

Identity Dynamics And Ideological Conflicts In Characterization Of Banda And Bulha—From Extremism To Mysticism In Shahid Nadeem’s “Bulha”

Amna Tariq¹, Zafar Iqbal Bhatti², Anila Akbar³

¹Lecturer, Department of English University of Education Lower Mall Campus Lahore, Pakistan.

²Assistant Professor, DLC, School of Liberal Arts University of Management and Technology Lahore, Pakistan

³Lecturer, DLC, School of Liberal Arts University of Management and Technology Lahore, Pakistan

ABSTRACT:

This research paper is the study of identity dynamics in two opposite characters of Banda and Bulha with two different approaches of Extremism and Mysticism in relation with ideological conflicts through lens of Lacan’s “Mirror Stage.” In characterization of Banda and Bulha, the conflict between individual and social ideology is inevitable and individual’s identity forms or deforms in relation with it but roots of identity dynamics lie in the unconscious formation of identity in the phase of “Mirror Stage.” Mirroriness haunts an individual’s social identity formation. The play deals with making and breaking of Ideals that set and reset the goals for both characters. Bulha and Banda as children make an “ideal image” of them in the mirror and fall in love with it. When they grow up they “misrecognize” that image in the world and find their *i* very weak in comparison with other identities. The next step they take is to associate their *i* with any strong *I*. Therefore, their image of Ideal self is replaced by Ideology’s Ideal and Big- *I*’s Ideal. Ironically, Ideal that they consider to strengthen their *i* end up swallowing their *i*.

Keywords:

Identity, Mysticism, Extremism, Ideology, Effacement, Ideal

Article Received: 10 August 2020, revised: 25 October 2020, Accepted: 18 November 2020

1. INTRODUCTION

The dawn of Twentieth Century brought with it the progress and conflicts of its own. At one side humanity saw the beauty of human intellect as man and machine progressed hand in hand. On the other hand, humanity emerged with its horrific face encapsulated in progress. As a result we have seen conflict of ideological violence on the name of religion, nationalism, race and World War at the end.

In all the incidents of conflicts as we have witnessed in previous century, it is very evident that human actions and their violence cannot be seen in isolation. It is not simply a matter of anger or personal revenge. It is a group’s behavior which is not certainly coincidence. The formation of ideological violence is a systematic procedure that needs to be investigated on individual level. It is important to see what goes on in an individual’s mind when he no longer remains himself and reacts irrationally. What is the reason that one person loses his identity? Or what hindrance he faces in his identity formation that he becomes his own “other.”

Formation of identity is a highly complex and subjective experience which many researches have tried to answer. In order to define identity in course of this article, identity is a kind of unique characteristics of an individual that differentiates him from rest of the world. Identity is what an individual is all alone at the time of his existence without any relation, context and classification. It is his independent *i*.

Ideology is a complex discourse. Ideology is “thoroughly muddled by diverse uses” (Converse, 1992, pp. 207). The connotations associated with the concept have undergone transformations (Knight, 2006, pp. 625). There are many explanations of ideology given by different critics. However, in context of this article, Ideology is a mixture of religious, institutional and political belief in Banda’s case. It is considered as a belief which is followed by an individual or group as his identity.

2. Research Objectives, Research Questions and Significance of the Research

The purpose of this research paper is to study identity dynamics in two opposite characters of Banda and Bulha with two different approaches of Extremism and Mysticism in relation with ideological conflicts through lens of Lacan’s “Mirror Stage.” This research questions what ideology and identity are in relationship with each other. In this research article, the conflict between individual and social ideology is explored to investigate individual’s identity formation or deformation in relation with it. This paper questions if identity formation is a conscious act or not and how far it dominates the life of Banda and Bulha. This paper will prove that how the roots of identity dynamics remain in the unconscious formation of identity in the phase of Lacan’s “Mirror Stage.” This article tries to explain how

*Mirroriness*¹ haunts an individual's social identity formation. This paper also questions why Banda and Bulha remain in quest of identity and never reaches to what they claim?

This article further explores making and breaking of Ideals that set and reset the goals for both characters (Banda and Bulha). Identity inverts or subverts in pursuit of these Ideals since Ideal's identity is replaced by the individual's identity but unconscious part of identity remains dominant all the life. The quest for Identity as a whole proves that there is no possible existence as independent *i*. The quest of Identity is an illusion.

