

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Abu Bekr Belkaid

Tlemcen



Faculty of Letters and Foreign Languages
Department of English

The Representation of Muslims in Selected Post 9/11 American Novels

**Thesis Submitted to the Department of English in Candidacy for the Degree of
Doctorate in English Literature**

Presented by

Mrs Sara ABDERRAZAG

Supervised by

Prof. Ilhem MORTAD-SERIR

Board of Examiners

Dr. Frid DAOUDI	M.C.A Chairman	University of Tlemcen
Prof. Ilhem SERIR	Pr. Supervisor	University of Tlemcen
Dr. Wassila MOURO	M.C.A Internal Examiner	University of Tlemcen
Dr. Mohammed DIB	M.C.A External Examiner	University of Mascara
Dr. ChahrazedHAMZAOU	M.C.A External Examiner	University of Ain-Temouchent
Dr. Nadia GHOUNANE	M.C.A External Examiner	University of Saida

Academic Year: 2019/2020

Declaration

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which has been accepted for the qualification of any other degree or diploma of a university or other institution. I also certify that the present work contains no plagiarism and is the result of my own investigation, except where otherwise stated.

Mrs Sara ABDERRAZAG

Date:

Signature:

DEDICATION

To my dearest parents

To my beloved husband and little kid

I dedicate this work

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, my endless thanks go to Allah who offered me strength and patience to accomplish this work.

Special thanks go to my supervisor Professor Ilhem SERIR for her patience, help, kindness, and useful comments that have enlightened me during the construction of this project.

My heartfelt thanks go to my dearest sister who has supported me till the end of this project.

My sincere gratitudes go to my friends Isra'a ALQALLAB and Hanane RABAHI whose comments and thoughtful input were greatly appreciated

Lastly, I would like to express my appreciation to the members of the examination committee who have accepted to discuss this thesis strengthening it with their insightful remarks and comments.

ABSTRACT

Throughout history, Islam has been perceived as a religion of terror and violence. Recently, in the wake of September 11th attacks, this discourse has been reinforced. In the literary sphere, a large corpus of textual representation of this horrific incident sought to depict this event's impact on the country and its population. Several novelists supported Islam's perception in the Western mind while other voices, including Muslim as well as non-Muslim ones, contributed through giving a voice to the "enemy" and depicted Islam and Muslim characters positively. The purpose of the present study, then, is to provide evidence that both of Linda-Jamilah Kolocotronis and Amy Waldman portray Muslim characters' efforts to resist the distorted image they are associated with in their works *Innocent People* (2003) and *The Submission* (2011), respectively; pinpointing the strategies Muslim characters rely on in order to resist the hegemonic discourse of Islam as a religion of terror. In order to reach this aim, the researcher will follow Michel Foucault's and Maria Lugones' models which would help in analyzing Muslim characters' resistance and attempt to prove their innocence and undermine their constructed image. Moreover, the present study is an attempt to prove that both novelists highlight the subjectivity of truth and history through providing readers with a different version of Muslims' reality and opening their eyes to a different interpretation of history. To this effect, this theoretical and analytical study is carried out.

Key words: discourse, resistance, truth, subjectivity, Foucault, Lugones, Muslim characters

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	II
ABSTRACT	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter One: Theoretical Framework	7
1.1. Introduction	7
1.2. Muslims as a Threat to the U.S.	7
1.3. Muslims' Fictional Misrepresentation.....	9
1.4. Countering Misrepresentation	10
1.5. Media's Contribution to Shaping Discourse	11
1.6. Foucault's Discourse, Knowledge, and Power	14
1.6.1. Discourse	14
1.6.2. Knowledge.....	16
1.6.3. Power.....	18
1.7. Resistance from a Foucauldian Perspective	27
1.8. Foucault and Literature.....	32
1.9. María Lugones Challenging Misrepresentatin	35
1.9.1. Thick Versus Transparent Members	35
1.9.2. Lugones' Suggested Strategies of Resistance	37
1.9.2.a. The Concept of Curdling	40
1.9.2.b. Double Vision.....	41
1.9.2.c. Resistant Intentionality	42
1.9.2.d. Active Subjectivity	43
1.9.2.e. The Multiplicitous Self	44
1.9.3. Individuals as Oppressed and Resistant	47
1.10. Truth(s) Up to the Postmodern Lens	51

1.11. Conclusion	56
Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' <i>Innocent People</i> (2003).....	59
2.1. Introduction	59
2.2. The Discourse of Islam in the Novel	59
2.3. The Role of Media in Reinforcing the Dominant discourse.....	63
2.4. Muslim Characters as a Serious Danger in the American Gaze.....	68
2.5. Muslim Characters' Challenges to their Misrepresentation	71
2.6. Strategies of Resistance in the Foucauldian Sense	72
2.6.1. Resistance Through Dialogue.....	72
2.6.2. Resistance Through Behaviour.....	77
2.6.3. Resistance Through Teaching	77
2.7. The Foucauldian Representation of Truth	79
2.8. <i>Innocent People</i> Meets the Expectations of Foucault on Literature.....	81
2.9. The Analysis of Lugones' Approach in the Novel	82
2.9.1. Thick Vs. Transparent Characters	82
2.9.2. Lugones' Suggested Strategies of Resistance	84
2.9.2.1. Curdling/ Impure Separation	84
2.9.2.2. The Multiplicitous Self.....	86
2.9.2.3. Double Vision.....	88
2.9.2.4. Muslim Characters' Response to the "Logic of Oppression"	90
2.9.2.5. Active Subjectivity	95
2.10. The Analysis of Selected Relevant Symbols in the Novel	97
2.11. Conclusion	98
Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's <i>The Submission</i> (2011)	100
3.1. Introduction	100
3.2. The Discourse of Islam.....	100
3.3. Media's Contribution to Reinforcing Discourse	110

3.4. Muslim Characters as a Threat	114
3.5. Muslim Characters' Counter to Misrepresentation Through Multiple Channels	118
3.5.1. Resistance Through Sarcasm	119
3.5.2. Resistance Through Polite Behaviour	121
3.5.3. Resistance Through Coldness and Stubbornness	124
3.5.4. Resistance Through Dialogue.....	129
3.6. Lugones' Theory of Resistance Applied to the Novel	133
3.6.1. Thick Vs. Transparent Characters	133
3.6.2. Lugones' Suggested Strategies of Resistance:	134
3.6.2.1. Curdling/ Impure Separation	134
3.6.2.2. "The Multiplicitous Self"	135
3.6.2.3. Double Vision.....	139
3.6.2.4. Active Subjectivity	141
3.7. Interpreting Selected Symbols from the Novel	142
3.8. Conclusion.....	143
Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in <i>Innocent People</i> and <i>The Submission</i>	146
4.1. Introduction	146
4.2. Foucault Versus Lugones: Common and Different Points.....	146
4.3. Similarities and Differences Between the Two Novels.....	155
4.3.1. Islam as a Dangerous Religion in both Novels	155
4.3.2. Media's Active Role.....	156
4.3.3. The Distorted Image of Muslims.....	157
4.3.4. Similarities in Muslim Characters' Resistance to the Hegemonic Discourse in the Selected Works	158
4.3.5. Differences in Muslim Characters' Resistance to the Hegemonic Discourse in both Novels.....	160
4.4. The Subjectivity of Truth from a Postmodern Perspective in <i>Innocent People</i> and <i>The Submission</i>	161

4.5. New Historicism	169
4.5.1. New Historicism in Relation to Postmodernism	169
4.5.2. An Overview of New Historicism and its Tenets	170
4.5.3. New Historicism Applied to <i>Innocent People</i> and <i>The Submission</i>	178
4.6. Conclusion	186
GENERAL CONCLUSION	188
WORKS CITED	192
APPENDICES	203

General Introduction

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The binary opposition between West and East has an old history. Further, Islam and Muslims have a very long and deep story of misrepresentation that existed long before the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in September 11th, 2001. However, this event reinforced and strengthened these relations of enmity, generating a discourse that purported that Islam is a religion of terror. Hence, Muslims are a serious threat to the world in general and the United States in particular because they were accused of committing this crime. Such a discourse, however, soon turned to be well established and followed by the non-Muslim majority. The main contributors to its empowerment include politicians' powerful positions as well as media's coverage. The latter's insistence and focus on worsening the image of Muslims affected the majority throughout the whole world. As a large number of individuals were affected so literary figures were no exception. The latter devoted their pens to fortify the same discourse by painting Americans as innocent victims. Several voices, however, appeared later to counter and reconsider the representation of Islam negatively.

This research, then, is based on selected novels by Linda-Jamilah Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003) and Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011) who aspire to challenge the established claims associated with Islam, representing the 9/11 attacks as a significant element for they have a deep impact on Muslim characters. These two works are considered as important because one is written from a Muslim perspective while the other is written from a non-Muslim one. Thus, it is interesting to shed light on the portrayal of Muslims from two, *seemingly*, oppositional sides.

The scholarship on Amy Waldman's *The Submission* has examined the novel from a variety of perspectives, pointing mainly to the post 9/11 situation. However, these studies, to the best of my knowledge, have not dealt with it in detail nor have they focused on Muslim characters' situation in the above mentioned work. To start with, in her book *The 9/11 Novel:*

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Trauma, Politics, and Identity, Arin Keeble examines Waldman's use of journalistic elements in the novel, given that Waldman was a journalist. Then, she moves on to analyze the main concern of the novel which she describes as "post-9/11 conflictedness" (166). In addition to that, the writer indicates the fact that this novelist focuses on "Islam versus the West discourse" (170) especially because the main character is a Muslim one.

In the same context, in their *Mapping Generations of Traumatic Memory in American Narratives*, Mihailescu, Oltean, and Precup investigate trauma as a result of the attacks in several post 9/11 novels. However, they just indicate, briefly, that *The Submission* is included. A similar study also elucidates how Waldman sheds light, in this novel, on the aftermath of September 11th attacks claiming that the novelist "concentrates on the still-existing wound of the country and speaks of the country's loss" (Rudaityté 171).

In his book *Twenty-First-Century Fiction*, Peter Boxall has analysed several contemporary novels. He classified, though briefly, Waldman's *The Submission* with the works that deal, mainly, with the "encounter between Islam and the west" (128). Likewise, the critics Crystal Parikh and Daniel Y. Kim classify *The Submission* as a novel that focuses on the American residents and the ideologies that exist in the USA.

As far as Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* is concerned, there is hardly any scholarly criticism on it, except few reviews and articles. Thus, observing that there is a need for detailed studies on the representation of Muslim American characters in the wake of the 9/11 attacks in these two novels, the present study aims at taking up the lacuna by investigating the power of discourse in defining Muslim Americans, their misperception by non-Muslims, and their perseverance to correct the image they have been associated with. Thus, the ultimate purpose of this analytical study is to come up with meaningful interpretations of these aspects; something that may enrich the meaning of these two novels and add to their appreciation as literary works.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This study attempts to underscore the power of discourse, reinforced through media, to define Muslim Americans as enemies and these characters' daily struggles as a result of the discourse of Islam. Thus, the main aim of this research is to demonstrate how each author deals with the aftermath of this event, paying attention to their responses from a Muslim versus a non-Muslim perspective. Furthermore, it will spotlight their portrayal of the image of Islam and whether they attempt to undermine the well established historical fact and discourse to emphasize the subjectivity of history and the multiplicity of truth. This will open our fields of vision and add another perspective to look at post 9/11 fiction.

To reach the aforementioned objective, the present research raises the following questions: 1) What are Michel Foucault's and Maria Lugones' perspectives on discourse and resistance? 2) To what extent are Foucault's and Lugones' approaches relevant to the interpretation of the novels under scrutiny and do Kolocotronis and Waldman succeed in undermining the constructed discourse of Islam? 3) Do the selected novels illustrate the New Historicist and postmodern concept of history and truth as subjective?

In order to answer the above-mentioned research questions, it is significant to mention the hypotheses this study issues from:

- 1) Michel Foucault considers discourse as a powerful means through which certain truths are generated, highlighting the possibility of resisting it. Similarly, Lugones strongly supports individuals' resistance to challenge constructed facts.
- 2) Foucault and Lugones' approaches can form a solid basis for the interpretation of the novels at hand because it is thought that the two novelists attempted to re-construct the image of Islam and correct some misconceptions that have been emphasized by discourse.
- 3) By attempting to correct Muslims' misperception, Kolocotronis and Waldman establish a different truth about this group and give this historical fact a different interpretation. Thus, they represented the truth and history of Islam after 9/11 attacks as subjective.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This is a theoretical and analytical study that aims at investigating the discourse of Islam in the wake of the attacks in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*. It hinges upon a variety of theoretical concepts and approaches in order to achieve the stated aim. This includes Michel Foucault's elaboration on discourse and resistance, Maria Lugones' model of resistance, the postmodern concept of truth, as well as the New Historicist approach to illustrate the subjectivity of history. This study will make use of several theoretical references related mainly to the mentioned concepts and approaches which will serve as tools of analysis and provide terms of reference for the critical discussion throughout the thesis. Therefore, the approach used in this work is an interdisciplinary one.

The present research is divided into four chapters. The initial one is theoretical that presents a detailed explanation of some principles that guide the researcher in the following chapters. It first summarizes the perception of Muslims as a threat after 9/11 attacks, their depiction as terrorists in fiction, and few writers' attempt to change such negative associations. Moreover, it gives an overview of the concepts and approaches the analysis relies on, focusing mainly on Foucault, Lugones, and the explanation of truth from a postmodern perspective.

The second chapter is entirely analytical and aims at providing a meaningful interpretation of Kolocotronis' *Innocent People*. It starts with a description of the perception of Muslim-American characters as a threat which results from the discourse of Islam and the role of media in empowering it. Then, it shifts attention to the analysis of the novel from a Foucauldian and Lugonian perspective to underline these characters' resistance and attempt to correct such a created image and live in harmony with non-Muslim characters.

The third chapter mirrors the situation of Muslim American characters as a result of the attacks in Amy Waldman's *The Submission*. It emphasizes the role of media because they occupy a major part in order to emphasize and aggravate the *naturalized* nature of Islam and

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Muslims. Hence, it describes the struggles of these characters that fall victims of discourse. Then, the major part is devoted to the strategies Muslim-American characters follow in an attempt to prove their innocence and remove the negative associations.

Finally, the concluding chapter is divided into two parts. The first one is restricted to a description of the similarities between Foucault and Lugones' perspectives in order to clarify the link between these two seemingly distinct theorists. Further, it provides a comparative study of both authors under scrutiny in representing Muslim American characters after the attacks, focusing on the common similarities that bring them together. The second part, however, is dedicated to the analysis of the postmodern concept of truth as well as the New Historicist elaboration on the subjectivity of history in relation to the aforementioned novels. The rationale, then, is to show whether these two authors, though not both of them are Muslim, share the same view toward history as subjective and truth as multiple by providing a different image of Islam.

Chapter One

Theoretical Framework

Chapter One: Theoretical Framework

1.1. Introduction

The struggle between Muslims and the West has an old history that started long before the attacks on the World Trade Center in 2001. This event reinforced prejudice and hate towards Muslims all over the world which resulted in the establishment of a binary opposition between non-Muslim and Muslim groups. Further, the latter started to be perceived as the ultimate enemy and hence, a serious threat to the United States, in particular. Moreover, it is worth mentioning that the association of Muslims with terrorism was due to several factors including politics, media, and even literature. Simply put, politicians are powerful enough to emphasize the discourse of Islam as a religion of terror and media's coverage of the events affected the whole world. As for the literary sphere, it is no exception. Writers contributed through painting the victimization of Americans and accusing Muslims.

This chapter, then, is devoted to provide a brief description of Muslims' misperception in the American society, their misrepresentation in literary production, as well as few writers' attempt to counter such negative associations. Further, it also aims at highlighting the role of media in contributing to the discourse of Islam in relation to terrorism. In addition to that, the present chapter will throw light on the basic interpretive approaches the researcher will rely on, in the following chapters, to analyze the selected novels. These theoretical underpinnings this chapter will cover include, mainly, an overview of Michel Foucault's discourse and resistance as well as Maria Lugones' challenge of marginalization and support of resistance.

