

Negotiating identity and ideology: the concept of the “third way” in Salman Rushdie’s literary vision

Dr. Rhitabrata Chatterjee

Assistant Professor-in-English, West Bengal Education Services, Deputy Secretary
(Academic), West Bengal Board of Secondary Education, Kolkata, India

E-mail address: rchatterjee20029@gmail.com

Abstract

This essay argues that Salman Rushdie envisions a “third way” of belonging and seeks to demonstrate how Salman Rushdie creates an alternative form of belonging, based on difference and negotiation between cultures and histories, rather than unity through sameness or ideological absolutism. The concept of ‘people-together’ created by Saleem Sinai in *Midnight’s Children* is founded upon the principles of choice, multiplicity, and commonality of goals, which rejects restrictive versions of nationalism and ideological absolutism. In Rushdie’s works, migration is not simply a geographical relocation, but a process that transforms memory, identity, and even narrative form itself. The idea of hybridity in Rushdie’s literature challenges the concepts of origin, purity, and cultural authenticity, allowing for a more dynamic and fluid approach to self-understanding and identity formation. Rejecting absolutism, Rushdie envisions society as a living network of memories, languages, and connections. In the end, Rushdie’s writing promotes a democratic and pluralistic imagination, based on diversity, coexistence, and creativity emerging from cultural interaction and historical connectedness.

Keywords:

third way; plurality; hybridity ; eclectic; migration

Philosophically, the imaginative universe of Salman Rushdie links to the pre-Socratic thought of Heraclitus. He argued that unity comes through the productive tension of opposites, not through uniformity. This idea of harmony through difference

shapes Rushdie's narrative vision. In *Midnight's Children*, the narrator Saleem Sinai envisions a community rooted in plurality. He expresses a desire for a "people-together...children-sticking-together-through-thick-and-thin," sustained by "free will" and "hope" (MC, 307). This aspiration reflects Rushdie's "third way," an intellectual and artistic framework that values multiplicity over strict ideological beliefs. The "third way" acts as a dialogic principle that aims to reconcile differences without eliminating them. Instead of depicting India as culturally uniform, Rushdie illustrates the subcontinent as historically rich and diverse, shaped by intersecting languages, traditions, and identities. Achieving this vision requires breaking down rigid cultural, ideological, and knowledge boundaries that support exclusionary identity concepts. In Rushdie's works, migration and hybridity are central to this effort. They function not just as narrative elements but as structural and epistemic strategies that confront essentialist views of culture and belonging. Migration in Rushdie's writing means more than just physical movement; it represents a broader state of intellectual freedom. Crossing geographical and symbolic boundaries expands understanding and promotes comparative views. Hybridity likewise undermines myths of cultural purity and questions the belief in fixed origins or stable identities. Through these concepts, Rushdie crafts a flexible understanding of identity, where it emerges as a dynamic formation shaped by historical encounters and cultural exchanges. Imagination plays a key role in allowing this reconfiguration of community and self. Through imaginative reconstruction, boundaries that seem historically fixed can be renegotiated. Rushdie's fiction thus dismisses the idea of "wholesight," the belief that a single, authoritative view can capture historical reality. Instead, it emphasizes plurality as a fundamental principle of knowledge and narrative. The "third way" in his writing is neither a mere imitation of Western modernity nor a commercial cosmopolitanism aimed at global markets; it reflects a deep commitment to democratic pluralism, cultural diversity, and intellectual freedom. This vision resonates with Jawaharlal Nehru's reflections, especially in *The Discovery of India*, where he views India as a civilization formed through ongoing cultural dialogue and synthesis. Nehru's concept of unity in diversity echoes Rushdie's narrative imagination, reinforcing the idea of Indian identity as