This research paper is significant contribution to give psychological understanding of the individuals in pursuit of their goals. It explores how far individuals are responsible in their choices and how these choices may affect societies. This research is significant enough to understand that paradigms such as Extremism and Mysticism as social behaviors are not very simple. They cannot be explored unless individuals are psychologically studied and paradox of identity dynamics is understood.

3. Literature Review

Formation of identity is a highly complex experience which many researchers have tried to answer. Weinreich explains it as "totality of one's self-construal, in which how one construes oneself in the present expresses the continuity between how one construes oneself as one was in the past and how one construes oneself as one aspires to be in the future" (1986, p.p 302). The major factors that help forming one's identity occur through one's identifications with social factors like "significant others" basically with parents and other individuals during one's life experiences, and also with members of society. When an individual's characteristics are similar to one group and individual wants to process that in construction of his *Ideal-self-Image*, this identification is called, a process of idealistic-identification that is constructive.² When an individual wants to dissociate himself from the characteristics of one group, this identification is destructive and is called a process of defensive contra-identification³ (Weinreich and Saunderson, 2003, p.p 54–61). It is evident from Weinreich's argument that Individuals are not born in chaos. They are born in context of society that imposes multiple identities on them. This argument is further enhanced by Amartya Sen. Amartya Sen says in *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny* that there is a normal illusion that identity is fixed in communitarian philosophy. Fixity of identity is a natural and pre-destined act and is referred

as singular identities. There is no will of individual to take decision of his identity in his own hands. (Sen, 2007). Daniel M. Wegner in *The Illusion of Conscious Will* further increases the argument made by Sen by saying that Conscious will's formation is from the process that seems volunteered but roots of which lies in psychological development. The illusion of will shows that acts are volunteer but the authorship of one's own action can be lost, it can be transferred from *self* to other factors easily, people, groups and so many things (Wegner, 2003). In the articles discussed above it is quite evident that identity is dependent on multiple factors. One more article that reinforces the concept of independent identity and how it remains at risk is explained by Descartes.

Descartes in *Discourse On Method And Meditations On First Philosophy* talks about the idea that individual and mob are two different ways of doing one thing. Individuals are superior in terms of intellect because their work had a plan and force of work is in one direction. In a way, he further says that mobs destroy the uniqueness and make us stop questioning the structure. Descartes means one individual eventually becomes the structure instead of keeping his uniqueness. This is a social and political strategy to control individuals (Descartes, 1998).

Bruce Hood's *The Self Illusion: How the Social Brain Creates Identity* talks about the proof that the very perception of complete *self* is an illusion because it is not like what we see. It is a shadow and not the substance. It is not the kind of reality which has an objective existence but is a myth of brain that constructs from time to time by coding and decoding information in interaction with society (Hood, 2012).

As the subtitle of the book suggests How the Social Brain Creates Identity, the self-illusion in this case is an unavoidable experience one needs for colliding with society. This influence of self cannot be ignored by any way. But one should be skeptical to the "so called" integrated entity of self we think our self is. Hood says that our brain makes story that gives the realization of the self. This is this sense of ego that forms identity or let you take a turn to the path of identity (Hood, 2012).

Dr. Sacks's book *The Man Who Mistook His Wife For a Hat and Other Clinical Tales* talks about a patient Jimmy G who lost his ability to keep memory and eventually lost his sense of self as a result. Indeed, it is this sense of self in interaction with society and memory that is a factor in keeping notion of self that leads to identity. Once there is no impression of individual's interaction with society on brain, this self is lost (Sacks, 1986).

¹ It is an acronym to tell the split state of 'self' and 'other,' confusion between the real and the illusion.

² Like Banda Singh who makes Ideological Identity as the part of his "Ideal-I" (Lacan, 2006, p.p 76).

³ Like Bulha who is indifferent to Ideological Identity.

Although there is no sense of self without being interaction with society but the friction between individual and society is inevitable because different forces aim at controlling the identity of an individual. Individual has to fight with many forces in pursuit of his established identity. Millions of works are done but Vladimir Dimitrov and Kalevi Kopra's "Dynamics of Human Identity" is a notable one. They say that by giving different kinds of political, economic and national identities, individual identities are lost and individuals are at the risk for manipulation and corruption (Dimitrov and Kopra, 1998).