1.2. Muslims as a Threat to the U.S.

After the 9/11 attacks, Muslims were mistreated in several domains. For instance, when they apply for a job, their religion (Islam) affects their acceptance. Actually, "Muslims were 24% less likely to receive at least one contact by either e-mail or phone and received 33%

fewer total contacts compared to secular applicants” (Hodge, Zidan, and Husain 119). That is, both of male and female Muslims were prejudiced and unfairly treated, even at schools. Americans used to mistreat them even “verbally” for they call them “bombers”, “extremists”, “dirty Arabs”, “terrorists”, etc. (Hodge, Zidan, and Husain 120).

According to the same study,

[a] number of variables were unrelated to the outcome variable, including gender, nation of origin, education, and Islamic tradition. In other words, Muslims were equally likely to report being called disparaging names regardless of whether or not they were male or female, born in the United States or born abroad, or were highly educated or less well educated. Likewise, Muslims from the Sunni tradition were no more likely to report being called disparaging names than Muslims who were members of non-Sunni traditions (Hodge, Zidan, and Husain 126).

This means that all Muslims were mistreated and discriminated because of their religion. No other thing mattered like ‘education’, ‘gender’, etc. Since they are Muslims, they act as a threat to the country and they are treated on this basis.

The critic Craig Considine found out that media aggravate and worsen the situation by giving too much importance to a certain accident and make it appear very dangerous, when the one who commits it is a Muslim. However, if the person is not a Muslim, things differ so much. In other words, “a perpetrator who is not Muslim would have to kill on average about seven more people to receive the same amount of coverage as a perpetrator who is Muslim” (2). This emphasizes the racist attitudes towards the followers of Islam.

He also indicates that after the attacks, a large number of “hate crimes” (Considine 9) have been organized against Muslims due to their religion and race, raising an important issue that proves the extent to which Muslims were mistreated. He argues that even when Americans hear that someone is called Osama, they associate the name with “Osama bin Laden”, the one who is responsible of the 9/11 attacks (Considine).

1.3. Muslims' Fictional Misrepresentation

The misrepresentation of Arabs in general and Muslims in particular in all the domains affected the portrayal of characters in fiction. That is, the impact of the “war against terrorism” discourse reached also the literary sphere for several writers portrayed Muslim characters in their fictional works negatively. John Updike (1932-2009), for instance, shows through his fictional works the cruelty and aggressiveness of Islam and the Quran, in particular. Don DeLillo (b. 1936) also is another writer who misrepresents Muslim characters through depicting their belief and way of thinking as wrong in addition to their dreadful conduct. Robert ferrigno (b. 1947), an American author, also pictures Muslim characters as brutal and very aggressive as he shows the Islamic “rules” as “backward” (Anushiravani and Khademi 10).

All the above mentioned novelists, in addition to many others, generalize to a certain extent the negative image associated with Muslims as they claim that this category is responsible of all the heartless, merciless, and aggressive acts. Anushiravani and Khademi also emphasize the similarity of this generalization to the “Orientalist discourse”. They refer to the French Orientalist Gerard de Nerval who, in one of his books, reached the following conclusion: “all orients are the same” (Anushiravani and Khademi 10). The same critics consider the perception of Muslims as a repetition of history arguing that “a historical experience about the orient is repeated and applied to Muslims” (10).

Thus, all these four writers seem to be highlighting the “violence” of Islam which is clear through their depiction of Muslim characters. In his novel entitled *Terrorist* (2006), Updike depicts a Muslim character who is engaged in terrorist acts as the writer tries to worsen the image of the Quran in the novel by trying to prove that it just encourages Muslims for violence. Ferrigno also, in his *Prayers for the Assassin* (2006), gives a similar image to Muslims by depicting them as occupying higher positions but at the same time they “are fully

engaged in corruption, power struggle, carnage, bomb planting, hypocrisy, and passenger trafficking” (Anushiravani and Khademi 10). As for DeLillo, his *Falling Man* (2007) tries to show Muslims as very bad and ugly in terms of attitude, appearances, and way of thinking. Ken Kalfus’ *A Disorder Peculiar to the Country* (2006) is no exception for he also used his pen to prove that Muslims are a failure. He did that through depicting a Muslim character who is “weak” and “undesirable” in all the domains including “family” and “society”. Because of this character’s failure in all life’s aspects, by the end of the novel, he “decides to buy a suicide belt to blow himself, his family, and half a block out of frustration and weakness” (Anushiravani and Khademi 11). Thus, every writer of these is trying to worsen the image of Muslims using his own way and story.

1.4. Countering Misrepresentation

Although Islam and Muslims have a long history of misrepresentation in fictional works, still there exist several writers who undermined that dominant discourse through their writings including Laila Halaby’s *Once in a Promised Land* (2008) and Mohsin Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007), in addition to many others. These writers countered the representation of Muslims as “weak”, “violent”, “aggressive”, “terrorists”, etc. through their depiction of the same category as innocent. For instance, in her *Once in a Promised Land*, Halaby draws a similarity between “the American cultural system” (Anushiravani and Khademi 12) and “Arabs” or “Muslims”. She sees the former as a “Ghula” and the latter as “a baby”. That similarity symbolizes the innocence of Muslims and the guilt of Americans. For instance, “Salwa, [who is the main character], in American society feels like the girl in the hands of the Ghula” (Anushiravani and Khademi 12).

Apparently, Halaby signals the danger of being a Muslim or an Arab in America rather than the opposite as it has been claimed by the other novelists. The character of Salwa is portrayed as a person who does not feel safe in America at all. Thus, Halaby’s rebellious

novel shows that there is no *one* dominant truth. In other words, “[t]hough not heard or yield to the same amount, ... there are multiple voices present in the American society” (Anushiravani and Khademi 10-11).

In *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, Mohsin Hamid also depicts a Muslim character whose name is Changez as a person who faces many troubles in the US just because of 9/11 attacks. He experiences many awful situations and many difficulties doing some very natural things. When he travels, he faces several obstacles to enter the US again. In addition to that, he has a girl friend, Erica, who changes radically after the attacks because she feels “haunted”. As a result of her fear, she breaks up with Changez (Al-Ibia 24). So, Changez is depicted as innocent though receiving such harm and ill-treatment.

1.5. Media’s Contribution to Shaping Discourse

In the wake of September 11th, 2001 attacks, many factors contributed to shaping discourse including media. The latter are considered as powerful means that affect people’s way of thinking because media are the main sources people rely on to know what is happening in the world and what are the most interesting events that are taking place (Yusof et al.). Consequently, Islam as a religion starts to appear as a threat due to its negative coverage. Media can worsen the image of Islam because its role “is to shape opinions and presenting a particular version as reality” (Yusof et al. 105). Thus, as a result of media’s representation of Islam and Muslims, the “reality” that dominated the scene was that Muslims are dangerous and they are all terrorists because after the attacks, “media tend to negatively depict Islam by associating it with terrorism” (Yusof et al. 105).

The power of media in shaping reality is proved through their ability to “influenc[e] the whole world to morally support the US in protesting against terrorism” (Yusof et al. 105). After the attacks and due to media’s impact, Muslims started to be called by such phrases as “fundamentalists” and “Islamists” what increased the gap between Muslim and Non-Muslim societies and groups (Yusof et al. 109). In fact, several researchers found that media

represented Islam and Muslims negatively even before the 9/11 attacks but that negativity increased after the attacks (Rane and Abdalla 40) as the following quotation indicates:

The anti-Muslim discourse in the Western media began with the Iranian Revolution in 1979 and the ensuing US hostage crisis, and it grew belligerent during the periodic crises over Libya and the Middle East in the 1980s (Said, 2008). In past decades, wars in Iraq in the 1990s, and the consequent events of 9/11 in 2001, further amplified the tone and volume of the discourse (Ahmed and Matthes 222).

This indicates that the story of hate and enmity towards Muslims started in the ancient past and long before the attacks. Hence, the attacks only added fuel to fire.

Although 9/11 attacks and their representation in media as well as many other sources raised lots of debates that emphasized, mainly, a religiously prejudiced American nation against Muslims, be them Muslim Americans or Arabs, a detailed study conducted by Christopher Smith proved that soon after the attacks, Americans show feelings of sympathy towards Muslim-Americans. However, “it was only after Americans’ fear of terrorism subsided that they began to reassess Islam in a more negative way” (Smith 1-2).

Smith sees that media are responsible of calming people’s feelings of prejudice towards Muslim-Americans soon after the attacks as they are the ones that increased that feeling later (2). The main reason behind the Americans’ shift in attitude towards Muslims lies “in the number of Americans who said Islam ‘encourages violence’” (Smith 5). Actually, that deep impact of media indicates its remarkable influence on people’s perspectives and attitudes (Smith). In addition to shaping reality, media also “contribute to the overall cultural production of knowledge” (Ahmed and Matthes 220). That is, they highly contribute to the construction of truth.

Media’s coverage of Islam and Muslims, after 9/11 attacks, proves that Muslims were seen as a dangerous menace to the Western spirit of independence and liberty for they are “framed as heartless, brutal, uncivilized, [and] religious fanatics” (Ahmed and Matthes 222).

Stated differently, Islam is presented from the perspective of a “white man’s world” (Ahmed and Matthes 222) and Muslims are categorized as “them” and presented as a threat to “us”. Furthermore, the hate discourse shaped by media justifies non-Muslim racist attitude (Ahmed and Matthes 231). This proves that media are the primary and most powerful references that encourage hate and abhorrence against Muslims.

Rochelle Terman also supports the same point of view and relates Muslims’ connection with “terrorism” to media. He sees that due to the latter’s link of Muslims to “terrorism”, Americans’ opinion toward Muslims changed and fear of the terrorist attacks increased. Additionally, media affected Americans’ view toward Muslims all over the world i.e. Muslims in America and outside.

While media have contributed to forming a negative stigma attached to Islam as a religion, several scholars started later to call for reassessing the image and representation of Islam and Muslims (Ahmed and Matthes 236). For instance, Moore believes that things have to change and the negative image given to Islam and Muslims must be corrected. To reach this end, she argues: “It falls now on the leadership of the community to spread real knowledge about Islam, to reach out to the mainstream community in an effort to combat the ongoing cycle of fear and hatred aimed at the Muslim community” (94). That is, she is calling for change and insisting on bringing the real image of Islam into light.

Edward Said is another scholar who encourages the reassessment of the image constructed by media. He considers media as very powerful and successful in influencing people to believe a certain fact. However, he sees that such an achievement “can be attributed to the political influence of those people and institutions producing it rather than necessarily to truth or accuracy” (qtd. in Polonska-Kimunguyi and Gillespie n.p.). Again, it is only due to media’s reporting of Islam and relating it with terrorism, Americans started to perceive Muslims as their opponents or as “the enemy within” while they are not necessarily real terrorists (Rottier 32).

1.6. Foucault's Discourse, Knowledge, and Power

1.6.1. Discourse

To start with, the term “discourse” is a very commonly used term but it is also a confusing one for it has been defined and referred to in different ways. Although several scholars pay special attention to this concept and its different uses, Michel Foucault is one of the theorists who becomes very famous of his use and explanation of “discourse”. Foucault himself explains it differently in some of his works. According to him, discourse is “speech or writing” which represents certain ideas and attitudes. The latter form one’s “way of looking at the world” (Mills, *Discourse* 5). That is, discourse is the result of certain thoughts that affect one’s way of thinking.

In the same above-mentioned reference, Foucault indicates that the best way to explain discourse is not to describe it as “a group of signs or a ...text” (Mills, *Discourse* 15). Instead, it is a set of “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (qtd. in Mills, *Discourse* 15). This means that discourse creates and shapes other things rather than being something that “can be analysed in isolation” (Mills, *Discourse* 15). In other words, discourse has certain effects or results.

Sara Mills, in her book *Michel Foucault* (2003), collects Foucault’s explanations of “discourse” and clarifies them in a simplified way stating that Foucault claims, in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, that

he has used ‘discourse’ to refer to ‘the general domain of all statements, sometimes as an individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements’ (Foucault 1972: 80). By ‘the general domain of all statements’, he means that ‘discourse’ can be used to refer to all utterances and statements which have been made which have meaning and which have some effect. Sometimes, in addition, he has used the term to refer to ‘individualizable groups of statements’, that is utterances

which seem to form a grouping, such as the discourse of femininity or the discourse of racism. At other times, he has used the term discourse to refer to ‘regulated practices that account for a number of statements’, that is the unwritten rules and structures which produce particular utterances and statements. For example, there is no set of rules written down on how to write essays, and yet somehow most students at university manage to learn how to write within the framework of the essay’ (53).

Mills, then, tries to highlight the fact that discourse is used in several ways. Sometimes, it is used to mean that it has certain results and consequences on others through the meaningful “statements” that are produced. In other times, it is used to describe “statements” that create some classifications. She gives the example of “femininity” and “racism”. It is also used to mean that discourse can have effects even when there are no written down official regulations.

Building on the definitions mentioned before, it is clear that discourse always has “an effect” that has to be taken seriously. This point has also been highlighted by Mills. She emphasizes that discourse does not “have little effect on people’s lives” (Mills, *Discourses of Difference* 68). Instead, it is responsible of creating “subjects” seeing that these “subjects” who are “individuals” play a role in this practice. According to her, their role is meant to be “both challenging and rewriting some of the positions within discourse” (Mills, *Discourses of Difference* 68). That is, they act as active and not passive receivers.

Foucault sees that several people, who are dissimilar, said “different things”, from a variety of perspectives to achieve different aims. He, then, raises the issue of who can say what, i.e. he questions the idea that certain people can speak powerfully about different subjects while others are not allowed to do so, how the *right* to speak is shared between individuals? And “which type of discourse is authorized [?]”(Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 27). Then, he moves to talking about “silence” in relation to “discourse” arguing that there are “silences” and they are the main cause as they form the basis for discourse (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 27).

In more than one book, Foucault focuses on power and knowledge in relation to discourse. He sheds light on the idea that the role and utility of discourse is not a fixed and steady one. In other words, individuals are not supposed to understand discourse as a strategy that creates “accepted discourse and excluded discourse ... the dominant discourse and the dominated one; but as a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies” (*Foucault, The History of Sexuality* 100).

1.6.2. Knowledge

Knowledge, according to Christopher R. Maboloc, “is everywhere, influencing what most people do or how people act by providing humans with an image of the world” (144). That is, knowledge is the means through which people think or look at things in a certain way or from a certain perspective.

Focusing on knowledge, “Foucault had written about the epistemic context within which those bodies of knowledge became intelligible and authoritative” (Gutting 96). He was highly concerned with the issue of “authority” for he raises many questions concerning whose and which pieces of information are considered as “serious” and why these “statements”, in particular, are taken into consideration. That is why he emphasizes the existence of different discourses and he called the production of knowledge as a result of discourse “discursive formations” (Gutting 96).

Foucault also pays special attention to what he calls “the rarefaction of the speaking subject” (qtd. in Mills, *Michel Foucault* 61). By this expression, he means that there are certain constraints upon those who can “speak authoritatively, that is, some discourses are open to all and some have very limited access” (qtd. in Mills, *Michel Foucault* 61). For instance, at the university, not everyone can give lectures and the latter take place in classrooms where the teacher is the one who faces the students and who controls and

dominates the session while students do not speak for the longest period (Mills, *Michel Foucault*). Thus, the teacher has the authority to speak.

According to Foucault, since there are no rules about who can control and dominate the lecture, if a student speaks for a long period, his/her colleagues will be disturbed. He agreed that, at university, there are no regulations that are officially written and dictate who can speak authentically. Thus, Foucault's point behind this idea has to do with "knowledge", i.e., how some kinds of knowledge are taken seriously while others are "excluded".

Thus, this whole seemingly self-evident system of silencing and forcing to speak, of commenting on and assessing that work in relation to fixed standards is less about imparting knowledge and is more about the institutionalisation of discourse and the mapping out of power relations between lecturers and students (Mills, *Michel Foucault* 61-62).

In addition to that, knowledge most of the time gives a kind of "a total description that draws all phenomena around a single center" (qtd. in Maboloc 145). However, this kind of "centering" leads people to think that the reality they are provided with is unchangeable. This kind of knowledge, then, which is the production of "the selfish individual" (Maboloc 145) leads those in the periphery to have a high regard for it and accept it and as the same critic highlights, this kind of knowledge "effectively silences and at the same time, inadvertently wins the admiration of the powerless voices in the peripheries" (Maboloc 145). That is, as an effect of discourse, knowledge leads to the creation of a certain reality that will be considered as absolute.