composite rather than uniform. This framework also influences Rushdie’s characters, where many challenge traditional gender norms and blur rigid lines between masculinity and femininity. In this sense, hybridity extends beyond national and cultural boundaries into individual identity, making it appear fluid and negotiable rather than fixed. To understand Rushdie’s “third way” better, we can consider the idea of holism. Holism emphasizes the interconnectedness of parts within a larger system rather than treating them separately. This idea became prominent in medical discussions through the “holistic approach,” which sees the patient as an integrated being whose physical, psychological, and environmental states are connected. Illness is viewed as a disruption in systemic balance, and healing involves restoring harmony among various elements rather than enforcing uniformity. In literary analysis, this concept serves as a helpful analogy for Rushdie’s narrative vision. In his work, diversity does not hinder unity; instead, it forms the basis for a dynamic and dialogic whole. Unity arises from the interaction of diverse elements rather than through eliminating differences. This holistic perspective develops gradually through engagement with historical complexity and varied experiences. Migration plays a crucial role in shaping this broader awareness. By crossing geographical, linguistic, and psychological boundaries, migrants encounter new cultural contexts that widen their intellectual views and promote tolerance and comparative reflection (Manecke, 226). However, Rushdie acknowledges that a complete “whole vision” is not achievable. Instead, he suggests what he calls a “stereoscopic vision,” a viewpoint grounded in multiplicity and dual perspectives (*IH*, 19). This approach accepts the inevitable partiality of human perception and rejects the illusion of total knowledge found in certain realist traditions. Literature thus becomes a contested space where diverse languages, histories, and cultural perspectives engage and challenge each other (*IH*, 427).

Central to this framework is the idea of a migrant sensibility. Global migration has created identities that rely less on territorial belonging and more on imaginative and intellectual connections. Perception resembles a fractured mirror—inevitably partial and influenced by various cultures. Rushdie is often seen as a “cloven” writer, addressing both Eastern and Western cultures without fully fitting into either (Goonetilleke, 6). Yet this state of being between cultures also brings about creative

possibilities. The migrant writer, situated at the crossroads of languages and cultures, contributes to the evolution of language itself. Experiencing the dual estrangement of being both “out-of-country” and “out-of-language,” these writers must create new expressive forms capable of conveying complex human experiences (Grant, 24). Rushdie’s fiction thus depicts life as fundamentally composed of mixtures rather than pure forms. Its richness comes from the blending of cultural, linguistic, and historical elements that enhance human experience. This acceptance of plurality lies at the heart of Rushdie’s holistic vision. For the decentered individual, migration is not just a state of displacement but a fertile ground for exploring hybridity, transformation, and the ongoing reshaping of identity (Hassan, 1).

Salman Rushdie's intellectual perspective can be placed within a broad Nehruvian framework that emphasizes secular modernity, cultural diversity, and the intertwined history of civilizations. Jawaharlal Nehru's thoughts in *The Discovery of India* offer significant philosophical context for understanding Rushdie's narrative style and that of other postcolonial Indian English writers, such as Vikram Seth, Amitav Ghosh, Shashi Tharoor, and Rohinton Mistry (Chatterjee, 42). A key element of this intellectual heritage is the idea of India as a “composite culture,” shaped through ongoing interactions among various religious, linguistic, and cultural groups. Nehru's approach to history actively challenged colonial views that portrayed the subcontinent as divided and unable to unite politically. Such colonial stories often justified imperial rule by depicting India as marked by community conflicts and instability. In contrast, Nehru argued that the Indian historical imagination has been driven by a strong urge toward unity (Nehru, 35). Importantly, this unity does not rely on cultural sameness; instead, it develops from centuries of dialogue, negotiation, and mutual influence between different traditions. Through this view, Nehru aimed to redefine Indian history as a story of integration rather than separation. In this context, secularism plays a vital role. To Nehru, secularism did not mean eliminating religion from public life; rather, it served as a guiding principle for the coexistence of different beliefs and cultural practices. Thus, Indian identity is the result of a long historical process

marked by ongoing cultural growth. Nehru famously likened India to an “ancient palimpsest,” a manuscript that has been rewritten many times, yet never entirely erased. Various cultural layers coexist without erasing earlier ones. No single layer defines the nation; instead, Indian identity remains historically rich, diverse, and complex. Its strength comes from its ability to embrace and incorporate differences.