Erikson is a psychologist who talks about identity formation. He talks in most of his theories that throughout each person's lifetime, they experience different crises. In his theory, these conflicts arise at a certain point in life and must be successfully resolved for progression to the next of the eight stages. The particular stage relevant to identity formation takes place during adolescence (ages 12-20). This stage is called "Identity versus Role Confusion." Identity crisis in one stage cannot let you move forward and you lost your way in the labyrinth of this identity (Erikson, 1968).

Thayer summarizes relationship of ideology and basic trust in Erikson's work by saying: "It is the perception of the inevitability of the creation of cognitive order that leads Erikson to see ideology as an essential component of identity" (1979, p.p 230). He explains that Erickson sees ideology and basic trust of an individual on external factors like mother that is responsible for his identity formation. For an infant when he comes into this world her mother becomes his ultimate existence and a cosmos for him (Thayer, 1979).

"Ideology and Identity: A psychoanalytic Investigation of a Social Phenomenon" by R. D Hinshelwood is the most significant work we have seen so far on the dynamics of identity and its rising conflicts with ideology which is inevitable. He raises the most important question of the twentieth century. He gives examples of millions of people who sacrificed their lives for the sake of ideology. According to him whether the idea is Christian, Hindus or even socialists, "mankind would indeed be better off without ideas at all." (Hinshelwood, 2009, p.p 132) He believes we are at the mercy of emotional, unrealistic and insightful modes of behaving together" (Hinshelwood, 2009, p.p 132).

Hinshelwood explains severity of the condition: "the way neurosis becomes the disease of an individual's mind, similarly ideology of a destructive group becomes disease of a group's mind" (2009, p.p 137). Hinshelwood explains that based on the supremacy of individual ideology, an individual's psyche ends up

replacing his identity with national ideology. In short this psychic condition is a key factor in replacing individual identity with ideological identity. He argues that idea of a shared identity has become a borderland phenomenon between "highly personal and broadly social" and is highly motivating for an individual (Hinshelwood, 2009, p.p 144).

Kernberg in *Ideology, Conflict and Leadership in Groups and Organizations* explains a broader definition of ideology by saying every kind of shared belief is an ideology of a kind. He says, ideology "refers to a system of beliefs that a group, a mass, or society share concerning the origin and function of their common social life and the cultural and ethical demands and expectations they hold for society" (Kernberg, 1998, p.p 277).

Mannheim says in *Ideology and Utopia*: ideology is not only confined to just a common belief but "the term denotes that we are skeptical of the ideas and representations advanced by our opponents" (Mannheim, 1936, p.p 49). He explains further that it does not mean by just providing an ideological boundary to a group but obsessing people with a kind of emotional attitude to another group – skepticism. The reality of an individual's mind is moulded by the membership of a group. The group produces knowledge for individuals (Mannheim, 1936).

LeBon in his book, *The Crowd: Study of the Popular Mind* talks about worst behavior in people when an individual does not remain all to himself. An individual loses his individual identity which is less sophisticated than of which he is "potentially capable as an individual" (LeBon 1995, p.p 23). The reason behind this extreme narcissistic approach is that individual associates his identity with a particular group.

Freud in his book *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* gives the psychoanalytical reason of extremist ideology by his simple explanation of conflict between minor groups⁴. He calls this extremism as "narcissism of minor differences" (Freud, 1955, p.p 114). In his book he explains that ideologies make people the narcissists and are based on ideology of difference.

4. Research Methodology

This research paper is using soft data in the form of articles, reviews, books, theoretical works of critics, psychologists and online data bases.

In this paper, identity in Mysticism is not simply *self*-negation, search of God or love of God which sentimental papers talk about or instead of exploring why and what lead to mysticism. They explore what is mysticism to which certainly there are subjective answers⁵. This is not research but sentimentality. There is another debate to which

⁴ Study involves minor group prejudices to big ideological and national fights.

⁵ Mystic has personal experience so there are as many subjective answers as subjective experiences. These

research papers are biased towards modern atheists or conservatives⁶. The purpose of this research paper is to see what kind of identity formation leads to mysticism and how does identity travels in mystical stages. Similarly, extremism is not simply wrong notion of any religious group which sentimental and ethnic group's articles talk about. This research paper will explore identity in extremism on individual psychological level.

Mysticism is social, metaphysical, ideological, philosophical state. Similarly, extremism is social and ideological state. But this paper will bring all the paradigms to ultimately psychological ground since psychological paradigm will cover all the other paradigms as a matter of fact. In order to elaborate, own terminologies in definition of identity are used to make the paper understandable for readers like *i*, *Big-I*, and *Ideological-I* etc.