One of the great concerns of Foucault is to alter and affect people's view towards knowledge as merely people's thoughts and opinions. Instead, he wants them to grasp it as a created effect that is formed through precise strategies and circumstances (Zakiuddin). Stated differently, knowledge is to a certain extent the product of power. This means that due to power, knowledge is known as such. Foucault believes that

a discourse does not exist in a direct causal Relationship with elements that constitute it or are constituted by it. Although it seems as though certain conditions and elements directly produce certain kinds of discursive knowledge, practices, behavior and norms, Foucault stresses the importance of focusing not on the constituent elements singly, on their own, or on their causal attributes, but with reference to the ways in which they are composed relationally, i.e. through the systematic ways in which the elements are connected in order to form a whole (qtd. in Zakiuddin 35). It is in these relationships, interconnected modes and forms of regulation, control, production and facilitation that power and knowledge become imbricated, and discursive “facts” are produced (Zakiuddin 35).

Foucault opposes Bacon’s philosophy that argues that “Knowledge is power” (qtd. in “On the Notion of Truth” 39). This means that if you know the rules of something, you can master it. So, in this case, your “knowledge” is what makes you in a powerful position. However, Foucault rejected this thought for he sees that “[p]ower creates the forms of knowledge” (qtd. in “On the Notion of Truth” 39) which is the opposite of what Bacon claimed. Foucault sees that “knowledge” means your “power over others” as it is your “power” to label and categorize them. Stated differently, power is what gives a person to establish certain knowledge and the latter will be accepted as true because of his power. Foucault adds: “Each society has its regime of truth, its general politics of truth, that is, the type of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true” (“On the Notion of Truth” 39-40). Thus, truth, again, is relative. Building on this quote, there is no *one* dominant discourse all over the world. Instead, it depends on each society and what it considers as true and powerful.

1.6.3. Power

However, while Foucault emphasizes the power of discourse and its effect, he also makes sure that discourse is not available to everyone. That is, “[n]ot everyone is able to make statements, or to have statements taken seriously by others. Some statements are more

authorized than others, in that they are more associated with those in positions of power or with institutions” (Mills, *Michel Foucault* 65). This means that “statements” are not treated or received in the same way, and power is what makes the difference. This indicates the importance of power and the key role it plays in making discourse acceptable and establishing its effect. He gives a detailed explanation of power in several references for he sees it as closely connected to discourse. He believes that “[s]peaking is not the free, accessible, and spontaneous act it might appear to be. It is reserved, assigned to a group of people, governed by social laws and practices; it is in short the result and manifestation of power” (Taleb-Khyar 190-191). That is, though “speaking” seems a very spontaneous act, it is not available to everyone. Rather, a very limited group has the ability to produce accepted knowledge.

In *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault gives special attention to the concept of power. He clearly related it to individuals’ compliance by arguing: “All the modes of domination, submission, and subjugation are ultimately reduced to an effect of obedience” (85). Then, he moves on to draw a comparison between the effect of power in his society as well as in the Western one. He believes that in the former, there is an “acceptability” of power because it is performed through restricting autonomy. However, in the latter, power is practiced “in terms of law” (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 87).

However, he strongly argues that his concept of power has nothing to do with people’s obedience and submission. Rather, he explains power differently by stating:

power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, as the strategies in which they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus,

in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 92).

In Foucault's point of view, power is not explained as one group's domination or oppression over another and hence, a group's obedience to another. Instead, he believes, it is a kind of a tactic or a process in which "individuals" play a key role. He states: "Power must be analysed as something which circulates, or as something which only functions in the form of a chain ... Power is employed and exercised through a netlike organisation ... Individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application" (qtd. in Mills, *Michel Foucault* 35). This means that he sees power as something that is passed in society through individuals, for it is similar to a "chain". He rejects the fact that power is applied to individuals and that they passively receive it since he sees them as active means through which power is exercised in the form of relations. This leads readers to reconsider the concept of power and the role individuals play, i.e., "whether they are simply subjected to oppression or whether they actively play a role in the form of their relations with others and with institutions" (Mills, *Michel Foucault* 35). Foucault, of course, believes that they play a key and active role, making this power functions.

Furthermore, Foucault argues that "[p]ower is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations" (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 94). Thus, Foucault's explanation of power and how it works in society gives a clear hint of how "power relations" affect society. It also gives an idea on the way power is performed and challenged or opposed in society. This leads Foucault to consider people as "as active subjects" and oppose their role as "passive dupes" (Mills, *Michel Foucault* 34). Thus, he strongly believes that persons are not cheated instead, they participate in power strategies, through their relations with others.

Since Foucault sees that power is practiced in the form of “a chain” (to use his term) and that people are active participants, he concludes that “[p]ower is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere” (*The History of Sexuality* 93). So in a different way, he highlights the same idea that power is a process that is present in all places since it does not act as a relation between two groups: one is authoritative and dominating the other (*The History of Sexuality* 93). Instead, it works like a grid. To emphasize this point, one has to refer to Foucault’s explanation: “One needs to be nominalistic, no doubt: power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society” (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 93). So, different relations in society are considered as related to power.

Foucault finds it very interesting to clarify the meaning of “power relations”. He underlines the fact that it is not a violent act. That is, power is not performed in a form of an act that will be exercised directly on “others” instead he sees that “it acts upon their actions: an action upon an action” (“The Subject and Power” 789). Although he confirms that it is not “violence”, still he assumes the responsibility of certain acts to power for he sees that it “incites, it induces, it seduces” (“The Subject and Power” 789).

Foucault believes that “[p]ower relations are both intentional and nonsubjective” (*The History of Sexuality* 94). This means that power is never practiced without a purpose. Still, there is no one person who plans to perform power over others. Instead, he sees it as

tactics which, becoming connected to one another, attracting and propagating one another, but finding their base of support and their condition elsewhere, end by forming comprehensive systems: the logic is perfectly clear, the aims decipherable, and yet it is often the case that no one is there to have invented them, and few who can be said to have formulated them: (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 94-95).

That is, power relations are the result of interrelated strategies that are encouraged and realized by individuals to reach the aim and make certain perspectives and realities acceptable in society.

After a long journey of research and publications, Foucault clarifies that his main purpose is to suggest how “human beings are made subjects” (qtd. in Roberts 34). In his article “The Subject and Power” (1982), Foucault started with a clarification of his main purpose during a period of twenty years. He declares that his intention was to clarify the different ways or what he called “modes” of turning “human beings into subjects” (“The Subject and Power” 777). He provides readers with the example of his focus on “sexuality” and how men consider “themselves as subjects of ‘sexuality’” (“The Subject and Power” 778). Foucault emphasizes the fact that the main theme he focuses on is the subject rather than power but he found himself obliged to include power since the “human subject” is placed within “power relations”. Hence, although he defines the word “subject” in two different ways still, he sees that it is closely connected to power for he says:

It is a form of power which makes individuals subjects. There are two meanings of the word "subject": subject to someone else by control and dependence; and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to (“The Subject and Power” 781).

Sara Mills indicates that Foucault’s explanation of “discourse and power” is very interesting and helpful for it clarifies the way the relation between the two goes. He relates the two concepts to truth. That is, he focuses on what is considered as true and how we come to know that truth and where it comes from (*Michel Foucault* 66). Furthermore, Foucault considers power as a key aspect that leads to establishing truth for it “produces reality, domains of objects, and rituals of truth. But people themselves form part of this whole configuration and not just the state” (Maboloc 148). Stated differently, power is responsible

of the production of reality but according to this critic, the state is not the only element to be blamed but individuals also form part of this system.

The same critic exemplified referring to the post 9/11 reality. He criticized the creation of such a “paranoia” and such an anxiety and fear on behalf of the public. He sees that things must be clear and the “dark secret must be revealed” (Maboloc 148). This means, according to him, that there is no need for such a fear for it is unjustified. He refers to Saddam Hussein as an instance, mentioning that the latter was accused of committing several illegal acts but no proof confirms that. That is, this critic sees that certain versions of reality are created but nothing proves that it is the one people have to follow.

In his *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault talks about the Panoptican prison. However, he sees that “the practice of placing individuals under observation is a natural extension of a justice imbued with disciplinary methods and examination procedures” (qtd. in Maboloc 149). He means that these “methods” are tools through which those who occupy higher positions can “control a very tired population fed with poison on TV” (Maboloc 149). As if he is trying to say that people are manipulated, used, and deceived. To emphasize the triviality of the post 9/11 *produced* reality and the deception of those in authority, Maboloc states: “Today’s world is replete with pharaohs, false prophets, and self-proclaimed champions” (149). That is, he considers them as fake, harsh, severe, and “self-proclaimed”. However, people in authority do not form the only entity this critic is criticizing. Instead, he blames everyone who succumbs to such a “scenario”, as he calls it. As if he is raising the issue of people’s submission to certain rules and certain baseless lies.

According to Sara Mills, Foucault sees that one’s capacity to rule and control does not mean that this person owns power. Instead, this person is able “to create a spectrum of relations which position people in order to make the system function effectively” (Maboloc 150). Thus, he considers persons as part of a system that they produced or constructed. They

create it in order to place people in a certain order and hence, everything will work successively.

According to Foucault, there is no way to get away from power. The only thing that restricts it is “death”. He emphasizes this point by saying: “death is power's limit” (*The History of Sexuality* 139). He strongly believes that all kinds of relationships include power relations, and the latter are the effect of these relationships, shedding light on the fact that these diverse relations of power among different groups and individuals form “the basis” for the difference and division among people in society (*The History of Sexuality*).

In his *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*, Foucault starts by highlighting the issue of power. He stresses the fact that his main focus is on power and its connection to truth. He believes that power “produces and transmits” truth and the latter “reproduces” this power. Foucault also raises the issue of philosophers and the way they questioned “the discourse of truth”. In relation to their concern with it, he questioned truth and the way it is created in relation to power. That is, he wants to know the nature or kind of this power that is capable of creating a discourse of truth that has very powerful and deep effects on society. In other words, he tries to examine the fact that those who are in a position of power are able to “dictate” what is true and what is not and as a result, their power is more likely to continue. He strongly agrees:

[I]n any society, there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterize and constitute the social body. . . . These relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse. There can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth. . . . We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 3-4).

Furthermore, he sees that in order for society to continue to exist, individuals are obliged to create truth since that society emphasizes. He continues arguing that these “truths” are what

dictate what is legal and good for human beings in a certain society and these principles and rules are the ones that give us “the sense which we have of ourselves” (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 4). Hence, he believes that individuals are “forced to produce the truth of power that our society demands, of which it has need, in order to function: we must speak the truth; we are constrained or condemned to confess or discover the truth” (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 3-4). That is, though he considers individuals as contributing to power and its functions, one can infer that he sees that they do not have another choice.

Truth has been defined by Foucault as “a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements” (*Power/Knowledge* 133). That is, once there is an agreement on the norms or what is right and wrong or what is acceptable and what is not, truth operates in a form of “a system” to produce certain “statements” building on which one can differentiate between the true and the false. Furthermore, he stresses the fact that truth is the product or result of power relations as it is the one that leads to the “effects” of this power.

According to Foucault, “truth” is inside “power”. Truth, he believes, is part of “this world” as it leads to certain “effects of power” (*Power/Knowledge* 131-132). However, what is considered as true or the discourse of truth changes from one society to another because every “society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true” (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 131-132). Thus, each society accepts certain discourses as true and makes them circulate and through certain techniques and “mechanisms” the society follow, one can differentiate between what is true and what is false.

While highlighting truth, Foucault pays attention also to the role of intellectuals. He sees that the latter function “at the general level of that regime of truth” (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 132), seeing truth as very essential to any society to continue its functioning. In order not to misunderstand what Foucault exactly means by truth, he clarifies

that by truth he means “the ensemble of rules according to which the true and the false are separated and specific effects of power attached to the true, it being understood also that it's not a matter of a battle 'on behalf' of the truth, but of a battle about the status of truth” (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 132). That is, his purpose is to question truth, its position, how it is produced, building on which “rules”, and its close relation to power.

Referring back to intellectuals, Foucault believes that the intellectual's objective is not to disapprove the correctness of “science” or “ideology” nor he tries to prove that his ideology is the true or correct one. Rather, he just tries to reach a certain point to prove that “new politics of truth” (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 133) are possible. In other words, the aim is not to change what people have in their minds “but the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth” (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 133). So, the aim here is not to liberate or disconnect truth from power which would be impossible. The aim, then, is to separate “the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time” (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 133). In other words, truth is proved to be very powerful and potent to the extent that it affects the way control functions in all the domains. Thus, the main purpose is to question its power and effectiveness.

Foucault sees that “truth” is something invented, something like a lie. It is “a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements” (qtd. in “On the Notion of Truth” 40). Thus, “truth” has to do with “power” that affects its production. Therefore, “[t]he power of knowledge reveals itself in a discourse through which it arbitrarily, and for its own purposes, engages in the invention of ‘truth’. In this way, says Foucault, knowledge produces our reality” (qtd. in “On the Notion of Truth” 40). This proves that Foucault is supporting the subjectivity of reality.

However, although Foucault related “truth” to “power”, he was sure to clarify the fact that “power” does not mean the exercise of force or strength over others. It is not “always

exercised from above in a negative or repressive way but is an open cluster of relations that extend to every aspect of our social, culture and political lives” (“On the Notion of Truth” 40). Thus, as previously mentioned, it works in the form of ‘relations’ and this includes all kinds of relationships without being necessarily related to one group’s power over another.

1.7. Resistance from a Foucauldian Perspective

Although Foucault dedicates a large part of his work to the question of power and how it functions in society, he is not only concerned with power as he is not trying to emphasize power’s relation to coercion. Instead, he gives also special importance to “resistance to power” (Mills, *Michel Foucault* 34).

In his *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault states that “[w]here there is power, there is resistance” (95-96). This proves that “power” and “resistance” are interrelated and cannot be separated because he agrees that in order for power to be performed in any “relation”, “there has to be someone who resists. Foucault goes so far as to argue that where there is no resistance it is not, in effect, a power relation” (Mills, *Michel Foucault* 40). That is, resistance must always be present in power relations.

Again, Foucault sheds light on the presence of resistance all the time, in all the places. Additionally, he emphasized the fact that several kinds of resistance exist and this depends on the case. As he emphasizes the close connection between resistance and “power relations” as stated in the following quote:

These points of resistance are present everywhere in the power network. Hence there is no single locus of great Refusal, no soul of revolt, source of all rebellions, or pure law of the revolutionary. Instead there is a plurality of resistances, each of them a special case: resistances that are possible, necessary, improbable; others that are spontaneous, savage, solitary, concerted, rampant, or violent; still others that are quick to compromise, interested, or sacrificial; by definition, they can only exist in the strategic field of power relations (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 95-96).

He also focuses on the fact that resistance is seen as an opponent to “power relations” for it is not welcome in this sphere since it can act as a hindrance in the face of power. They are seen as such because “[r]esistances ... are the odd term in relations of power; they are inscribed in the latter as an irreducible opposite” (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 95-96). That is, to oppose or resist means to refuse to comply with the *created* norms which will hamper the functioning of power. That is, then, the main reason behind seeing resistance as such.

Foucault sees that as discourse proves to be a means of power, it can also lead to resistance. That is, it can be used to exercise power and its opposite because

[d]iscourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it, any more than silences are. We must make allowance for the complex and unstable process whereby discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 100-101).

This quote emphasizes the fact that discourse is not stable for the latter can act as a positive means to exercise power as it can act as an obstacle that leads to “resistance” and opposition. Further, discourse is always present in relations but the presence of “contradictory discourses” (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 101-102) at the same time is also possible. That is, the discourse created by power and the one that leads to resistance.

Supporting the same idea, Foucault declares:

Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it. In like manner, silence and secrecy are a shelter for power, anchoring its prohibitions; but they also loosen its holds and provide for relatively obscure areas of tolerance (*The History of Sexuality* 101).