Rushdie's views on India—especially in the essay “The Riddle of Midnight” from *Imaginary Homelands*—mirror this Nehruvian idea of national identity. He often depicts India as a place of multiple realities. The metaphor of the “crowd,” for example, symbolizes the nation, representing diversity and the coexistence of various historical experiences within a common political framework (*IH*, 32). This imaginative perspective is fully realized in *Midnight’s Children*. The protagonist, Saleem Sinai, is born at midnight on August 15, 1947, the exact moment of India's independence. His birth ties his personal fate to the nation's historical path. This connection is emphasized by a fictional letter from Nehru, which suggests that Saleem's life will reflect that of the newly independent country. Through this plot device, Rushdie blends personal experiences with national history, turning Saleem’s story into a symbolic representation of India’s postcolonial journey. Saleem's body and mind represent the nation itself. His prominent nose, similar to the outline of the Deccan peninsula, transforms him into a symbolic map of the subcontinent. With this imagery, Rushdie turns the individual into a national metaphor: fragmented yet continuous, excessive yet unifying. Saleem's narrative voice strengthens this composite identity. His storytelling weaves together elements from various cultural backgrounds, including the dramatic style of Bombay cinema, expressions from Hindi and Urdu, mythological allusions, and differing religious symbols. Language becomes a place where diverse traditions meet. The narrative form itself adopts a mixed style that reflects the complex nature of the nation it aims to portray. Rushdie has noted that modern India needs a shared imaginative story that can compete with the historical forces of religion and economic power that once supported European colonialism. By re-envisioning India as a collective narrative rooted in shared beliefs, Rushdie suggests the creation of a secular national story. Within this symbolic idea, “India” turns into a unifying tale that can challenge both sacred authority and material influence. National

identity thus appears as a dynamic narrative and ethical endeavor driven by continuous reinterpretation and historical understanding. By linking the nation's fate to the uncertain body of Saleem Sinai, Rushdie highlights the fragile nature of this imaginative concept. The story of India persists through constant retelling and rethinking across generations. However, *Midnight's Children* also reveals the conflicts between the Nehruvian vision of a secular, diverse nation and the realities of social violence, inequality, and political turmoil. In this symbolic context, Saleem serves as a fictional guardian of Nehruvian democratic ideals. His story points to what could be seen as a "third way"—a model of shared belonging based on civic diversity, emotional unity, and ethical coexistence (Chatterjee, 48). Rushdie's dedication to this vision is evident in details noted by Josna Rege, who mentions that while writing the novel, Rushdie kept a sculpture representing a unified India on his desk. Even while addressing the painful history of Partition, the novel creatively maintains the geopolitical and ethical idea of a unified India as both a historical memory and a geopolitical possibility (Rege, 199). In this light, Saleem's belief in unity amid diversity reinforces Rushdie's lasting commitment to a mixed and diverse view of the nation.

The viability of Rushdie's "third way" depends upon the capacity of India to sustain its historically composite and dialogic character (Chatterjee, 48). As long as the nation preserves its traditions of cultural interaction and plurality, the possibility of such an alternative model of collective belonging remains open. Yet Salman Rushdie also dramatizes the vulnerability of this vision through the ideological conflict between two central figures in *Midnight's Children*: Saleem Sinai and Shiva. Their opposition symbolizes competing conceptions of the nation. While Saleem imagines India as a community grounded in cooperation, diversity, and affective solidarity, Shiva represents a worldview structured by hierarchy, domination, and coercive power. The conflict between these characters thus allegorizes the enduring struggle between pluralist humanism and authoritarian nationalism. This tension ultimately produces a complex synthesis embodied in Aadam Sinai. Although Aadam is Shiva's son he is socially and symbolically claimed by Saleem. He names him after his grandfather.