It was very difficult to apply one theory on a broader topic, but Lacan's Mirror Stage plays an essential explanation to the topic and gives explanation to major aspects. The metaphor of "mirror" is further enhanced from the "Mirror Stage" that helps understanding many of the concepts and a psychological and metaphysical state which is referred as 'mirroriness.' There the metaphor of "center" is derived on so many levels. Center of universe, center of ideology, center of politics, center of system, center of physical structure, center of everything—*Big-I* and obsession of these centrality.

In literature review that is above mentioned, identity is certainly the process of individuation for an individual or a group. Identity is the mid-point between an individual's past and future's construction. There are factors that determine what associates an individual with the group or not. Identity is explained in realization of *self* and it forms in relation to interaction with society. There are works that questions the choice of individual in formation of identity. The works talk about importance of an individual's identity in relation with mob. The works talk about self being an illusion. Many talk about fixed identity and role of basic trust. However, his paper will specifically talk about the quest of identity as an illusion, and fatalistic effects to it as a result, whose roots lie in psychological development of characters.

5. Data Analysis

It is human nature to remain in quest of his identity. Everyone wants to be unique and preserve a part of his *self* by one way or the other. He gives different names to this quest as "purpose or mission." This play has two equally opposite strands of extremism and mysticism.

They are two different attitudes and paths to the unattainable destiny. Bulha and Banda have two equally different quests for their identities. What Banda follows is extremism and what Bulha follows is path of mysticism. But what is common for both is an ideal, Ideal of their mirror image as "Ideal-I" and replacement of that ideal by ideology's ideal⁷ or Big-I's Ideal⁸ in social formation of identity (Lacan, 2006, p.p 76). They run after their Ideals—identity Ideals for asserting identity. Nadeem himself says in his production notes: "They may have acted differently in different situations to achieve the 'same Ideal'" (2008, p.p 227).

In order to understand the psychological and social status of identity on its working principle in relation to these characters, it is required to look at Lacan's concept of "Mirror Stage" in detail. "Mirror stage" is a moment in the life of a child when a child sees his image in the mirror. He "experiences the relationship between the movements made in the image and the reflected environment, and between this virtual complex and the reality it duplicates—namely, the child's own body, and the persons and even things around it" (Lacan, 2006, p.p 94). Lacan further goes on saying that "striking spectacle of a nursing in front of a mirror who has not yet mastered walking or even standing [...] takes an instantaneous view of the image in order to fix it in his mind" (Lacan, 2006, p.p 95). The child recognizes himself with that image. Hence, the child makes an "ideal image of himself" in his mind forever as a perfect, complacent image—"Ideal-I"—that haunts his fate in the process of identity formation (Lacan, 2006, p.p 96).

It helps us see the characters of Banda and Bulha as persons who make an ideal image of them by looking in the mirror and fall in love with it. When they grow up they misrecognize that image in the world and their ideal lacks. This situation fluctuates their "ideal-I" and they feel "alienated" (Lacan, 2006, p.p 79). According to Lacan, those people who cannot come out of the "Mirror stage" and remain in their "Ideal-I" often becomes victims of neurosis. What actually goes in their mind behind this tag line will be explored in this paper. Mysticism is not only a metaphysical phenomenon but it has a social and psychological status. "It is more generally attuned to social and personal circumstances than to any general theological principles or explanations" (Fales, 1999, p.p 226). In Shahid Nadeem's *Bulha*, there is a social status to the phenomenon of mysticism which will be proved psychologically in this research paper. It is cause of some ideological conflict and it strikes with ideological

experiences cannot be regarded simply as researches or cannot be criticized as researches.

⁶ The religious people bang the drum that there is a mystical experience. On the other hand, atheist insists on proving it wrong.

⁷ Banda replaces his Ideal-I by Ideology's Ideal. It is the goal of Ideology.

⁸ Bulha replaces his Ideal-I by Big-I's Ideal. Big-I's Ideal is Ideal of unification with God. Big-I is God's identity.

conflict but behind all this drama, there is quest of identity, “an agent’s most fundamental commitment” (Bilgrami, 1997, p.p 2528) which is to be explored in this research paper.