Again, this indicates that discourse can support power as it can act as a barrier in its face. However, “silence” helps in fixing and fortifying power because if there is silence, no opposition will be initiated.

In an attempt to explain the way “power relations” work, he suggests that for human beings to analyze and grasp what “power relations” are based on, one “should investigate the forms of resistance and attempts made to dissociate these relations” (Foucault, “The Subject and Power” 780). That is, he believes that it is necessary to scrutinize resistance or opposition so that one can get an idea on how “power relations” work. As an example, he refers to the resistance of the power of “men over women”, “parents over children” etc. (“The Subject and Power” 780). Therefore, he interprets these oppositional acts as

struggles which question the status of the individual: on the one hand, they assert the right to be different, and they underline everything which makes individuals truly individual. On the other hand, they attack everything which separates the individual, breaks his links with others, splits up community life, forces the individual back on him- self, and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way (“The Subject and Power” 781).

He means that the acts of resistance are started by people in order to prove their subjectivity and remove a certain stigma that is created by power relations. In other words, he sees that they want to prove the existence of a different version of reality and at the same time, they criticize everything related to limiting the ‘individual’ and separating him from others.

He also indicates that these individuals’ resistance is the result of the “effects of power” (“The Subject and Power” 781) and, as it has been mentioned, Foucault believes that power is closely tied to knowledge. Therefore, these resistant acts are “struggles against the privileges of knowledge” (“The Subject and Power” 781). Simply put, these oppositional acts are a form of saying *no* to “these abstractions” (“The Subject and Power” 781) as they try to answer questions related to who they really are. Then, Foucault finalizes his interpretation of

resistance by clarifying the fact that these individuals are not attacking a specific group. Instead they are against “a technique, a form of power” (“The Subject and Power” 781).

Underlining the same issue of “power relations” and resistance, Foucault sees that individuals’ main objective today is to modify and correct the image imposed on them for he clearly states: “Maybe the target nowadays is not to discover what we are but to refuse what we are. We have to imagine and to build up what we could be to get rid of this kind of political ‘double bind,’ which is the simultaneous individualization and totalization of modern power structures” (“The Subject and Power” 785). That is, he wants individuals to “imagine” their future and possible image and then, they take a step forward in order to change the present and purge it of ill thoughts. By “totalization”, he means that almost all the time, the state, that is considered as a political power, pays no heed to “individuals”. Rather, it gives notice just to “the interest of the totality” (“The Subject and Power” 782). That is, it focuses on a certain “group” or “class”. In addition to that, Foucault also relates power to freedom and by the latter he means “the freedom of the will not to be dominated” (Maboloc 144). In other words, he means people’s ability to express their opinions freely, opinions that are different from the officially accepted ones, and to resist and criticize the ways of control.

While Foucault focuses, as previously mentioned, on truth and its creation, he highlights the fact that “truth should always be questioned” (Maboloc 152). That is, he does not see truth as authentic and hence, it can be changed. For him, “the present order of things...dictates” (Maboloc 152) a certain truth while in fact it is not the only version of truth that must be followed. Rather, it can be changed and other versions can be proved to exist. Foucault believes that the existence and dominance of this kind of truth is merely the result of the weak’s silence.

Again, Foucault believes that power is not a possession but an exercise. By this, he means that power does not refer to the fact that a certain group will dominate and control

another. Rather, it is a set of relations that are exercised and people need to do a step forward to change their position, reality, and image in these “complex relations” (Maboloc 153). Thus, the individual can leave his traces by refusing to surrender to such a created fake reality (Maboloc).

Foucault confirms in many occasions that power is everywhere so, Maboloc sees that this power should be used so that those in the periphery can prove themselves, try to be in the center, and inquire the reasons behind such a “social order” and hence he argues:

Since power is indeed ubiquitous, the idea is to be able to deploy power in order to strengthen those in the margins, away from the center—in busy streets or barber shops, outside the board room, far from that panoptic gaze, or in places where human thought can make its last heroic stand—in peasant movements, in social media, those ethnic rituals or even in that small room where young minds put to question the insidious motives of the social order (Maboloc 154).

In addition to that, Foucault also pays special attention to what he calls “technology of the self” (Foucault, *The Politics of Truth* 180-82). By this technique he means that in every society there are certain “techniques” that allow people to do certain operations in terms of “bodies”, “souls”, “thoughts”, etc. and by allowing them to “conduct” or lead themselves, these individuals will attain or achieve satisfaction or “happiness”. This operation is what Foucault calls “technology of the self”. He suggests that if one wants to study the history of the “subject”, he has to take into consideration not only what he calls “the technology of the self” but also that of “domination”. He sees that the two are interrelated as he argues that one

has to take into account the points where the technologies of domination of individuals over one another overlap processes by which the individual acts upon himself. And conversely, he has to take into account the points where the techniques of the self are integrated into structures of coercion or domination. The contact point, where the individuals are driven [and known] by others is

...tied to the way they conduct themselves [and know themselves] (Foucault, *The Politics of Truth* 180-82).

Thus, it is such an overlap that Foucault calls “government” as he refers to the term preserving the same meaning of the word in the 16th century. He believes that “the government of people” does not necessarily mean that individuals are obliged to do what the “governor” dictates. Instead, he continues, it is a mixture of and a balance between the strategies that dictate domination and the ways “through which the self is constructed or modified by himself” (Foucault, *The Politics of Truth* 180-82).

1.8. Foucault and Literature

Although Michel Foucault is a philosopher and his field seems far from literature, he, in fact, is highly interested in literature. In one of his interviews about *The Order of Things* (1966), Foucault shows his interest to the field of literature as he clarifies that he is keen on everything that “contains thought in a culture” (qtd. in Zyl and Kistner 200). That is, he supports the thoughts no matter what the field is. In several of his works, he refers to many literary works including Cervantes's *Don Quixote*, Velazquez's *Las Meninas*, and the writings of the Marquis de Sade to mention just few. When asked about his reference to literary texts, he replies by clarifying the fact that his focus on literary texts is not done by chance as he did not do that for the sake of focusing on the literary works’ criticism of society. Rather, “[l]iterature and art occupy a privileged position in Foucault's work as a result of their capacity to establish both systematic and symptomatic links between knowledge and art” (Zyl and Kistner 200-201). Therefore, he sees that literature is thoroughly connected to knowledge.

According to the same critics, it is not an easy task to classify the way and methods in which Foucault employs literature for it is very deep or profound. However, one can notice that partly, Foucault values literature “for its capacity not just to argue for, but to instantiate dissent or radical critique” (Zyl and Kistner 201). Put differently, he gives importance to

literary texts for their ability to embody the disagreement and expression of different opinions from those that are officially accepted.

Also, in his *Essential Works of Michel Foucault* entitled *Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology*, Foucault shows his fascination for literary texts for “their capacity not just to transgress prevailing orders of knowledge and discourse, but to embody dissent ... that Foucault most admires” (Zyl and Kistner 202). That “dissent” relationship means, according to Foucault, “the relation between writing (or signification) and knowledge” (Zyl and Kistner 203). He sees the relation between the two as a deep, essential, and interesting one for it is “writing” that epitomizes “knowledge” in its “radical critique” (Zyl and Kistner 203). Furthermore, Foucault values this close connection between “writing and knowledge” for he sees that literary texts’ importance does not lie merely in their “moral” or “social” messages. Rather, he admires them for “they instantiate radically alternative forms of writing - those that escape the grips of discourse and representation” (Zyl and Kistner 204). As if he values literature’s transgression of certain established forms of knowledge as well as its ability to get rid of the power and control of “discourse”. Hence, literature is no more a prisoner of “discourse”.

Thus, it must be indicated that Foucault gives special attention to written texts and the role writing plays considering “language and writing” as “transparent instruments in which the world was reflected, decomposed and recomposed: in any case writing and discourse formed part of the world” (qtd. in Zyl and Kistner 205). This quote highlights the importance of both “writing and discourse” as two very essential ingredients of the production of this world’s reality.

In order to highlight the importance of art as a means through which one can change many aspects, Foucault refers to Baudelaire as an example while he does not mean Baudelaire as a person but as a literary figure. He indicates that this poet is not a man who tries to find

out his “truth” but “he is the man who tries to invent himself” (Zyl and Kistner 209). This proves Foucault’s strong belief in artists and their ability to alter the world. Foucault sees that literature as an effective tool through which artists can alter and improve reality especially when he clearly says: “this transfiguring play of freedom with reality, this aesthetic elaboration of the self does not belong in society itself or the body politic, but can only be produced in that other, ‘different place, which Baudelaire calls art’” (qtd. in Zyl and Kistner 209).

Literature occupies a very interesting place in Foucault’s books to the extent that sometimes the reader feels that he is interested in literature more than philosophy for he refers to plenty of literary figures and their works in his writings (Taleb-Khyar 185). However, there is a slight apparent contradiction between what Foucault says about it and the large part given to it in his writings. He believes that “literature is the language that says nothing” (Taleb-Khyar 188-189). He proves through his works that literature not only says things but “prove” them also. Hence, this is “in fact...the status of literature in Foucault's books” (Taleb-Khyar 188-189).

Foucault sees literature as very important and significant for he strongly believes that it is a means through which reality is better understood. Furthermore, he claims that literature contributes to the creation of truth because “true fiction”, according to Foucault, is not the mere reflection of reality as he clearly states:

Fiction...is a mode of apprehension of reality, a necessary moment of knowledge, something like the scenario used in military strategy. It prefigures reality, yet is removed from it. That discrepancy affects the very status of truth. Truth in fiction is a delayed correspondence. True fiction does not correspond to reality; it does not reflect it, it adds to it, and thus produces truth by creating a truth game (Taleb-Khyar 195-196).

That is, fiction also plays a key role in generating a certain discourse and hence truth that opposes the officially accepted one.

1.9. María Lugones Challenging Misrepresentation

María Lugones (b. 1944) is an Argentinian-born feminist philosopher. She is a Professor of Comparative Literature and women studies at Birmingham University. Her main focus is developing different methods of resistance against multiple oppressions. In her book *Pilgrimages/Peregrinajes* (2003), Lugones explicitly addresses ‘specific groups of readers, such as co-resisters of color or white/European oppressors’ (Roelofs 373-374). However, she implicitly directs her theories to others who do not belong to these groups but they share the same feeling of inferiority and disempowerment. Lugones is aware of addressing different groups while focusing, mainly, on the former ones.

1.9.1. Thick Versus Transparent Members

Lugones used the terms “transparent” and “thick” to refer to the mainstream’s as well as the minorities’ interests. According to her, a person is considered to have “transparent interests” if his/her interest is considered as the one that is agreed on by the main group. However, “[i]ndividuals are thick if they are aware of their otherness in the group” (qtd. in Saba n.p.). Lugones relates the term “thick” to the subordinate groups’ “fragmentation” because she believes that “thick” members are “invisible as themselves, whole” (Saba n.p.). They are seen as closely related to transparent members. Even their demands, perspectives, etc. are believed to be “a composite of transparent interest” (Saba n.p.).

For Lugones, “‘thick’ members, such as Shias in Sunni majority communities, or women in male-dominated associations, are rendered non-sensical as they are reduced to voicing their concerns within the framework of additive analysis of transparent interests” (Saba n.p.). This means that the categorized members (the ‘thick’ ones) are not considered as reasonable and having a voice as their concerns are always related to those of the

“transparent” ones and that is why Lugones insists on these groups’ making of their “worlds of sense” (Saba n.p.). She insists on their rejection of that categorization. She wants them to resist not only the “act” but the “logic” itself (Saba).

In a chapter entitled “Structure and Anti-structure”, in *Pilgrimages*, Lugones explains the role of structure as that of Foucault’s power relations. She believes that structure is responsible of forming persons and the way they feel and think. As if she is trying to say that those ‘thick’ members and the image given to them are just the creation of “structure” for she argues:

Structures construct or constitute persons not just in the sense of giving them a façade, but also in the sense of giving them emotions, beliefs, norms, desires, and intentions that are their own. That is, the person does not just wear a mask, but that person is the person who the structure constructs. Even the experience of putting on a mask or enacting a role is structure dependent (Lugones, *Pilgrimages* 60).

Similar to Foucault’s distinction between who can speak authoritatively, Lugones also refers to Michel de Certeau’s distinction between “tactics” and “strategists”. The former refers to the weak and the latter refers to the “planner” who sees from a high perspective. She explains:

Strategies are devised by planners, managers, subjects of will and power, from a point of view that is positioned high above the street, being able to view the “whole” to be structured, abstracting from the concrete in accordance with scientific rationality (de Certeau 1988: xix). Strategies always presuppose a “proper,” a place that can be circumscribed, and provides ‘a certain independence from the variability of circumstances’” (qtd. in Lugones, *Pilgrimages* 212).

Lugones strongly believes that “[d]omination constructs the oppressed subject as either invisible, not within the bounds of normalcy (that is, without structural description or

one as insane or deviant), as inferior, or as threatening because not ruled from within by modern rationality” (“On Complex Communication” 78). Thus, since they are seen and thought of as such, she sees that if these groups want to be recognized, they must “conquer channels of communication to call attention to the way they have been treated” (qtd. in Lugones, “Multiculturalism and Publicity” 179). According to her, if they need to be seen, heard, and intelligible, these groups must express their needs instead of remaining silent.

Lugones seems optimistic concerning resistance for she suggests some ways of resisting oppression, indicating that subordinate groups’ achievement of a new reality or “a new story of self” (“Multiculturalism and Publicity” 180) is promising. Furthermore, in her introduction to *Pilgrimages*, she clearly states that one of the main purposes of this book is to clarify “how and why no slice of ‘reality’ can have a univocal meaning” (28).

1.9.2. Lugones’ Suggested Strategies of Resistance

Lugones sees that minorities are responsible of reinforcing their inferiority or resisting it for she believes that “we become agents of oppression ourselves ... by following the logic of purity, by organizing ourselves into the neat orderly world of the lover of purity” (Saba n.p.). That is, if we fall under that categorization and division, we do not have to be consumed by this idea. Instead, we have to resist and reject “the lover of purity’s” principles and attempt to disempower us. For Lugones, the fact that they stop seeing themselves as such is a way of resistance for she believes that the “way to not be agents of oppression ourselves, we must resist seeing ourselves and others in neat separable categories” (Saba n.p.). That is, she completely rejects the impossibility of resisting misrepresentation as the following quote clarifies:

Here, we must remember that Lugones rejects a one self/one world ontology and instead subscribes to a pluralistic metaphysics where selves are multiple, as are the worlds that they inhabit and move between. Lugones’ metaphysics is based on a conception of space as ‘multiple, intersecting, contemporaneous realities’ (Lugones 2003, 16) and on a conception of the oppressed person as a

‘world’-traveler’ who journeys between realities and selves in order to survive (Mcweeny 295-296).

Lugones clearly states in her *Pilgrimages* that one of its main objectives is the construction of “meaning” and the oppressed’s realization by the oppressor. She sees that “oppressions intermesh” (3) and as a result “oppressed people” are categorized, grouped, and treated as alike without taking into consideration the fact that they are individuals. Such a grouping is the result of “a logic tied to purity as an instrument of social control” (*Pilgrimages* 3). In other words, the oppressor acts building on the logic of purity and superiority and thus this gives them the intention to categorize. Hence, Lugones sees that resisters must take part in this “categorical separations” (*Pilgrimages* 3). She wants them to contribute in terms of meaning for she clearly states: “Getting ready to intervene at the level of meaning is one of the strands that I am putting out to worlds of resistance, to be taken up or transformed, but I hope to be considered” (*Pilgrimages* 3). That is, she wants the resisters to take part in constructing a new and different meaning and hence a different reality.

Lugones clearly states that her book is “a walking against and away from that hushing of the manyness of the past in the present by both dominators and those resisting domination” (*Pilgrimages* 4). In other words, she is directly stating her purpose which is the resistance of people’s silence. That is, she believes in the multiplicity of realities, meanings or what she called “manyness” but she is criticizing its “hushing” by both the oppressor and the oppressed. As if she wants the former to admit or confess and the latter to resist. She wants the oppressed to take action by clearly stating: “sometimes the history is of me and you” (*Pilgrimages* 4). As if she wants to say that *we* make history and that is why one has to take action and resist.