Through this act of symbolic adoption, the novel gestures toward a tentative reconciliation between opposed historical forces. Aadam emerges as a transitional figure through whom the narrative imagines the possibility of a renewed national future—one that mediates between ethical aspiration and historical violence, idealism and political realism. At the same time, Saleem’s trajectory reveals the fragility of identities grounded in nostalgic absolutism. His sense of self remains deeply tied to an idealized memory of Bombay, which he attempts to preserve as a stable point of reference. The city of his childhood—populated by cinemas, laundries, comic-book shops, and colonial mansions—gradually transforms into a different urban landscape whose meanings and names no longer correspond to his earlier recollections. Although the physical spaces persist, their symbolic significance shifts irreversibly. This disjunction undermines Saleem’s narrative coherence, preventing him from reconciling the changing present with the imaginative framework through which he interprets the past. Saleem’s physical disintegration mirrors this psychological rigidity. The cracks that appear across his body function as a metaphor for the fragmentation of his consciousness. Unable to integrate new historical realities into his self-understanding, he retreats into the past and becomes increasingly detached from the evolving social world around him. His illness therefore symbolizes an imaginative failure—the inability to adapt to historical transformation. Although he retains a degree of self-awareness, he lacks the intellectual resilience required to reconstruct his identity in relation to shifting circumstances. The result is a progressive dissolution that culminates in personal collapse, reflecting the turbulence and instability of the nation whose history he attempts to narrate. Rushdie employs Saleem’s fragmentation as a narrative strategy for rethinking the nature of history itself. Rather than presenting a coherent and authoritative historical account, the novel foregrounds uncertainty, multiplicity, and the instability of knowledge. Saleem’s storytelling is marked by chronological disruptions, digressions, errors, and repeated acts of revision and recollection. Through this narrative structure, history emerges not as an objective record but as a layered construct shaped by memory, desire, and retrospective interpretation.

Within this framework, the Midnight Children’s Conference functions as a symbolic microcosm of the nation’s diversity. Saleem’s telepathic assembly includes

individuals possessing extraordinary abilities alongside those whose characteristics appear disruptive, transgressive, or morally ambiguous. The “voices” that initially appear elevated or prophetic gradually reveal themselves to be heterogeneous, fragmented, and innumerable—“as multitudinous as dust” (*MC*, 200). Their impurity is not incidental but constitutive. It is precisely this heterogeneity that forms the basis of collective identity. Recognition of such impurity underpins what may be described as Rushdie’s “third principle,” a conceptual rejection of rigid binary thinking. This principle directly challenges Shiva’s dualistic worldview, which interprets existence through oppositional categories such as strength versus weakness or victor versus victim. In contrast, Saleem advocates a mediating position capable of traversing and destabilizing these oppositions. To move “between the horns of the dilemma,” as he suggests, is to inhabit a creative space defined by difference and negotiation rather than fixed polarity (*MC*, 306). Within this space, otherness becomes a generative force through which new forms of identity and community may emerge. The narrative, however, repeatedly emphasizes the precariousness of this position. As the forces of historical violence, political disillusionment, and personal crisis intensify, Saleem’s capacity to sustain this third space gradually erodes. Although he aspires to embody hybridity and to mediate between opposing elements, he increasingly finds himself overwhelmed by pressures that reassert rigid divisions. The novel therefore does not portray the third principle as an accomplished achievement but as an unstable and contested possibility. Nevertheless, Rushdie insists that even in failure Saleem’s identity remains fundamentally composite. His subjectivity is shaped by multiple genealogies, cultural exchanges, and narrative influences. The “impurity” that defines him is not a defect but an essential condition, reflecting the complex processes through which both individual and national identities are formed. Even when Saleem struggles to inhabit the space of hybridity, his existence itself testifies to the impossibility of singular origins or pure cultural essences. Saleem’s eventual disillusionment stems from the difficulty of sustaining meaningful connections between the divided worlds he inhabits. As the hope of unity recedes, his earlier optimism gradually gives way to skepticism. Reflecting on the fate of the *Midnight’s*