Mysticism is about a truth, a mental state, a social state but more than that—a quest of identity and self-fulfillment. Self-Effacement becomes the part of this identity quest as a step towards state of identity. Effacement starts with inactivity and indifference to ideology. It has stages and each stage is the part of quest of identity until one reaches to the ultimate destiny/Identity affirmation by union with *Big-I* which is impossible as quest of identity is an illusion.

When Bulha enters into the society, he cannot come out of the idealness of his Ideal Image and becomes neurotic as Lacan says that if u can’t come out of that “Ideal-I” you become neurotic. Lacan considers “ideal-I” as a form of narcissism (Lacan, 2006, p.p 79). In Bulha’s case, individual wants to anchor his identity in support with *Big-I* as he wants to preserve his identity.

Bulha grows up as a neurotic and enters into the society. In the crowd of identities, religious ideology tries to obsess him with the idea of God/*Big-I*—a complete ideal image. Bulha sees the image of *Big-I* in the mirror of his mind where he used to see the image of “Ideal-I” (Lacan, 2006, p.p 96). The mirror was always there. It is replaced by obsessive image of *Big-I* now and Bulha sees the image of *Big-I* in that mirror now. Hence, “Ideal-I” of Lacan is replaced by *Big-I* and its *Big-I*’s Ideal which is union with *Big-I* and is the new goal for Bulha which is the “center” around which identity forms if there is anything as independent identity. His obsession of that image makes him say, “An-Al-Haq... I am God. I am alla. Let it be known, I am alla” (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 235). The mirror-image which he used to call as “Bulha” has become “alla” now. He has lost his *i* in pursuit of getting it. Hinshelwood gives a valid psychological explanation of this phenomenon when he mentions explanation of Freud: “He shows how a particular aspect of someone’s mind can be removed, amputated as it were, and replaced by another person. The aspect of the mind that can be amputated is the ego-ideal, he called it a leading idea being substituted for the leader” (Hinshelwood, 2009, p.p 141).

In this play, “the Chorus enters the arena as a funeral procession. They are all reciting a verse from Bulha’s poem: “Gor Paya Koi Hoar (it is not me, who is in the grave—it is someone else)” (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 232). Who is in the “goar” is someone else invites to the fact that Bulha is transformed into something else. If Bulha who is in the grave is another, then, where is real Bulha and his independent *i*? If Bulha has become eternal now as he claims by absorbing into the *Big-I*, but where is his *i* which was to be affirmed? Is this fair union at the cost of *i*’s death?

This is mysticism’s paradox. “The immense claim of the mystic—to attain actual union with God” (Downes, 1920, p.p 621). This position sharply contrasts with Bulha’s position in the play who talks about union with the beloved, Union is at the cost of *i*’s death rather than its preservation.

Institutionalized ideology is the first attack on *i* when Bulha enters in a society. Bulha’s mysticism is the reaction of staunch ideological pull. Ideology tries to murder independent identity. Either it produces Bulha’s mysticism or Banda’s extremism. Bulha needs to support his *i* by any greater identity. Therefore, Bulha supports his *i* in negotiation with *Big-I* that is conceptually stronger than any ideological identity. The time when Bulha claims his identity in a society, society considers him its enemy by making him “other.” As a reaction, he is being attacked by society in every possible way. Ideology even tries to scrape history of Bulha by declaring that “his funeral will not be performed, nor will he be allowed to be buried in the city graveyard” (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 228). Molvi and Qazi are “representatives” of religious and political ideology as Sirajuddin claims in the “Introduction” of the play (2008, p.p 15). This makes it evident that play will deal with the conflict between ideology and individual in identity dynamics of Bulha.

Ideological Identity was threatened by *Big-I*’s Identity because “Hossain Khan felt that his political and military power was threatened by the spiritual popularity of the Sufi master” (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 232). Ideology tries to throw away anyone who comes in its way. Ideological identity does not want any *i* to come in its way even if it is in search of *Big-I*. *Big-I* and *ideological-I* do not directly interfere in each other’s way but people who are instrumental to both identities strike with one another. Both have their own ideals.

Bulha’s non-ideological position is also a kind of ideology. Mystic “could belong to no party and became a party to himself. For a mystic is an intense idealist, a sort of spiritual aristocrat” (Downes, 1920, p.p 620). Every ideology is other’s enemy in pursuit of identity. They are all black holes eating independent *i*.