What proves that Lugones is strongly supporting the existence of different realities and perspectives is the following quote:

There is the bird's-eye view ----- the perspective from up high, planning the town, the takeover, or the analysis of life and history. There is the pedestrian view----- the perspective from inside the midst of people, from inside the layers of relations -----and institutions and practices (*Pilgrimages* 5).

This means that no one dominant perspective exists. Instead, a variety of perspectives and hence realities and meanings are possible. That is, the reality seen from the perspective of those who believe in their superiority and “purity” is not the same as the one lived and seen from the perspective of those who are categorized as inferior and “impure”. And that is why she is resisting, as previously stated, the “hushing of the manyness” (*Pilgrimages* 4).

She strongly encourages the oppressed who is believed to be inferior and passive to take action in order to resist the reality formed in the past. She directly states: “The commitment is to live differently in the present, to think and act against the grain of oppression” (*Pilgrimages* 5). Hence, Lugones’ main purpose seems to spread hope in those considered as “impure”. She disagrees with the fact of seeing those as inferior from a superior perspective. Instead, she highlights the concreteness of these people as she calls for taking their reality into consideration before classifying them. At the same time, she calls those categorized people to prove their other meanings and realities as a result of the creation of such a difference between ‘us’ and ‘them’. She argues:

Taking in the map is not to occupy a ‘from the top position,’ a bird’s-eye view. It is rather to study one’s spatiality, the spatiality of one’s relations, of one’s productions and their meaning in both a concrete and abstract sense. You are concrete-your spatiality, constructed as an intersection following the designs of power, isn’t. This discrepancy already tells you that you are more than one (*Pilgrimages* 10).

That is, she wants those people to benefit from this classification to prove themselves and resist that dominant reality rather than being passive and weak. They have to take action in order to prove their multiplicity.

1.9.2.a. The Concept of Curdling

Lugones uses the term “curdling” and relates it to resistance or what she called “impure separation” (qtd. in Roelofs 379). For her, subordinate groups cannot be completely separated from mainstream ones for it is impossible, according to her, to reach a *pure* separation. In order to illustrate this point, she refers to her childhood when her mother used to ask her to prepare mayonnaise. She had to separate the egg’s white from its yolk, the thing that Lugones saw as impossible to reach as it must be done. As a result, Lugones sees that, in the political sphere, the attempt to reach that “pure” division must be replaced by the “impure” or “curdling” one. To illustrate this point, she refers to another step of making mayonnaise which is when she adds oil to the egg’s yolk. She is supposed to have a good mixture. However, when she adds lots of oil, she gets a “yolky oil and oily yolk” (qtd. in Roelofs 379). Thus, this kind of curdling is what Lugones “called for in the field of the relations among subjects, between subjects and objects, and among objects” (qtd. in Roelofs 379). That is, they can never separate or reach a total “purity”.

Furthermore, she focuses on the impossibility of separating white from yolk completely in order to compare it to “the logic of purity” (Saba n.p.). According to her, the latter is responsible of creating “fragmented subjects” (Saba n.p.). She sees that people with “transparent interests” (Saba n.p.) consider themselves as reasonable and superior. However, the “thick” ones are related to and judged by their race, culture, etc. “They are seen as anomalous, deviant, ambiguous, impure” (Saba n.p.) unless their interests are seen as needed to add to the “transparent interests”. Thus, there is always an attempt to separate and

categorize, the idea that Lugones rejects completely for she sees the pure separation as unachievable just as the yolk cannot be separated from the white completely.

1.9.2.b. Double Vision

Focusing on the same point of supporting the existence of *realities*, Lugones calls for developing what she terms as ‘double vision’. For her, “as we exercise double vision, it is clear that this gives us a way of rejecting the reality of the oppressor as true even when we recognize that it rules our lives” (Lugones, “On Complex Communication” 79). That is, even though the image created by mainstream groups dominates and ruins the subordinate ones’ lives, still the latter can neglect that image and “reality” by developing that “double vision”. However, she insists that neglecting this reality does not mean “to diminish one’s sense of its power, but it is a call not to be consumed by it” (Lugones, “On Complex Communication” 79). In other words, refusing to accept such a created fact must not lead to one’s sense of weakness. She means that this created image must not lead to their sense of inferiority. They must not believe it and act building on this logic.

Lugones insists on resisting and taking action for she indicates her fear and worry of people’s belief in their inferiority. She is afraid that one will believe the image created by the “arrogant perceiver” (*Pilgrimages* 160) and hence he will become weak and objectified. She argues:

One fears that one may become what one is in the racist perceiver’s eyes, and nothing else, all other subjectivity erased. And as I have argued, that is to become something insubstantial, dependent, a distorted image of white humanity. So one guards the seeing circle zealously (*Pilgrimages* 160).

Moreover, Lugones insists that racism, this image construction, and stereotyping are closely related to culture. She believes that if someone is marginalized, this means that s/he is taking part in “at least one culture” (*Pilgrimages* 46). However, one is marginalized or

“racialized” because there is a certain belief, in certain cultures, of “superiority” and one’s culture is better than the other’s as Lugones argues: “[T]he ideology of the ethnocentric racial state...privileges the dominant culture as the only culture to ‘see with’” (*Pilgrimages* 40). Still, she seems to interpret this ‘ethnocentrism’ positively for she sees that when one prioritizes one culture over another, this does not mean that his/her culture is the best but it means that it is his favorite one, especially when this person belongs to marginalized groups and s/he is refusing to abandon it. In other words, everyone values his or her own culture, country, etc. without being able to underestimate it or prioritize another one over his/hers. To emphasize this point, Lugones says:

‘Ah, how beautiful my people (or my culture, or my community, or my land), how beautiful, the most beautiful!’ I think this claim is made many times noncomparatively. It is expressive of the centrality that one’s people, culture, community, or language have to the subject’s sense of self ... In these cases, the claim does not mean ‘better than other people’s,’ but ‘dearer to me than other people’s communities, etc., are to me.’ It is like a mother saying... ‘How beautiful my child, the most beautiful’ and expressing the centrality of this child in her affection. Many times, similar claims are made comparatively and invidiously, and I think that *only then* are they ethnocentric (*Pilgrimages* 47).

1.9.2.c. Resistant Intentionality

One of the concepts that Lugones highlights is the production of reality in relation to what she calls “worlds of sense” (Moya 199). In relation to the latter, Lugones sheds light on “resistant intentionality” as something very essential for it enables people who are considered as inferior and less powerful to maintain themselves “by keeping [them] from being exhausted by oppressive readings” (qtd. in Moya 199). Lugones believes that having such an intention in mind, one can change “the hegemonic organization of power effectively” (Moya 199). That is, in order to improve their situation and change the dominant reality, disempowered groups must have that “resistant intentionality”.

However, Lugones does not focus just on resisting certain “acts” that are considered as oppressive. Instead, she sheds light on resisting “the very logic” of oppression (Moya 201). Since Lugones rejects the very logic of oppression, she suggests different ways to realize oppression and reject it. She clearly indicates her purpose in *Pilgrimages* by saying: “In particular, I am eager to move against social fragmentation. World-traveling, streetwalker theorizing, curdling, and trespassing are all different and related forms of noticing oppression at its logic and moving against it” (12).

While focusing on the “logic of resistance”, Lugones clarifies the difference between “reaction” and “response” to resistance. According to her, the former does not serve the purpose for it does not help in creating a different meaning. Instead, “reaction” is just one way of saying “no” while it does not add anything. However, the latter is a good way to resist and add something creative because she sees that resistance “is not reaction but response—thoughtful, often complex, devious, insightful response, insightful into the very intricacies of the structure of what is being resisted” (*Pilgrimages* 29). That is, she is encouraging resisters to use skilful tactics to achieve their goal which is the creation of a different meaning. She wants them to delve deeper, in a very detailed way, inside “what is being resisted.”

1.9.2.d. Active Subjectivity

Lugones also highlights another concept that she called “active subjectivity” pointing out that her purpose is to shed light on “the ‘traveling’ of our own against the grain, resistant, oppositional thoughts, movements, [and] gestures” (*Pilgrimages* 7). She is highly concerned with “oppressing-----resisting relations” (7). Thus, she introduces the concept of “active subjectivity” as an alternative to “agency”. She, to a certain extent, challenges the traditional belief that the oppressed cannot exercise “agency” and hence cannot make meaning. Instead, she believes that they can act as “active subjects” that is they can interfere in the process of “resistant meaning-making” (Chang et al. n.p.). Hence, she opposes the weakness and

disability of the other to take action. However, Lugones does not mean by resistance just physical action, instead, she means also “the dispositions, thoughts, and glances that make critiques of oppression thinkable” (Chang et al. n.p.).

Lugones strongly believes that “active subjectivity” plays a key role and contributes in changing the past in the present because new possibilities and new meanings will be made. It makes a difference “because as we focus on exercises of active subjectivity, the past is revisited as multiple and remade in the present act of putting out the word, gesture, movement and moving it from tongue to tongue, from hand to hand, from place to place” (*Pilgrimages* 228).

1.9.2.e. The Multiplicitous Self

Lugones, as the researcher has already mentioned, is highly concerned with forms of oppression and ways of resisting and opposing it. As a way of resistance, she “calls for an openness to “multiple sensings” and “multiple sense makings” (qtd. in Roelofs 375). As if she is trying to emphasize the fact that reality is multiple and that there is no one single meaning but multiple and numerous ones. She argues: “Social groups or aggregates are crisscrossed by relations of power; thus, though there are subaltern groups, none are mono+cultural or monological, but complex, heterogenous, pluri-logical. Social reality is thus understood as multiple rather than fragmented” (Lugones, “Multiculturalism and Publicity” 175). So again, she is highlighting the plurality of the reality of individuals who are occupying a “complex” reality.

She used the terms “multiplicity” and “pluralism” to mean that everyone must be aware of the fact that he has more than one self. That is, “people can inhabit more than one world at the same time” (Mcweeny 297-298). To clarify her idea of multiplicity, she relates it to “structures” that exist in every society. For her, as the researcher has already clarified, a structure is

the patterned arrangements of practices, roles, concepts, and institutions within a given society that function as a means of construing and constituting persons (Lugones 2003, 60). For example, one structure could construe women of color as passive subordinates whereas another structure could construe them as active subjectivities. Because the practical demands of a structure constitute the ‘emotions, beliefs, norms, desires, and intentions’ of the people who move within that structure, when a person shifts structures she also becomes a different self (60). Not only can a person live in more than one structure at the same time, she can also go in between structures and be without structure (61) (qtd. in Mcweeny 298).

That is, a person can occupy more than one structure as he can live without it. Furthermore, structure is responsible of providing an image of a certain group of people and the latter can have more than one self to live in more than one structure.

According to Lugones, the person acts in more than one reality. For instance, if a person is “invisible” in a certain reality, that person will find it very difficult and challenging to prove him/herself as someone who has a good reasoning and calls for freedom (*Pilgrimages*). For this reason, Lugones emphasizes the fact that one must have the intention and “logic” of resistance by questioning and discussing one’s position and inferiority with others agreeing that there is no one “true self”, highlighting indirectly the multiplicity of selves. According to her,

[i]n the oppressing/being oppressed---resisting a refracted, heterogeneous, concrete, you may negotiate resistantly in the company of others, your own being imagined, abstracted, reduced, debased, demoralized, muted. You understand your own fragmentation and your own multiplicity in these movements. Since there are histories of resistance, resisting---oppressing/being oppressed does not presuppose or require any underlying “I” that is the “true” self” (*Pilgrimages* 11-12).

Lugones believes that the multiplicity of reality is the result of the existence of oppression and resistance since she states: “The tension of being oppressed---resisting

oppression ‘places’ one *inside the processes* of production of multiple realities. It is from within these processes that the practice of shifting to different constructions, different spatialities, is created” (*Pilgrimages* 17). Additionally, in order to live in more than one reality, she calls into question the term of “traveling”. She strongly supports multiplicity because she sees that the one version of reality does not exist. Instead, there exist realities and hence “worlds”. She believes that “no world can be understood as monistic, homogenous, or autonomous” (*Pilgrimages* 26). Thus, she emphasizes her support of multiplicity for she clearly states:

I departed from the philosophical literature that had emphasized to me...a unity of the self, a linear way of telling, and an abstract rhetoric. Instead, I lived the experience as an exposure of psychic multiplicity and I strove to make sense of it by locating the multiple self in space, conceiving of space itself as multiple, interesting, co-temporaneous realities (*Pilgrimages* 16).

This indicates that she strongly rejects everything related to the one version of reality. Instead, she wants and encourages people to prove their manyness and multiplicity. She supports diversity in terms of content because she clearly says: “I want to understand reality as heterogeneous, and the heterogeneity to lie not just in interpretation” (*Pilgrimages* 16). That is, she wants that manyness to really exist and be recognized.

According to her, as a result of racist attitudes, the marginalized’s resistance is resisted, “obscured” and underestimated. In other words, the efforts done through “world-traveling” are not importance-worthy while Lugones considers it as a good solution. She states:

By traveling to other people’s ‘worlds’, we discover that there are worlds in which those who are the victims of arrogant perception are really subjects, lively beings, resisters, constructors of visions even though in the mainstream

construction they are animated only by the arrogant perceiver and are pliable, foldable, file-awayable, classifiable (qtd. in Lugones, *Pilgrimages* 18).

She pays special attention to the fact that the oppressors travel but not in the same way that she means. That is, she wants them to see the “Other’s” world and reality, to consider them as subjects while the oppressor travel just to see the “exotic” and the “primitive”. Then, highlighting the same point of silencing marginalized groups, Lugones focuses on the fact that “[r]esistant networks are often historically muted or distorted” (*Pilgrimages* 25). That is, behaviors or actions that are considered as “resistant” are not given respect, importance, and attention.

Simply put, Lugones tries “to make what is usually invisible or unintelligible both visible and intelligible” (Moya 199-200). She believes that people live in “multiple” “worlds of sense”. So, she highlights the multiplicity of perspectives, worlds, realities, etc. In addition to that, her main concern is to change “the us/them binary” into a world of “multiplicity”, indicating the fact that “some worlds of sense are hegemonic” (Moya 200). That is, they are powerful enough to dictate what is considered as “common sense,” while others do not have that opportunity and as a result the latter are considered as “invisible or unintelligible and consequently, much less powerful” (Moya 199-200). “Another part of Lugones's aim is to drive home the point that we all exist, and our actions have meaning in, several different worlds of sense simultaneously” (Moya 200). That is, her main aim is to bring to light the meaningfulness of underestimated groups.

1.9.3. Individuals as Oppressed and Resistant

Lugones agrees that there exist some individuals who are oppressed and resistant at the same time. That is, they are “not consumed...by oppression” (*Pilgrimages* 12) and at the same time, they resist “a system aimed at molding, reducing, violating, or erasing them” (*Pilgrimages* 12). In other words, although they are oppressed, they are not absorbed as they

have the intention of resistance for they refuse being “reduced” and “consumed” by the oppressive system. As a result, Lugones highlights the existence of “two realities” (*Pilgrimages* 12). However, acting with the logic of resistance in “an oppressive reality” (*Pilgrimages* 12) may have an impact on the resistant. For instance, this may lead to a difficulty of communication between the two entities as this may affect the personality of the resistant because he will have certain personality features that oppose the personality characteristics of someone else who follows the opposing logic.

These two “logics”, then, are the ones that constitute

people’s movements, interactions, desires, and intentions. A person may be both oppressed and resistant and act in accordance with both logics. Such a person will have a character and personality traits, relations to others, and histories that have interwoven lines with contradictory logics and that are understood by, revealed to, and recognizable by different socialities (*Pilgrimages* 13).

That is, in case a person is acting with both “logics”, he will act building on two “contradictory logics” and thus, he can act in both worlds. This fact produces human beings “who are some of the time “you” and you” (*Pilgrimages* 13). This means that sometimes they can be multiple belonging to two different “logics” at the same time.

Since the two “logics” oppose each other and find it very hard to perceive each other, “the perceptions are hard to sustain in conjunction with each other” (*Pilgrimages* 13). That is, they cannot support and help each other since there is such an opposition in intentions. If one looks at things and individuals through an oppressive eye, the same person “tends not to see resistance” (*Pilgrimages* 13). Lugones believes and emphasizes that oppressors do not want or cannot see resistance because if they see the latter, they will find themselves obliged to see “oppression”, the fact that they attempt not to face.