Children, he suggests that if a “third principle” exists, it belongs to childhood—a period of imaginative openness that adulthood ultimately destroys (*MC*, 256). The loss of childhood innocence signifies the erosion of the pluralist imagination. What initially appears as a community capable of transcending inherited divisions gradually reproduces the sectarian and social antagonisms of the larger society. The children who once formed a visionary collective begin to replicate the prejudices of their environment. Regional rivalries, religious antagonisms, racial hierarchies, and class divisions infiltrate the conference, dissolving the fragile unity that Saleem had hoped to sustain. Despite their extraordinary abilities, the *Midnight’s Children* cannot escape the ideological structures that shape their social world. Their fragmentations underscore the profound difficulty—perhaps even the impossibility—of preserving a genuinely pluralistic ethos within a society marked by deep historical divisions. Saleem’s notion of a “third principle” also resonates with broader political ideas associated with Jawaharlal Nehru, particularly the international vision embodied in the Non-Aligned Movement. Just as the Non-Aligned Movement sought to position newly independent nations beyond the polarized alliances of the Cold War, Saleem’s conceptual framework attempts to transcend rigid ideological binaries.

It proposes an ethical space that resists forced alignment and affirms the possibility of independent judgment. The idea also bears a significant conceptual affinity with the theory of the “third space” developed by Homi K. Bhabha (Chatterjee, 52). Both frameworks emerge from dissatisfaction with the superficial deployment of multicultural discourse in late twentieth-century Britain. During the 1980s, Rushdie increasingly criticized mainstream political responses to racial inequality, arguing that official multiculturalism often functioned as a symbolic gesture rather than a transformative project. In essays such as “The New Empire within Britain,” included in *Imaginary Homelands*, he contends that state-sponsored multicultural policies frequently conceal rather than dismantle the structural legacies of imperialism and racism. Such approaches risk reducing cultural difference either to trivial lifestyle variations or to insurmountable civilizational conflicts. Against this limited framework, Rushdie’s “third principle” and Bhabha’s “third space” envision a far more radical form of cultural interaction. Rather than stabilizing identities within fixed categories, they imagine a dynamic and contested terrain in which identities are continuously

renegotiated, power relations are interrogated, and new possibilities of cultural affiliation can emerge. In this sense, the “third way” remains less a resolved synthesis than an ongoing process of negotiation—an imaginative space where plurality persists despite the pressures of history and power.

Although Saleem Sinai strongly supports the “third principle,” he ultimately fails to fully embody it. In Salman Rushdie's fictional world, the “third way” serves more as a critical way to question rigid ideological and cultural divides than as a solid achievement. For Saleem, this bridging vision connects closely with childhood, which represents innocence, imaginative openness, and the chance for ethical renewal. However, as the story unfolds, these attributes gradually disappear under the weight of fear, disillusionment, and political violence. Given the events of the novel, Saleem's commitment to the “third way” seems weakened and even defeated. Yet this apparent failure holds deeper meaning. As a self-aware and unreliable narrator, Saleem reveals the weakness of pluralist ideals in a society faced with deep divisions. His struggle to maintain the balanced position he claims does not disprove the ethical vision behind it; instead, it highlights the historical challenges of achieving such a vision. Through this narrative conflict, the novel maintains the meaningful essence of the “third way.” Saleem's personal flaws showcase the instability of pluralist principles without taking away from their inspirational value. The difference between ideal and reality emphasizes the ongoing importance of the democratic imagination that informs the text. The “third way,” even if not fully realized, remains a crucial ethical goal—an imaginative possibility that drives the novel's wider commitment to plurality, dialogue, and civic coexistence. A related thought on this imaginative and ethical aspect appears in *Imaginary Homelands*, where Rushdie comments:

What I tried to do was to set up a tension in [*Midnight's Children*], a paradoxical opposition between the form and content of the narrative. The story of Saleem does indeed lead him to despair. But the story is told in a manner designed to echo, as closely as my abilities allowed, the Indian talent for non-stop regeneration..... the narrative ...throws up new stories.....'. The form-multitudinous,

hinting at the infinite possibilities of the country—is the optimistic counter-weight to Saleem’s personal tragedy (*IH*,16).