It is human nature to stand with the “center.” But different humans have different versions of centrality. Bulha’s mystic ideology has another “center.” Extremist/institutional Ideology has another. Bulha’s “center” is *Big-I*. He is moving towards it step by step for pursuit of his identity.

Stasis is the first step towards mysticism. Bulha’s indifference and inactivity is a sign of initial revolt for independent *i* which is an illusion. Ideology is an active apparatus which demands action and Bulha’s stasis becomes his first revolt towards ideology. Ideology is never static. It does not belong to those who are inactive and indifferent to it. Bulha is indifferent to ideology from the very start of the play since he does not take part in any ideological action. Bulha’s mysticism is an

escape from ideological activity. When people come to tell woes of political condition, he escapes into frenzy and dances. He remains in his own search.

Bulha converts his inactivity into spirituality gradually that is more promising in comparison with Ideology's Ideal whose objective is ideology's victory and extermination of other ideologies at human cost. Mysticism is more promising because a person can achieve through it those things that he cannot achieve from his normal life, a kind of power, a kind of satisfaction to enjoy a worthy position in comparison with other ordinary people with ordinary *i*, to be unique, to be superior or to preserve your name in comparison with other people's name. In the country like Subcontinent, Bulha takes the spiritual path in order to save his *i* in threatening political condition where there is instability and everything is at stake. These choices are not always taken deliberately for sure. Behind these choices lie the unconscious fears of extinction. Mysticism is the ultimate promise for your preservation and preservation is no doubt instinctual. In the following example, there is a sense of power and confidence in tone of Bulha when he resurrects crops of Jeevan Khan on the power of his mysticism. He says: "Look at your beautiful crops, see how they are swaying in the wind (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 229)." He calls himself "The Big Man" in comparison with people having belief in ideology (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 230)

Bulha finds Shah Inayat in the way of his identity. As there is no concrete presence of *Big-I* in comparison with materialistic things and it's a concept, Bulha anchors his boat to Shah Inayat's Identity which he finds closer to *Big-I*. He tries to unify with it and identity begins to form in relation with it. "*Inayat holds Bulha's hands, students surround them and wave colorful scarfs (duppatas) and gradually cover them together while the qawwals sing the cheena song* (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 235). He like other humans relies on what he finds closer to him as a concrete object. There is a difference between a concrete body and a concept. *Big-I* is an idea, an ideology. Bulha finds Shah Inayat its embodiment. Inayat becomes the true representation of God in the long quest of *Big-I* and union with it as he is the one "who will help him go across" (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 233). From the beginning of Scene four, Bulha has given place to Inayat as the closer image to *Big-I*. Image is replaced and Ideal is replaced, quest is the same. Whatever was to be done for *Big-I* is being done for Inayat now. Bulha says, "let anyone who calls me a Syed be punished in hell. Let those who call me Arain be rewarded with the pleasures of Paradise" (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 236). The ties that he had to break for his love with *Big-I* are breaking because of Inayat.

Big-I has no gender, it is an unimaginable identity. It is unoriented energy but Inayat's spiritual energy has orientation of male energy. He is concrete as a body. Bulha's obsession of unity blurred him and he begins to form identity with respect to Inayat's gender's energy which is not *self-effacement* but *gender-effacement* and inversion into the female Identity. It is again proved that there is no core annihilation hence no union with *Big-I*. [*self*] cannot be annihilated to the level of zero because Bulha is a concrete body of flesh and blood.

Bulha has strucked in the realms of identities. When Bulha wants to unify with Inayat, he "calls him Ranjha in front in of the world/ But you are, in fact, my faith, my fate" (Nadeem 2008, p.p 260). As Bulha gets closer to Inayat, just like closer to the center, he releases his energy like electron by dancing in ecstasy (Nadeem 2008, p.p 262). He dances for him and becomes a woman. Nadeem uses the word "bride and groom" for Bulha and Inayat (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 262) which hints at how Bulha is attracted towards Inayat in pursuit of his illusive identity. He obsesses with everything in relation with which his identity forms. He obsesses with what he asserts identity. Key concept is the beloved in whose relation identity is forming. He says:

I will sleep with my arms
around my beloved,

Only then will I be a woman.
[Nadeem, 2008, p.p 257]

Bulha is in the realms of mirrors. Every person who sees in the mirror, actually sees him through the medium of light. The person is the light and every concept⁹ is a mirror. When a person sees himself in the mirror, inspite of mirror's own dark back it produces an illusion of perfectness by an imperfect reality. Whereas individual is detached and image of perfectness is in the mirror. The idea of image in the mirror is creating illusion. Inayat as a concept adds to the illusion of Bulha whose identity is a product of illusion himself. No Mirror can help in quest of the identity because it has a black back of its own. Mirrors can create shadows or illusions not substance and concrete objects. Hence, the illusion of identity keeps Bulha moving. Ideal makes and breaks, Mirror changes and illusion remains an illusion.