Reading through the lens of the oppressor leads to the creation of a certain “reality” that “one struggles to undermine or dismantle” (Lugones, *Pilgrimages* 14). However, this power to create such a fact or such a reality is unavoidable or inevitable. In addition to that, the oppressor creates such a reality as a result of not seeing resistance as a useful and good act. Thus, “[t]he reading of the act as incompetent has significant consequences since it conforms to the justification of subordination” (Lugones, *Pilgrimages* 13). As a result, one can say they do not want to see resistance because that is an advantage since there is a lot to gain as it is mentioned in the previous quote. Additionally, the oppressor is not able to delete or remove all the traces of resistance because in order to do so, they have to “see resistance” which is not advantageous for them.

Lugones sees that by acting in such a way, the oppressor is in a state of “self-deception ... [because he lives in] multiple realities all in the first person” (*Pilgrimages* 14). As a result, Lugones calls for “cross-reference” as a solution, especially for those who are eager to create a different version of reality and get rid of the oppressor’s constructions. She, then, sees that “[i]t is of great interest for emancipator work that we can cross-reference different realities” (*Pilgrimages* 15). However, although she suggests it as a solution, she finds it reasonable to get fearful of taking such an action for one may be accused of being submissive and unpleasant. Therefore, she adds: “The one in self-deception could, but does not, cross-reference” (*Pilgrimages* 15).

Lugones considers the task of seeing the oppressor’s reality as very hard for the oppressors do their best in order to “reinforce one’s unshared world of sense” (*Pilgrimages* 15). Then, she adds that she wants everything “to be read as praxical” (*Pilgrimages* 15). In other words, she wants those who are reading certain groups or categories as “incompetent” and passive, etc. to be cautious and careful of several aspects. She advises them to take into consideration “the particularities of the characters and personalities, the complexities of them,

and the manyness of them and of the worlds they inhabit” (*Pilgrimages* 15). That is, before judging and categorizing others, they have to take into consideration many other things as this may help them understand themselves and others.

An emphasis, then, is put on the term “identification” for she sees that people who see others “arrogantly” cannot identify with them. She says: “To the extent that we learn to perceive others arrogantly or come to see them only as products of arrogant perception and continue to perceive them that way, we fail to identify with them----fail to love them----in this particular way” (*Pilgrimages* 78).

Lugones believes that marginalized or categorized people are considered as “incomplete” because those who consider them as such have a certain benefit in such a classification. In other words, the latter are considered as “complete” and important etc., just

to the extent that we are ambiguous ----non-dichotomous----we threaten the fiction and can be rendered unfit only by decrying ambiguity as nonexistent that is, by having us, splitting us. Thus, we exist only as incomplete, unfit beings, and they exist as complete only to the extent that what we are, and what is absolutely necessary for them, is declared worthless (*Pilgrimages* 131).

The irony lies in the fact that the oppressor believes a reality of his own creation. If the Other is not given such a negative image, the oppressor cannot have such an importance and such respect. That is why Lugones sees this fact as “self-deceiving” for he is also the production of the Other. She agrees:

Paradoxically, the lover of purity is also constituted as incoherent, as contradictory in his attitude toward his own and others’ gender, race, culture. He must at once emphasize them and ignore them. He must be radically self-deceiving in this respect. His production as pure, as the impartial reasoned, requires that others produce him. He is a fiction of his own imagination, but his

imagination is mediated by the labor of others. He controls those who produce him, who to his eyes require his control because they are enmeshed in multiplicity and thus unable to occupy the vantage point of control (*Pilgrimages* 131).

1.10. Truth(s) Up to the Postmodern Lens

Since the researcher has dealt with the issue of truth and reality from a Foucauldian and a Lugonian perspective, she finds it very interesting to tackle the same concept from a postmodern one for the way it is viewed in postmodernism is very close to the way the previous critics tackled it, especially because Foucault is a postmodernist theorist.

According to Livio Nimmer, reality or truth or what is right has to do with power because he believes that “political, social actors who strive for power always try to normalize their worldview at the expense of excluding others’ worldviews” (225). In other words, those who are thirsty for “power” try very hard to make their points of view appear the norm or the right one while doing their best, at the same time, to reject the others’. He sees that those who want to organize the world and categorize it, i.e. those in power, are responsible of creating the truth about “[w]ho are terrorists and what acts constitute terrorism” (Nimmer 229).

Like Foucault, Nimmer strongly believes that “power relations” establish the pieces of information that are taken seriously, the persons that have the right to speak “authoritatively”, and “how they are positioned in the discursive field” (230). He sees that discourses are formed or created and used to achieve certain aims, the main one being to preserve ‘power’. Discourse is just the implementation or the effect of ‘power’. That is, they are taken seriously and seen as “dominant or hegemonic” (Nimmer 230) through making people stop believing or considering as true other discourses that oppose them. They achieve their aims by making themselves appear as the only sources of true information while silencing all other realities that do not support their version of ‘truth’. Furthermore, the “public” also play a huge role in making the discourse created by “power relations” as acceptable for “public fear and anxiety”

(Nimmer 230) facilitates the task “for dominant powers to find support” (Nimmer 230) to categorize their enemies.

However, in relation to the postmodern perspective towards the notions of ‘truth’ and ‘representation’, “representations then can never truly be real or objective; instead, they are constructed images, images that need to be interrogated for their ideological content” (Anushiravani and Khademi 1-2). This means that reality is subjective and no ‘representation’ can be taken as purely real because it is just a created and not a natural one. Thus, that ‘representation’ that is seen as ‘objective’ must be re-examined for it carries an ‘ideological’ thought behind. In addition to that, if a certain entity is categorized or ‘represented’ or ‘interpreted’, one must take into consideration “who may be doing the interpreting” (qtd. in Diaconu 167) because “truth is rather created than discovered” (qtd. in Diaconu 167). Spivak sees the fact of “representing others” as a serious issue that needs a serious attention. She opposes the idea of “constructing the other simply as an object of knowledge” (Anushiravani and Khademi 1-2). In other words, she is revolting against the idea of creating certain realities about certain groups and those realities are just the product of those whose points of view are considered as true.

According to postmodernists, “scholarly truth claims are not superior to other sorts of truth claims” (Szostak 39). This proves the critic’s rejection of superiority in terms of knowledge. Stated differently, he is encouraging different versions of reality rather than considering the ‘scholarly’ one as the only reliable one. And by this, he means that more than one point of view must be taken into consideration rather than rejecting ‘science’ (Szostak 39). The same critic supports the multiplicity of truth instead of taking only one version seriously and neglecting others. This point is emphasized when he argues: “There are multiple realities constructed by individuals” (Szostak 45).

Postmodernists, mainly, doubt or mistrust any *one* version of describing any incident as they do not consider it as ‘authoritative’. They have such a belief simply because they

reject all what is considered as “objective truth” (Nath 26). They see “that it is impossible to have a correct description of Reality. It is undoubtedly a skeptical view. The famous advocates of this view among others are – F. Nietzsche, L. Wittgenstein, Karl Popper and Thomas Kuhn. They are called the extreme skeptics” (Nath 26-27).

Postmodernists believe that there should be a re-evaluation of “what knowledge is and what can be treated as knowledge” (Nath 27). That is, there is no ‘absolute’ truth or one source whose point of view is considered as the final truth. Instead, ‘objective reality’ or ‘truth’ are just ‘social constructions’, according to them. ‘Reality’ or ‘truth’ is relative, in the postmodern thought (Nath 27) because for them,

apparent realities are only social constructs and thereby these are not static but subject to change. It emphatically believes that for the formation of ideas and belief, the role of language, power, relations and motivations are immense. This approach of thought does not believe any sharp line of demarcation or classification between male and female, straight and gay, white and black or imperial and colonial. It does not believe any absolute truth. Rather it believes that reality is plural relative and dependent. The description of reality is dependent on the persons and their nature who describe it. Moreover, the description of the world is dependent on the persons who perceive it and thus this description is subjective (Nath 27).

Postmodernists believe in ‘interpretation’ rather than ‘knowledge’. They emphasize the presence of various truths, realities, points of view, etc. instead of being limited by one, ‘single’ and ‘correct’ version of reality (Nath 28).

Postmodernists are convinced that there is no ‘objective truth’ for the reason that all what we consider as ‘reality’ is our own creation and we create it “using our own concepts” (Nath 28). That is why “there is no fixed vantage point from which we can have objective view” (Nath 28). That is, since it is our own creation, it is subjective. They support subjectivity for they see that human beings are different by nature as they experience different

situations and as a result, form different opinions about 'the world'. Thus, "we find that there are different political opinions and religious beliefs which people hold" (Nath 29).

Truth is never 'fixed' and 'certain' and to achieve such a truth, it would be impossible. It is always 'approximate' and 'limited'. Also, when it comes to theories, you can never confirm that a certain theory is 'true' but you can show that it is 'false' (Nath 30). Hence, postmodernists did never accept the idea of objectivity. They replaced it by "stories about reality that "work" for particular communities-but have no validity beyond that community" ("On the Notion of Truth" 18). This indicates that the version of truth they create is not valid and applicable in all times and to all situations. They are supporting multiplicity indirectly, in this way ("On the Notion of Truth" 18).

Postmodernists disagreed completely with the way the previous generations thought about 'truth' because they see that to judge whether something is true or not, this will depend on many factors including "time, space and perspective" ("On the Notion of Truth" 18). Thus, people can never judge or accept a certain idea as fully true for its falsity can be proved easily. They rejected this way of evaluating truth because according to them, "whatever we accept as truth and even the way we envision truth are dependent on the community in which we participate ... there is no absolute truth, rather truth is relative to the community in which we participate" ("On the Notion of Truth" 18).

Postmodernists believe that "there is no one truth and hence no one representation of any object" ("On the Notion of Truth" 33). That is, no object can be described or represented in a certain way that is considered as final. This object can have an infinite number of descriptions and "no one representation can be said to constitute complete knowledge of it" ("On the Notion of Truth" 33).

According to Joseph Natoli, 'representation' or truth can never be reliable because no 'signifier' is naturally linked to the 'signified'. And even the latter does not reside inside the former ("On the Notion of Truth" 33-34). Therefore, "the postmodernists are adamant in their

claim that truth is socially, or to be more specific, linguistically constructed. Truth or reality is not outside our representation of it and here it often means, outside the sphere of linguistic signs and concepts” (“On the Notion of Truth” 34). As if this critic is highlighting the fact that people are responsible of creating a certain reality and then, the majority agree on it and as a result, it is considered as the only and final truth. This concept of truth and its creation has to do with society and linguistics.

Postmodernists insist that “the order we see has been imposed on the world by us and is thus a human construct, not given” (Kervinen 19). Thus, what is considered in the present as true has been ‘acknowledged’ that way in the past. The task of postmodernism is to question this way of ‘acknowledging’ something as true and how they came to such a conclusion in the past. Linda Hutcheon supports the way postmodernists analyze the concept of truth for she believes that “this questioning attitude is positive in that even if it does not seek ready-made answers it can produce knowledge that enables change” (Kervinen 19).

In a way, postmodernists support Michel Foucault’s ‘discourses of power’ and how the latter are employed “to marginalize subordinate groups” (Wakchaure 5). Thus, these discourses are used to underestimate and categorize all those groups and people who do not participate or contribute to them (Wakchaure). Furthermore, ‘Truth’ or what is considered as reality is restricted or limited by ‘discourse’. As if this critic wants to say that the latter is powerful enough to claim what is true and what is not (Diaconu 166).

As for knowledge, the postmodernists also questioned this concept and undermine its total authority. They see that all what is happening around is not fixed or stable that is why ‘knowledge’ is seen by postmodernists as fleeting and temporary. They believe that ‘knowledge’ is “subject to change as the world changes” (qtd. in Pritam 43). Truth is always subjective and incomplete because the ways that make people able to know are not obtained from objective sources but “subjective conditions like human emotions” (Muley 10). That is why you can never get access or produce an absolute, final, and fully exact truth (Muley 10).

Postmodernism is characterized by its rejection of objectivity, the belief in one reality, and one perspective. As it is highlighted in the following quote,

One of the main characteristics of postmodern thinking is that the world is seen as a much more complex and uncertain place. Reality is no longer fixed or determined. All truth within a postmodern context is relative to one's viewpoint or stance. The world is a representation. In other words, it is a fiction created from a specific point of view only, and not a final truth (Muley 11-12).

As a result of this disbelief in one truth and acting building on this *one* version, 'marginalized' groups started to make their voices heard in order to emphasize the multiplicity of truth. Additionally, "the language of marginalized subjects is always at the centre of postmodern little narratives. In Postmodernism the traditional metanarrative gets deconstructed by little narratives of marginalized groups" (Wakchaure 5). This means that those powerless and categorized groups started to make their voices heard through their focus on their situation. Simply put, they started to counter the dominant discourses. Furthermore, "there is no single objective truth, [t]he grand narratives are untenable and repressive. They lack credibility. They impose restrictive boundaries on as otherwise pluralist cultural formation. They delimit discourse and exclude or marginalize voice that do not suit the dominant group" (qtd. in Somatkar 66).

1.11. Conclusion

To conclude, the marginalization and classification of certain groups as inferior, be it in terms of religion or other aspects like race, gender, etc., caused a hot and complex debate among scholars and such issues are still negotiated for they continued to exist till the present day. However, discourse, as it has been shown in this chapter, proves to be a solid pillar in society that can successfully affect individuals, construct truth, and change perspectives. Nevertheless, several scholars, like Foucault and Lugones, believe that groups that fall under the victimization of discourse are able to alter their situation through resistance, showing their optimism in the possibility of constructing a different truth. In the following chapters, two

novels will be selected to illustrate the usefulness of the ideas tackled in this chapter to analyze fictional characters and prove that literature also contribute to shaping discourse.

Chapter Two
Strategies of Resistance in
Kolocotronis' *Innocent*
***People* (2003)**

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People*

(2003)

2.1. Introduction

The centre of attention of this chapter is to provide readers with a glimpse about the way the discourse of Islam as a religion of terror leads to the mistreatment of Muslim characters in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People*. Furthermore, it highlights Muslims' challenges to the negative perceptions on behalf of the non-Muslims. Stated differently, it sheds light upon Muslim characters' resistance to the discourse of Islam and their attempt to provide non-Muslims with a different and positive reality of their religion.

In order to reach the above mentioned objective, the researcher relies on the Foucauldian concept of resistance, highlighting the main techniques Muslim characters use to show their innocence. It is also worth considering that Lugones' suggested strategies of resistance also form the background for the analysis in the present chapter. Thus, this part will shed light on Kolocotronis' portrayal of the misconception of Muslim Americans on behalf of the non-Muslim majority and their endeavour to respond and resist, without being racist towards non-Muslims.

2.2. The Discourse of Islam in the Novel

Linda-Jamilah Kolocotronis starts the first chapter in her *Innocent People* by describing her children and the way she controls what they watch and makes sure that they all do their homework, etc. She provides the readers with an image of all the commitments she has to pass through before going to bed. However, the reader notices that she starts the chapter by the following sentence: "The house is quiet, and quiet is good" (Kolocotronis 1) and concludes the same chapter by a similar expression: "...the quiet is so relaxing" (Kolocotronis 2). Although, in both instances, she is referring to quietness in her own house,

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

this may symbolize the quietness of the country, America, as a whole because the novel revolves around the aftermath of September the 11th attacks. Thus, the emphasis on the repetition of the word “quiet” symbolizes Muslims’ enjoyment of stability, unlike the chaos that followed the attacks.