The nation, like the novel, can be seen as an unfinished and constantly changing project. Its internal conflicts and contradictions come, in part, from the ongoing gap between the moral and artistic ideals it claims and the realities it manages to deliver (Su, *Epic of Failure*, 554). *Midnight’s Children* highlights this sense of incompleteness, revealing both the vulnerability of nationalist dreams and the instability of the storytelling methods used to express them. In this context, the birth of Aadam Sinai signals a tentative balance between conflicting historical forces. In this character, the opposing ideals represented by Saleem Sinai and Shiva—idealism and coercive power, pluralism and control—come together in a delicate mix. The narrative does not try to eliminate these conflicts; instead, it recognizes their interdependence. Saleem and Shiva serve as complementary characters whose rivalry shows that the experience of the nation cannot be simplified into a single ideological story. Regarding the narrative form, Salman Rushdie accomplishes what his protagonist cannot. While Saleem’s personal identity crumbles under the weight of historical contradictions, Rushdie’s artistic approach effectively redefines the binary structures that shape the novel. By placing opposing forces in productive tension, allowing them to overlap, and revealing their interconnection, the narrative creates a space that neither suppresses differences nor resolves them too soon. Within this imaginative landscape—built through formal experimentation and rich symbolic layering—the idea of hybridity becomes possible. The novel’s inventive structure thus achieves what its narrator fails to see: a dynamic balance between competing forces that maintains the potential for pluralist renewal.

In *Imaginary Homelands*, Salman Rushdie poses an intriguing question: can art serve as a “third principle” that connects the material and the spiritual realms (*IH*,420)? By creatively bringing both together, can it create a new way of understanding? This question reframes aesthetics as something more than decoration; it becomes a powerful force that can change our perception of reality (Chatterjee, 54). In *Midnight’s Children*, Saleem promotes love, community, and lasting friendship. He emphasizes “people-together” and “children-sticking-together-through-thick-and-thin,” contrasting sharply with Shiva’s harsh materialism (*MC*, 307). Shiva sees social life strictly through the lens of wealth and poverty, using industrial leaders Birla and

Tata as symbols of a nation focused on production and ownership, while many remain without. In his view, people risk becoming mere commodities in this economic system, treated as “things.” In contrast, Saleem’s focus on emotional and ethical connections presents a different principle rooted in free will and hope.

For Salman Rushdie, literature is an essential medium that sustains cultural and imaginative hope. Through the power of imagination, literature becomes an integral part of the global cultural dialogue that creates “new descriptions of the world” and “new maps for old” that challenge the status quo and change the way we view the world of reality (*IH*, 4). Literature becomes an essential medium that provides a space that is uniquely autonomous and resists political appropriation. This view of literature as being pluralistic is consistent with Rushdie’s view of the importance of hybridity and heterogeneity. Thus, the power of imagination becomes an essential force that transcends boundaries and becomes capable of mediating between irreconcilable differences. This view of the power of imagination is consistent with the views of Wilson Harris, who also emphasized the importance of the power of imagination in opening up new possibilities in literature. Rushdie’s experience of the fatwa issued against him on the publication of *The Satanic Verses* is an indication of the power of imaginative literature.

In *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*, Rushdie uses the metaphor of the suppression of the power of imagination through the tyrannical ruler Khattam-Shud, who wants to poison the well of imagination (39). His dislike of narrative creativity is a reflection of the fears of authoritarian systems that perceive the power of imagination as a danger to their absolute power. There are similarities between different authoritarian ideologies and the fictional character of Shiva from *Midnight’s Children* in the way they symbolize authoritarian power that values silence over dialogue. Rushdie’s defense of the power of free expression is deeply linked to the Nehruvian ideology of secular pluralism. Although Rushdie celebrates the open intellectual culture of India in the past, he is critical of the present because of the rise of intolerance and political opportunism. However, he remains hopeful that the power of imagination in literature will resist the pressures of authoritarianism and revive democratic values.