In pursuit of Bulha's spiritual journey Inayat is the source of it. The last stage of mysticism is "Wahdat-ul-Wajood" (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 263) where everything is "Him."¹⁰ Bulha wanted to know himself, his identity and the result is this that "it is only Him" (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 263). Where is Bulha? Bulha who wanted to know himself through *Big-I* has lost himself in *Big-I* because "I am Him, you are Him, who is this Bulha." (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 264) He has added to identity of *Big-I* rather than his own identity. These lines are

⁹ Inayat, Ideology and *Big-I* are the concepts. They are themselves mirrors.

¹⁰ *Big-I*

resolution of Bulha's mysticism and disclosure of his illusion as Inayat says, "Now it is you and Him. In fact, it is only Him. It is the stage of unity of being (wahdat ul wajood) (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 263)."

When Inayat dies, Bulha again falls in identity crisis. He was the lens or mirror to see *Big-I* or an inverted version of *Big-I* for Bulha. Identity shatters again as he confesses to Muradi, "my heart is shattered into a thousand pieces" (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 274). But actually the mirror in which he was looking is shattered and the quest remains the quest since "takia is to be remained," [name is to be remained] (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 274). Bulha's ideals makes and breaks but quest remains the quest.

Does he achieve his *i*? He has lost his identity by having the other identity. He has no perfect-*self* but the illusion of perfect-*Self* which has made him lost his own *self*. His identity stands nowhere. *Big-I* swallows it. There is nothing as independent *i* in the Milky Way. Extremism is a psychological state, a social dilemma but more than that—a quest of identity rather than patriotism. It is at the heart of ideology. Ideological establishment is the goal of extremism. It is the ultimate destiny for Banda because it is the ideal image for him since there is no existence as independent *i* in this world and every individual is running after illusion of identity caused by "mirrors." Banda's extremism has a purpose in his identity formation or deformation. He is distorted with the illusion of ideology as he has made his Identity as a group Identity rather than independent identity. It was an attempt to affirm his identity by adding *Ideological-I* to it but it ends up arising the question "who absorbs whom?"

Banda cannot come out of the idealness of his Ideal Image (Ideal-I) and becomes neurotic because he misrecognizes his image in the society. Lacan says fixity in "Ideal-I" results in neuroticism (Lacan, 2006, p.p 96). Lacan considers "ideal-I" as a form of narcissism. (Lacan, 2006, p.p 96) In Banda's case, individual wants to anchor his identity in support with *Ideological-I* as he wants to preserve his identity. He is not the loyal servant of ideology but he is in search of his own identity through this medium.

Illusion of ideology's strength attracts individuals and they anchor their identity in relation with it. Banda replaces the Ideal image of himself with *Ideological* identity. Now, his sole aim is establishment of ideological identity under the pursuit of his own identity but "blood for blood, tyranny for tyranny" (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 244) cannot satisfy him since every ideal lacks. "Group Ideal" is to be achieved at any cost and it cannot be achieved at any cost (Hinshelwood, 2009, p.p 141). This notion of achieving ideal causes individuals to create violence.

Ideal always lacks and Banda's "heap of Muslim bodies" (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 253) is not an ideal that can be achieved. So, Banda's lust for blood cannot

be quenched even by hundreds of dead bodies" (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 253). Ideology shows you an illusion and destroys you after it like Banda who is executed in the mad pursuit of ideology's Ideal in the end of the play because ideology's ideal is Banda's ideal and *Ideological-I* is Banda's identity.

One who dies in the pursuit of ideology's ideal, himself becomes Ideal and starts creating illusion for others. He becomes a mirror which creates illusion. His execution invites many to become Banda. It is an illusion to make it an example for the traitors. He himself has become ideology and not part of him.