Even in the following chapter, she keeps putting emphasis on the word “quiet” and also “silence” like when she mentions that she prefers “to enjoy the silence” (Kolocotronis 6) and when she says: “The phone rings, shaking me from my quiet world” (Kolocotronis 6). The last sentence is highly symbolic for when the phone rings, it was her best friend Maryam who is calling. While talking to her, Maryam says, in surprise: “Oh, my God!”.... “Turn on your TV, Sadia. I don’t know what to say. Just turn on your TV. I’ll talk to you later. Assalaamu alaikom” (Kolocotronis 7). Then, Sadia says: “I turn on the TV, and I see it. One of the towers of the World Trade Center is burning. Why? What happened?” (Kolocotronis 7). As if the news of the attacks wakes her from her calm and stable world. Sadia knows very well the threat and chaos that will follow because when she hears the news, she starts thinking about the source of this accident saying: “[P]lease don’t let it be Muslims. This becomes a prayer. Please, Allah, please don’t let Muslims be involved” (Kolocotronis 7). This may symbolize also the threat Muslims were living in even before the attacks take place because she directly thinks of and is afraid of accusing Muslims. Her expectations, however, go true and soon after, a discourse that revolves around Islam in relation to terrorism dominated the American society.

As previously stated in the first chapter, discourse means “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (qtd. in Mills, *Discourse* 15). In *Innocent People*, Muslim characters are aware of the fact that they are the ‘object’ formed by certain ‘practices’ related to the discourse of Islam, simply because they were mistreated early before the 9/11

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

attacks. However, the events just make the situation worse. What illustrates their awareness is what some characters think about immediately after hearing the news. For instance, after the attacks, Br, Imran tells his students including Sadia's son, Adam, that "Muslims will probably be blamed" (Kolocotronis 10). At home, Sadia confirms to her son by clarifying: "Muslims have been accused of doing terrible things in the past, and I'm afraid that it's going to happen again" (Kolocotronis 10). Here, one notices that Muslims are the first entity to be blamed because they have already been accused and categorized as bad and dangerous.

In another occasion, while sitting with other Muslim friends, Sadia wonders:

'What do you think all this is going to mean for us?' 'I don't know,' Maryam responds, 'but I can tell you one thing, girl. I've lived as a Muslim in this country for a time. There are people who are against you no matter what, but most people aren't so bad. Anyway, I was black before I was Muslim, so I've already played that game' (Kolocotronis 25).

This proves again that a character like Maryam is the victim of what Foucault calls "a grouping" (Mills, *Michel Foucault* 53) as a result of the discourse of racism as well as religion for she is a black Muslim in America. Thus, all these early discussions between the characters give the readers a hint that Muslims are badly treated in some occasions before the attacks. However, after the events, things change to the worse.

As it has been mentioned in the first chapter, Foucault highlights the importance of discourse and its production arguing that not anyone can produce 'statements' that will be considered as discourse. Instead, he closely attached this concept to 'power'. For him, "[s]ome statements are more authorized than others, in that they are more associated with those in positions of power or with institutions" (Mills, *Michel Foucault* 65). Institutions do occupy a position of power for their ability to produce what Foucault calls "regimes of truth"

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

seeing the latter as “the result of scientific discourse and institutions” (“Foucault: Power is Everywhere” n.p.). To well illustrate, in *Innocent People*, the president represents the state and hence, an institution and his relation to the Americans can be considered as a “power relation”. After the attacks, the president, through media, produces certain utterances that form a “grouping” or a gap between Muslim and non-Muslim characters by referring to them as “us” and “them”. For instance, when Hussein is asked about the reason he wants to go back to his country, he mentions many things like the threats he and his family are suffering from in addition to the following idea: “Last night the president said that either you’re with us or you’re with the terrorists. He doesn’t understand that most of us are just trying to survive” (Kolocotronis 49). By referring to Muslims as terrorists, the president produces a truth that many Americans take as an absolute one for it comes from a certain institution that they consider as reliable because “power is a regime of truth that pervades society, and which is in constant flux and negotiation. Foucault uses the term ‘power/knowledge’ to signify that power is constituted through accepted forms of knowledge, scientific understanding and ‘truth’ ” (“Foucault: Power is Everywhere” n.p.). In this instance, the president’s produced truth can be considered as an “accepted form of knowledge” (“Foucault: Power is Everywhere”) and this truth dominates the American society, as it is clear in the selected novel.

In addition to that, the ‘truth’ of Islam as a religion of terror becomes the ‘norm’ and Foucault believes that the “tool [of power relations] is not prohibition through law, but normalization through the norm” (Sørensen). Foucault strongly argues that when one thinks about power, s/he must not think about it as a ‘possession’ or ‘repression’. Instead, it is a ‘system’. In addition to that, Foucault also believes that “the state is not mainly something that owns power, but rather something which builds a system of relations between individuals so that the political system works” (Bällan n. p.). Thus, the president who represents the state

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

creates this 'norm' and categorization in order to build "a system of relations between individuals" (Bällan n. p.). In this case, relations are built between Muslim and non-Muslim characters. Hussein's indication that they just want to survive is also a way to say that Muslims are innocent.

After a period of the attacks and the chaos Muslims live in, Muslims know through media that the government will declare a war. For example, when Sadia tells her son, Muhammad, about Uthman's arrest, she mentions and seems affected by what the government decides declaring to her son: "The government is talking about war----war on terror, maybe even war in Afghanistan" (Kolocotronis 59). Thus, she does not want him to study in a college far from home. Here, the government is considered as an institution and its relation to people is a "power relation" too. So, they create a certain truth and discourse about Islam and Muslims. They reinforce it, build certain relations between Muslim and non-Muslim characters and then, they declare a 'war on terror' as a reaction. This calls attention to the way Foucault sees the state and how it works. That is, as if they are doing all that in order to make "the political system works" (Bällan n. p.).

2.3. The Role of Media in Reinforcing the Dominant discourse

Actually, that dominant discourse has a deep impact on the American society and as a result, American characters change their behavior toward Muslim characters, seeing them as threatening and dangerous. However, those feelings of hatred are strengthened and encouraged by media for Foucault sees the latter as very essential to contributing in 'normalising' a certain 'truth' arguing that the "regimes of truth' are the result of scientific discourse and institutions and are reinforced (and redefined) constantly through the education system, the media and the flux of political and economic ideologies" ("Foucault: Power is

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

Everywhere”). That is, media are one of the means through which discourse is emphasized and strengthened.

This means that media also contribute to normalize a certain “truth” and make it function as “true” for there exist many instances in the novel that prove media’s contribution to shaping and emphasizing the reality of Islam as a religion of terror and violence. For instance, when the 9/11 attacks first take place, several characters first hear the news on TV and the incidents shown on the screen express the danger of the situation to an extent that Sadia feels terrified: “I continue to watch, mesmerized by the images of destruction. People are running. They say that some are jumping to their deaths. I become lost in the terror of the moment” (Kolocotronis 7). Sadia’s loss, as a result of the way the events are shown on TV, proves that maybe American characters’ perception of Islam as a terrorist religion is influenced by Media and how they shape events as well as “the manner in which [their] culture and society creates its meaning” (“Islamophobia and the Media” 35).

Later on, after the attacks, when the children get home safe from school, “the scene is replayed on the TV. Yusuf [Sadia’s ten years old son] watches in wonder...Was that real?” (Kolocotronis 10). Then, he directly asks his mother whether Muslims are responsible of that. Although at this moment Muslims have already been accused, Sadia does not show him any signs of terror and asks him to wait and see what will happen. This shows how the events are dramatized on TV to an extent where even Muslim characters are terrorized by the scene so how such a broadcast won’t affect the public opinion? Furthermore, the portrayal of Muslim characters, in many instances, as deeply affected by the events is a way of saying that Muslim characters too are scared by the events, which proves their innocence.

Stated differently, media are powerful enough to shape people’s way of thinking because they are the only means through which people can know what is taking place in the

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

world and as a result, the majority sees media as reliable sources they can dwell on to know the truth. However, sometimes media manipulate the reality. In *Innocent People*, one notices that adults as well as children rely on media to know the improvement of the situation, after the attacks. One day, when Adam is narrating to his mother what happens in his classroom when Br. Imran tells them the news, he informs her that “[s]ome of the guys went on the internet to see what they could find out” (Kolocotronis 10). The characters in this novel rely mainly on TV and the internet as the two main sources to get information about the attacks. To highlight the power of media more, one can refer to Adam again. When they finish their discussion, he asks his mother: “Can I watch TV with you and Baba? I want to know what’s going on” (Kolocotronis 11). She replies: “Are you sure, Adam? It’s awfully sad and scary” (Kolocotronis 11). Here, Adam’s request suggests his and people’s heavy reliance on TV and Sadia’s reply shows media’s way of broadcasting events, so ‘scary’ to an extent that she does not want her son to watch TV.

As it has been stated above, the state creates certain “relations between individuals” in order to make its system works (Bällan n. p.). Thus, one concludes, building on the reaction of American characters, that the discourse of Islam produced by the state has been strengthened and reinforced by media and as a result this leads to another power relation between non-Muslim Americans and the Muslim ones. For instance, Sadia says:

In my rare quiet moment I think about the irony of the situation. Most Americans are terrified that there will be more terrorist attacks. I’m terrified, too, but not just of terrorist attacks. I’m also terrified of other Americans. The news commentators speak about the grief and shock, but they talk mostly about the anger. My fellow American citizens are angry, and some want to take action. These emotions are normal but, unfortunately for my Muslim sisters

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

and me, are a few crazies out there who are anxious to turn anger into revenge, and they can't tell the difference between a bona fide terrorist and a mom with a headscarf (Kolocotronis 16).

So, as a result of media's emphasis on Muslims as the enemy, the latter starts to appear like the abnormal 'group' while the 'norm' is the religion and way of life of the mainstream. Hence, they perceive Islam as a threat to their country.

As a result of Americans' anger, another illusion is created which is about anthrax (a dangerous disease that animals sometimes suffer from). This illness causes a huge sensation on media for the latter affects the public by associating this illness with Muslims. For example, while reading newspaper, Sadia pays attention to an article entitled "Terrorist Link?". The latter is about the spread of anthrax in the country as it is associated with Muslims. Describing the importance of the subject, Sadia says: "By Sunday, a week after the bombing started in Afghanistan, the anthrax scare is almost as big news story as the war" (Kolocotronis 88). All the chaos and hatred, towards Muslims, created by the war is compared to the spread of this new disease. Sadia does so because she knows that as Muslims, they will experience the same fear and threat that they live in the wake of the attacks. Again, media play a key role in making the situation worse through dramatizing the events and without even providing viewers with proofs.

As it has been just mentioned, the Muslim entity starts to appear as abnormal or as opposing the norm in the American society. Media, of course, have a deep influence on people's way of thinking. Several months have passed after the attacks and media are still repeating the news and providing people with other stories of terrorism. Describing the fear and mistreatment that still evade Muslims in America, Sadia says:

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

Terrorism is still very much in the news, of course. There are frequent news stories about suspicious characters, always with Arabic names, and our local paper runs a daily one-page section with updates on the 'war on terror.' There is still a general fear, too, that another attack could occur at any time (Kolocotronis 136).

Well, even if the attacks have been committed by Muslims, not all Muslims are to be blamed. However, the way the American society deals with the situation makes it appear as if all Muslims are accused to an extent where the 'war on terror' they focus on in the news starts to appear like "a war on Muslims, or at least those Muslims that the West does not like" ("Islamophobia and the Media" 31). To emphasize this point, one can refer to Sadia, who after the attacks says:

Things have been quiet around town for the last month or so. In fact, we've seen even more kindnesses in recent weeks. I've heard that Muslims in some other cities are still having trouble, especially since the war began. I don't understand. The U.S. is attacking Afghanistan, but Muslims in the U.S. have to fear backlash from our fellow Americans because of the war. I once took a class in logic, but this one completely escapes me (Kolocotronis 101).

Furthermore, when Salahuddin has been accused of terrorism, the news has been broadcast on the TV without having any proof and at the end, it has been revealed that he is not a terrorist and that it is a mistake. While going on a business trip, Salahuddin is detained. When Sadia hears the news, she keeps checking on the TV until she finds the newscaster saying:

We have just learned that a local man has been detained at a New York airport on suspicion of links to a terrorist organization. Early reports indicate that

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

Salahuddin Abdullah may be part of a larger sleeper cell. We will have more details in our regular broadcast at 5 (Kolocotronis 153).

Here, one notices that media are dramatizing the events without even making sure of the pieces of information they provide people with. Therefore, media are depicted as the means through which power relations between Muslim and non-Muslim characters are built and hence, this help in normalizing the truth of Muslims as terrorists. Thus, media maybe used to create this kind of relations in order to make the political system functions.

2.4. Muslim Characters as a Serious Danger in the American Gaze

As a result of media's deep impact on Americans, Muslims are perceived as a threat and as a result, they try to get rid of them and their religion through abusing and mistreating them. As the researcher has already mentioned in the first chapter, the attacks affected even Muslims' "job applications" (Hodge, Zidan, and Husain 119). This fear invaded Muslim characters including Sadia. When the latter hears the news, she thinks of the interview she is supposed to attend. She is afraid she won't be accepted neither for the interview nor the job because she says: "I guess, there will be no job. Not even the interview. The assumption is already being made, coast to coast, that Muslims are behind the terror I see on my screen. There is no way that I would get that job" (Kolocotronis 8). This proves that they are really facing difficulties in daily life. She is afraid of not being accepted for she knows that she will be judged building on her religion and not on her competence.

After the attacks, Salahuddin, while in his house, hears that "[s]omeone called in a bomb threat to the restaurant" (Kolocotronis 13). Because he is Muslim, they start to threaten him by attacking his restaurant. Few hours later, Sadia receives a call from a secretary in her children's Islamic school. She asks her to keep her kids at home because they will close it for few days since they "have already received a few phone threats" (Kolocotronis 15). However,

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

the way Salahuddin deals with the situation proves his good behavior and principles. "Somebody threw a brick through the big front window. That's what triggered the alarm, they also painted graffiti on the side of the building, things like 'Go home, you dirty Moslems' and some profanity" (Kolocotronis 30). However, Salahuddin does not react angrily. He just repairs his window and asks his sons to help him work on the restaurant again. This implies that in the wake of 9/11 attacks, people are emotionally affected which lead to confusion and feelings of annoyance, including Muslim as well as non-Muslim characters. As a result, "these strong feelings ... led to violent language being used" ("Islamophobia and the Media" 41).

To emphasize how worse the situation is, one can mention the famous figure who is accused of the attacks 'Osama Bin Laden'. Since the latter is considered as responsible of committing this crime, every Muslim who holds a similar name was the victim of Islam haters. For instance, when Sadia's sons are telling her what happens in their class, they refer to a classmate named Osama. Her son, Muhammad, says:

The funniest thing in our class was when Br. Imran asked Usama what he thought about the attacks. Usama said, You know how people like to make fun of me because I'm fat. Try having a name like Usama these days! (Kolocotronis 41).

This can be related to what the researcher has already mentioned in the first chapter concerning Americans' association of the name 'Osama' with 'Osama bin Laden' who is accused of the attacks (Considine). This proves how unfair and bad Muslims are treated and judged.

To mention another instance, one can refer to Sadeq, Sadia's son. While in a shop, the latter encounters an old man and his wife. The man read Sadeq's name tag:

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

‘Saadik. That’s a strange name. Are you one of those Moslems?’.... ‘I tell the man, yes, I am a Muslim’. He says something like, ‘You better just tell your people to leave this country alone. If they don’t like it here, they can just go live in their tents.’ (Kolocotronis 61).

Although the old man is somehow disrespectful to the guy still, Sadia insists on the way her son answers him. She wants him to show respect. She asks: “‘What did you do?’...I hope he wasn’t disrespectful to the misguided old man” (Kolocotronis 61). However, her son is polite enough to reply by simply saying “Yes, sir” (Kolocotronis 61). Here, again, one can refer to media as the main influence on people’s perception of Islam and Muslims. And because media emphasized such a negative image and dramatized it, “[w]estern governments and societies... felt that all people of Eastern descent, especially Muslims should return to their homelands” (“Islamophobia and the Media” 42). Put otherwise, Muslims are treated as such for Islam started to be looked at as a “race, rather than a religion” (“Islamophobia and the Media” 42). As a consequence, all those who are considered as part of this “race” are refused to be a member in the American society.