In *The Ground Beneath Her Feet*, music and photography are presented as powerful aesthetic practices through which individuals transcend the limitations of their origins, nationalities, and identities. For Ormus Cama, Vina Apsara, and Umeed 'Rai' Merchant, art becomes a means through which they negotiate their hybrid and transnational identities. The ten-year postponement of Ormus and Vina’s marriage serves as a kind of artistic discipline through which they are able to channel their emotional intensity into artistic production. Their musical partnership in the band VTO, comprised of Ormus’ musical genius and Vina’s charismatic voice, propels them to international stardom after they move to the United States. However, their meteoric rise is marred by tragedy when Vina dies in an earthquake during a concert tour. Ormus meets a violent end in New York. Through all these turbulent events, the trajectory of Rai provides a more reflective and nuanced exploration of the impact of loss and displacement. While he is haunted by his unrequited love for Vina, he eventually enters a meaningful relationship with Mira Celano. While the relationship is initiated by a sense of similarity between the two women, it eventually becomes a more profound ethical commitment that goes beyond the nostalgic. The photographic exhibition “After Vina” by Rai is a manifestation of his desire to create a memorabilia of the past, but in doing so, it is also a form of self-reconstruction rather than self-mourning. His embracing Mira and her daughter Tara, who has no biological link to Rai, also reflects a new form of belonging, which is in keeping with Rushdie’s philosophy on hybridity. This is further reinforced by the analysis provided in the text. Gavin Keulks, in his chapter “The Politics of Memory in Salman Rushdie’s Fiction” in the book *Rushdie the Novelist*, edited by Meenakshi Bharat, posits that the novel in fact reveals the potential for art, particularly portraiture, to mediate and translate trauma (Keulks, 253). Rai’s use of photography, therefore, becomes a space for memorialization where deeper meanings are revealed beyond the surface. This is in direct opposition to the spectacle created by the media on the relationship between Ormus and Vina, where Rai’s art reflects the potential for memory, creativity, and love to create a space for renewal and hybridity.

Conclusions

So, to summarize, the best way to understand Salman Rushdie's "third way" is via his concept of "mongrelization," or the ideological and the ethical acceptance of mixture. This makes room for a pluralistic philosophy based on the coexistence of different cultures and ideas, hybrids, and the importance of discussion and connection in helping us realize that there is no such thing as one pure culture or ideology; it rejects the notion that a "perfect" society exists. He argues that vitality (an individual's vitality as well as the vitality of a community) cannot exist without the presence of many different cultures, or "mongrels," interacting with one another and with their environment(s). This idea of vitality reflects the idea of holistic thinking. Just as the human body requires the whole body to function at an optimum level instead of focusing on separate body parts, so society requires multiple communities working together to create a vibrant society as well. Migration and hybridity are two areas that exemplify this idea. Displacement in Rushdie's fiction is not merely a component of the experience, but the condition for encountering people of other cultures who make it possible to break down rigid boundaries associated with geography, language, and ideology. The experience of being displaced opens up a greater awareness of the world due to the encounters with people from other cultures. These encounters challenge us to become more expansive, and to move away from our own exclusive identity. The consciousness of migrants that is shaped by their experiences and relationships with others creates a greater sense of shared community worldwide and reflects the values of the "third way." Imagination also plays a key role in sustaining this pluralistic vision. The issue of fatwa and the discussions that have arisen around *The Satanic Verses* reflect how people perceive political authority through the use of imagination in art and literature. The reaction to the book indicates that fiction is not an unimportant activity but a powerful means of transforming both ethical and political debates. For Rushdie, creative writing offers readers a broader perspective on life and alternative ways to interpret the world around them. While many critics accuse Rushdie of being masterful at creating new forms of literature by combining elements from many different cultures over time, they fail to understand that the idea of bringing together