Banda's pursuit of "mission" for achieving ideology's Ideal gives him an illusion to preserve his identity. Self-preservation is instinctual. He wants to preserve his name. This preservation is the underline quest behind his violence as he says "my name will remain as a symbol of terror" (Nadeem, 2008, p.p 268).

Ideology has its blind ideal that is nothing but monolithic ideology, its propagation and its establishment at the death of other ideologies and individual identities. It demands sacrifices and takes your life in the mad pursuit of ideology's ideal and ideological identity. Ideological enemy is Banda's enemy. Ideology cannot exterminate other ideologies. The goals of ideology are politicized. But where does an individual stand in ideology? All the individuals who belong to ideology are themselves ideology. Banda wants to exterminate whole race of the Muslims and wants to kill "ten Muslims and for each Sikh" (Nadeem, 2010, p.p 243). He continues this pursuit of monolithic ideology until he is executed in pursuit of illusion of this identity.

6. Conclusion

It is very evident from analyzing data that the time when one is born, he is surrounded by unending webs of identities, each of them ready to swallow the other like a black hole. The largest of black hole is the *Big-I* that like Black hole is invisible, have the strongest gravity. It is destiny of Bulha's *i* to fall in it even Bulha who believes in "union" with it cannot escape without being swallowed in it. No *i* can escape through it. There is no union without being swallowed in it. Union with *Big-I* is an illusion because the quest for identity is an illusion too. Ideology is another Big-hole which is invisible. On the other hand, Banda's quest of identity traps him into *Ideological-I* until he is executed. There was no identity of individuals at any point in life. There is only the illusion of that identity that forces one moving forward in pursuit of that ideal that is unachievable and is a deception.

REFERENCES:

Bilgrami, Akeel. 1997. Secular liberalism and moral psychology of identity. *Economic and Political Weekly* 32.40: 2527-2540.

- Converse, Philip E. 1964. The nature of belief systems in mass. *Ideology and Discontent*, ed. David E. Apter. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Dimitrov, Vladimir & Kalevi Kopra. 1998. *Dynamics of human identity*. Retrieved May 3, 2019 from <https://www.zulenet.com/vladimirdimitrov/pages/identity.html>
- Descartes, R., 1998. *Discourse on method and meditations on first philosophy*. 4th ed. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub.
- Downes, William Philip. 1920. Mysticism. *The Biblical World* 54.6: 619-624.
- Erikson, E.H. 1968. *Identity: youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Fales, Evan. 1999. Can science explain mysticism?" *Cambridge University Press* 35.2: 213-227.
- Freud, S. 1955. Group psychology and the analysis of the ego. *Standard Edition*. 18: 76-143.
- Hinshelwood, R. D. 2009. Ideology and identity: A psychoanalytic investigation of a social phenomenon. *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society*. 14. 2: 131-148.
- Hood, Bruce. 2012. The illusion of the self: An interview with Bruce Hood." Retrieved May 22, 2016 from <https://samharris.org/the-illusion-of-the-self2/>
- Kernberg, O. 1998. *Ideology, conflicts and leadership in groups and organizations*. New York: Yale University Press.
- Knight, Kathleen. 2006. Transformations of the concept of ideology in the Twentieth Century. *The American Political Science Review* 100.4: 619-626.
- Lacan, Jacques. 2006. The mirror stage as formative of the I function." *Ecrits* Trans. Bruce Fink. London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- LeBon, G. 1995. *The crowd: study of the popular mind*. NJ: New Brunswick.
- Mannheim, K. 1936. *Ideology and utopia*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Nadeem, Shahid. 2008. *Bulha. Selected plays*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sacks, Oliver. 1985. *The man who Mistook his Wife for a Hat and Other Clinical Tales*. New York: Summit Books.
- Sen, A. 2006. *Identity and violence: The illusion of destiny*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Sirajuddin, Shaista Sonnu. 2008. Introduction. *Selected plays*. By Shahid Nadeem
New York: Oxford University Press, 5-25.
- Thayer, Nelson S.T. 1979. Perspective on contemporary mysticism." *Journal of Religion and Health* 18.3: 230-240.
- Wegner, Daniel M. 2003. *The illusion of conscious will*. London: MIT Press.
- Weinreich, P. 1986. The operationalisation of identity theory in racial and ethnic relations. *heories of race and ethnic relations*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Weinreich, P. & W. Saunderson. (Eds.) 2003. *Analysing identity: Clinical, societal and cross-cultural applications*. London: Routledge & Psychology Press.