel. *Modern Fiction Studies*, 48(3), 552–580. www.jstor.org/stable/26286690.