cultural elements from different cultures has deep roots throughout history throughout the Indian subcontinent. Rushdie's incorporation of hybridism into his creative work corresponds well to the Nehruvian ideal of creating a secular democratic nation based on the concept of unity within diversity. In this respect, he speaks out often against censorship; totalitarianism; and other forms of ideologically imposed limits on dialogue as these prevent the creation of a vibrant democratic culture. The value of art as a means to liberate oneself is a major theme in Rushdie's novels. Through the use of song, visual art, theatre and oral history, the oppressed are able to utilize their creative voices to resist their oppressors by using creativity to push against boundaries imposed on them and establish their own creative freedom. In this sense, while migration may have been viewed simply as a consequence of being exiled from one's homeland, through Rushdie's works, migration has been transformed into a process which allows for the development of tolerance toward others and for standing up to society with intellectual courage, allowing freedom from oppressive cultures. Many of the main characters within Rushdie's novels exist outside of the confines defined by traditional definitions of culture, gender, and ethnicity. The theme of the fluidity between categories is a key aspect of Rushdie's beliefs about the imagination. Therefore, ultimately and on a larger scale, Rushdie believes that people exist imaginatively in their relationship with the universe, to create alternative realities that exist outside of what is determined for them, ultimately creating new life within existing cultures through their imaginative activity.

Works Cited

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.

---. “How Newness Enters the World.” *The Location of Culture*, Routledge, 1994.

---, editor. *Nation and Narration*. Routledge, 1990.

Goonetilleke, D. C. R. A. *Salman Rushdie*. St. Martin's Press, 1998. (Macmillan Modern Novelists).

Grant, Damian. *Salman Rushdie*. Northcote House Publishers, 2012. (Writers and Their Work).

Hassan, Ben-Deggoun. "Fiction as Fission: Salman Rushdie's Aesthetics of Fragmentation and Hybridity." *Political Discourse – Theories of Colonialism and Postcolonialism*, www.scholars.nus.edu.sg/landow/post/poldiscourse/casablanca/hassan1.html. Accessed 01 Feb. 2026.

Keulks, Gavin. "The Ground Beneath Her Feet and Fury." *Rushdie the Novelist from Grimus to The Enchantress of Florence*, edited by Meenakshi Bharat, Pencraft International, 2009.

Manecke, Ute. *Salman Rushdie's Concept of Wholeness in the Context of the Literature of India*. Heidelberg University, archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/volltextserver/7045/1/PublishedVersionofDissne_1F. Accessed 01 Feb. 2026.

Nehru, Jawaharlal. *The Discovery of India*. Penguin, 2008.

Rege, Josna E. "Victim into Protagonist? Midnight's Children and the Post-Rushdie National Narratives of the Eighties." *Rushdie's Midnight's Children: A Book of Readings*, edited by Meenakshi Mukherjee, Pencraft International, 1999.

Rushdie, Salman. *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*. Granta, 1991.

---. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981–1991*. Granta, 1991.

---. *Midnight's Children*. Vintage, 1995.

---. *The Ground Beneath Her Feet*. Vintage, 2000.

Su, John J. "Epic of Failure: Disappointment as Utopian Fantasy in *Midnight's Children*." *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org. Accessed 01 Feb. 2026.

---. *Imagination and the Contemporary Novel*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Author's bio-note

Dr. Rhitabrata Chatterjee is Asst. Professor-in-English (West Bengal Education Services), having experience of teaching at different government colleges in the state. He has experience of teaching for 16 years. He has also taught at West Bengal State University, as part-time faculty for two years. He has trained ATCs at the Airports Authority of India for a couple of years. He is presently posted, on deputation, as Deputy Secretary (Academic), at the West Bengal Board of Secondary Education. He has completed his M.A. in English, M.Ed, and Ph.D. in English from Calcutta University. The title of his thesis was *Third Way: Rushdie's Representation of the Sub-Continent*. He has read papers in many national and international seminars/conferences/workshops and has also been published widely, both in academic journals and newspapers-vernacular and national.