One day, when Salahuddin goes on a business trip in the same country, America, he has been arrested for there is a mistake in terms of the spelling of his name. This goes hand in hand with what the researcher says in relation to Muslims’ travels. He indicates that when it comes to Muslims who travel either in the same country or abroad, they are looked at as dangerous ‘terrorists’. They are not treated the same way non-Muslim passengers are. Rather, they receive a strict control in airports “simply because they had an Islamic name” (“Islamophobia and the Media” 30). Then, once Salahuddin is arrested in his business trip, Sadia starts directly to receive phone calls from strange persons like the following: “Don’t you know how to speak English? You foreigners need to get out of here, or we’ll burn you

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

out” (Kolocotronis 155). In fact, Muslim characters’ reception of this verbal abuse is a result of media’s impact since Muslims are portrayed as dangerous and as a serious threat to the American society. This fact of depicting Islam negatively leads “the public to believe it, and thus treat Muslims as foreigners in their countries” (“Islamophobia and the Media” 42).

To conclude, one can say that all the sufferings of Muslim characters in America after the attacks are an embodiment of the effect of the dominant discourse of Islam as a threatening religion. However, these negative associations are reinforced and emphasized by media. The latter “was one of the major sources of racist opinion and the perpetuation of racial tension” (“Islamophobia and the Media” 31-32). This point highlights the way media encourage the public to abuse Muslims verbally and physically.

2.5. Muslim Characters’ Challenges to their Misrepresentation

It has been proved above that in *Innocent People*, the discourse of Islam as a threatening religion dominates the American society. This discourse is the product of power. Media play a key role in reinforcing and emphasizing that discourse through dramatizing things and making the situation worse, creating a power relation between Muslim and non-Muslim characters. As a result, American characters start to feel that Muslims must be kicked out and that they have to get rid of them. So, they start to threaten and abuse Muslims verbally and physically. However, as Foucault argues: “Where there is power, there is resistance” (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 95). Although the characters in this novel do not react through rebellions and demonstrations, they choose different strategies like dialogue, lectures in classrooms, and polite behavior in order to prove that Muslims are innocent and kind. Also, they want to provide Americans with a positive and good image of Islam and Muslims.

2.6. Strategies of Resistance in the Foucauldian Sense

2.6.1. Resistance Through Dialogue

According to Foucault, the effect of “power relations” must not be looked at as negative for this kind of relations have fruitful and positive results since they will create individuals who resist. He argues that one must get rid of thinking about ‘power’ as coercion and domination. Rather, this can also be “productive, causing new behaviours to emerge” (Bällan). This is actually the case of Muslim characters in the novel. They try to find a way in order not to be consumed by the fact that their religion is one of terrorism and hence, they try to resist these misconceptions. For example, when the events are played and replayed on TV and Muslim characters are living such a chaos and fear, Sadia replies: “How can they just start accusing Muslims? Don’t they know what Islam stands for? Muslims couldn’t have done this!” (Kolocotronis 11). Here, she is highlighting Islam as a good and great religion. Her husband, Salahuddin, tries to calm her down asking her to wait what will happen in the near future but she cannot stand “listening to them go on and on about the Muslim terrorists” (Kolocotronis 11). Sadia’s reaction can be interpreted as a resistant act that Foucault considers as a “struggle against the privileges of knowledge” (Foucault, *The Subject and Power* 781). That is, he argues that what counts as true or false may change and that sometimes something is considered as true and is taken seriously by individuals while the latter can reject such a fact as true as they can “dismiss” it (Rouse 2). Building on his thought, one can consider Sadia as a character who is “dismissing” the production or creation of this truth as serious, accurate, and authentic. In other words, Sadia is rebelling against “these abstractions” (Foucault, *The Subject and Power* 781) that consider Islam as a religion of terror.

To emphasize the previous idea, Foucault invites his readers to see the “individual as an active subject, not as a simple object for the power” (Bällan). That is, people are not

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

passive receivers to whom power relations are applied. Instead, their role is highlighted in this power relation. For instance, in the same novel, affected by the news, Sadia tries to narrate to her husband what happened the previous night:

Can you believe that? These men were supposed to be Muslims. They said they were carrying out the attacks as a form of jihad. We already know how wrong they were on that count, killing innocent people and all, but now look. They spent their last night in a bar. How can they even call themselves Muslims? They just fooled around, did whatever they wanted and left the rest of us holding the bag! (Kolocotronis 19).

Sadia can be considered as an active “subject” for she is trying to resist the misconceptions associated with the meaning of the word “jihad” in Islam. She highlights the fact that this is not the right jihad Islam calls for and that Islam does not stand for terrorism and killing innocent people. Her insistence on correcting the meaning of the word “Islam” proves that she is not depicted as an “object for the power” (Bällan).

Salahuddin tries to urge her not to be consumed by that reality and gives her a new perspective by replying:

During the khutbah today, the imam said that the hijackers still haven't been positively identified. They may not even have been Muslim. There are a lot of theories going around right now. Just take some time to think about it before you get too upset again (Kolocotronis 19).

Even the way Salahuddin responds illustrates the positive role he is playing for he is advising her not to judge easily and to be patient which is a good principle Islam stands for.

When Muslim children's parents meet to discuss their kids' safety, Uthman, a Chemistry professor, raises a point saying: “The Jews are out to defeat the Muslims in this

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

land. And they will not stop until they succeed. I think” (Kolocotronis 34). However, the other parents that are present, though Muslims and threatened too, do not share with him the same opinion. Salahuddin, for instance, when he gets back to his house advises his wife to have similar opinions by arguing:

I don't want to hear anyone talk about 'the Jews' the way Uthman did just now....It's a terrible situation. But if we start saying 'the Jews this' or 'the Jews that,' then we're no better than people who are saying 'the Muslims this' or 'the Muslims that.' (Kolocotronis 35).

It is interesting to relate this example to what Foucault states in relation to power as an exercise and not a “possession”. He sees that once these “power relations” are exercised, individuals are supposed to take a step forward in order to change their image within these “complex relations” (Maboloel 153). In this case then, Salahuddin tries to convince the members of his family to avoid accusing people the same way they, as Muslims, have been accused in order to remove the negative image associated with Muslims in these power relations.

His wife replies: “You're right. We can't let this just be about us versus them” (Kolocotronis 35). So, they are trying to be different. They do not face stereotype with stereotyping other people. Her reply proves what Foucault says about individuals' resistance. According to him, individuals who react and resist are not expected to criticize a specific group. Rather, they must be against “a technique, a form of power” (Foucault, *The Subject and Power* 781).

In another instance when Hussein mentions, angrily, what the president says about being with the Americans or with the terrorists, Imran tries to reply in a reasonable and good way:

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

'But, Br. Hussein,' Imran protests, 'I think you're making a rush to judgement. This is still a fine country. I think that if we just hold together and stay strong, we'll be alright in the end. The American people are still suffering from the shock of the attacks. We just need to be patient. I think things will turn around' (Kolocotronis 49).

Imran's answer proves that Muslim characters, through dialogue, try to remind each other from time to time not to judge people. Also, although Muslim characters suffer in the wake of the attacks because Americans accuse them, Imran seems to be giving them an excuse since they are shocked. This short conversation, however, can be related to Foucault's analysis of discourse for he sees the latter as a means through which power can have its deep effects on individuals as it can act as an obstacle that hamper the exercise of power because this will lead to oppositional acts to occur. He says: "[D]iscourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy" (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 100-101). Here, the discourse of "us" versus "them" can be considered as an "instrument" to create this power relation between Muslim and non-Muslim characters. However, it is also the point that leads to resistance for it affects the whole society especially Muslims. Hussein's verbal resistance can be considered as an embodiment of the effect of the production of such a discourse. Here, then, is another instance of the positive impact of power for like Sadia, Imran is another Muslim character who is trying to react positively and his answer to what Hussein says symbolizes Muslims' patience and good character.

Even Br. Uthman is taking part in the discussion and agrees with Hussein but Imran insists on his opinion saying: "I know what you mean by 'they,' and I feel it's wrong to stereotype any group of people in that manner. More importantly, I feel that it's detrimental to assume that

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

there is an organized effort against Islam” (Kolocotronis 50). Although the creation of such a discourse harmed Muslim characters, they do not want to react in the same way. Instead, they always try to remind each other to avoid stereotyping people as they do not attempt to attack a specific group.

When Sadeq brings the news to his family that another attack will be organized and blamed on Muslims and the latter, as a result, will be put into camps, his father, instead of taking the opportunity to blame Americans, proves to have good principles by replying: “That’s enough....You boys have to be careful who you listen to. Some people are extremists” (Kolocotronis 137). Salahuddin adds:

Sometimes, I am afraid that it could happen again. Some Americans are very angry and distrustful of anyone who reminds them of the attacks....At the same time, most Americans are reasonable people who won’t let their emotions get in the way” (Kolocotronis 138).

As a form of resistance, Foucault believes that individuals may “attack everything which separates the individual, breaks his links with others, splits up community life, forces the individual back on himself, and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way” (Foucault, *The Subject and Power* 781). Although in this example there is no clear “attack” against putting Muslims in camps, they are afraid this will happen for this will lead to a split in Muslim characters’ identity as they will break their ties with other characters, Americans in particular. In addition to that, their “community life” will be threatened because a large gap and break will be created between Muslim and non- Muslim characters.

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

2.6.2. Resistance Through Behaviour

When Sadia goes to the shop, she accidentally hits an American woman with her cart. So she excuses: “‘Oh, I’m sorry,’ I say, with greater emotion than the situation would usually warrant. ‘Please excuse me.’” (Kolocotronis 24). The way Sadia excuses proves her good behavior. In addition to that, Sadia’s exaggerated excuse is one way to resist what Foucault calls “abstractions” (Foucault, *The Subject and Power* 781) because she, as a Muslim, suffers of course of the “abstraction” created about Islam as a dangerous religion. Thus, by doing so, she attempts to show somehow that Muslims are polite and not that bad.

A similar incident that has already been mentioned above happens when Sadeq, Sadia’s son, meets that old man in the shop. Although Sadeq is mistreated by that American man as the latter’s method is provocative, Sadeq shows great respect which indicates his good behavior. Sadeq then is another instance of Muslim characters’ dogged perseverance to improve their negative perception in the minds of American people.

2.6.3. Resistance Through Teaching

In addition to fruitful dialogue and good behavior, some Muslim characters, in this novel, are depicted as careful and advising parents for they pay attention to everything their kids hear outside. Once they notice that their kids start to stereotype or accuse people without any proof, they try to advise and insist on them to avoid doing so. For example, when Sadeq says: “I was talking to a brother at the masjid who said that Osama didn’t do it. You remember that, Baba. This brother said that the Israelis did it.” (Kolocotronis 84), his father does not give him a chance to accuse any specific group by replying:

I remember when he said that, Sadeq, and I’d like to agree with the brother when he said that Muslims had nothing to do with the attacks. But it’s not right for us to blame someone else, either. Also, we have to be careful about

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

throwing around all these theories. People say this and people say that, but we shouldn't say anything unless we're certain (Kolocotronis 84).

Again, he is teaching his son to avoid stereotyping and categorizing without being certain. He likes in his son the intention of resisting the idea of Muslims as guilty but he is teaching him not to blame other people either.

In one of her classes, Sadia teaches her students to avoid categorizing people and raises an interesting question: "You know, boys....there have been a lot of instances when people have been blamed unfairly, not as individuals but as a group. Can you think of any?" (Kolocotronis 85). This may be related to Foucault's idea of individuals. Her question leads one to think of the possibility of relating this example to what Foucault says concerning individuals and their future. Her question leads them to think of their situation as Muslims for they have been treated as a 'group', who are terrorists, rather than as individuals. This is an attempt to urge these kids, through the question, to imagine their categorization and hence the association that maybe linked with them and then, as Foucault explains, they take a step forward in order to improve their situation and present through getting rid of the negative associations (Foucault, *The Subject and Power* 782).

When Salahuddin has been released from prison, he tells the members of his family about the reason of his imprisonment:

First of all, my first name was spelled wrong on the ticket. It said 'Saladin.' They didn't catch it here in town, but it put up a red flag in New York. Because of that, they ran my name through the computer. It turns out that there is a Salahuddin Ahmed Abdullah from Indonesia who is on their list of suspected terrorists. I had to convince them that I'm Salahuddin Ahmad Abdullah from Singapore, and that I'm not on anybody's list (Kolocotronis 169-170).

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

Then, when his son comments on the reason seeing that they have to make sure for it is unfair to arrest a person for that slight difference, Salahuddin tries to give a lesson to his sons through this mistake arguing:

I have no idea who the other Salahuddin is. He could be a terrorist, or just another innocent man. But I want to remind you boys to be the kind of person who makes things easier for others, not the kind of person who makes things harder. If some Muslims do commit terrorist acts, it makes life that much more difficult for the rest of us (Kolocotronis 170).

Although Salahuddin has been imprisoned without any proof, he does not side with his son and react angrily. Rather, he wants him to avoid the mistakes and hardship they suffer from. As if Salahuddin is calling his sons to avoid what Foucault calls “totalization” which means the fact of not giving any attention to “individuals” as essential and active human beings. Instead, one takes into consideration just “the interest of the totality” (Foucault, *The Subject and Power* 782), in this case Americans. Because Muslim characters have already suffered from this “totalization” by being treated as a group and not as individuals, he wants his sons to avoid complicating things for others.

Furthermore, this focus on educating children good principles in the novel may be interpreted as a symbolism of the future. Children symbolize the future and parents' insistence on raising them properly symbolizes their hope in a good future free of stereotypes.

2.7. The Foucauldian Representation of Truth

Foucault clarifies his conception of truth as

the ensemble of rules according to which the true and the false are separated and specific effects of power attached to the true, it being understood also that

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

it's a matter not of a battle "on behalf" of the truth, but of a battle about the status of truth and the economic and political role it plays (Rainbow, *The Foucault Reader* 74).

Stated differently, Foucault is interested in what makes "the true" and the "false" considered as such. Then, "the true" becomes the norm and leads to certain "effects of power" as he also emphasized the key role what counts as "true" plays in the political as well as the economic systems. To illustrate this point, one can refer again to the president's speech in the novel when he says: "either you're with us or you're with the terrorists" (Kolocotronis 49). Since Muslims are seen as terrorists, one can infer that it is "true" to be with Americans and "false" to be with terrorists. Consequently, it is "true" that Muslims are terrorists and building on this *true* reality, Americans start to mistreat Muslim characters and a "war on terror" is declared. The question to be raised here is: According to which rule this "truth" related to Muslims as terrorists is established?

Foucault strongly supports the fact that "[t]ruth' is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extends it. A 'regime' of truth" (Rainbow, *The Foucault Reader* 74). Relating this point to the novel, one has to refer to the president's speech after the attacks. Since the president is part of the "system of power", his categorization of Muslims as "them" and non-Muslims as "us" produces the truth of Muslims as terrorists and makes it function as "true" and this truth causes and "extends...effects of power" and hence what Foucault calls "a regime of truth" (Rainbow, *The Foucault Reader* 74). In this case, both Muslim and non-Muslim characters are considered as "effects of power" because this leads both groups to react. Americans, as effects, react angrily while Muslim characters, as effects too, react through their polite behavior.

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

Here, one can refer to Foucault and his insistence on the positive effects “power relations” produce rather than viewing power as leading just to negative results. Thus, although the discourse of Islam as a dangerous religion which encourages terror and violence leads to the creation of several “power relations” including the one between Muslim and non-Muslim characters, still Foucault sees that

[p]ower relations... are productive relations, because they imply resistance – without which no power relation can be conceived: where is power, there is always someone who resists it. The individual, that is, is not the *vis-à-vis* of power; it is, I believe, one of its prime effects (Bällan).

That is, he considers individuals' resistance as positive since they will act instead of being passive receivers. Thus, in *Innocent People*, the “power relations” mentioned above lead Muslim characters to resist, each in his/her own way, the negative associations related to Islam and Muslims.

2.8. *Innocent People* Meets the Expectations of Foucault on Literature

To conclude this part, the researcher finds it interesting to show how Kolocotronis uses this literary text in order to highlight certain issues and deliver some messages in a manner that goes in parallel with Foucault's perspective on literature. For example, he mentions several reasons for his interest in literature including its ability to represent or convey opposing ideas and attitudes (Zyl and Kistner), its capacity to challenge the dominant ‘discourse’ (Zyl and Kistner), and its importance for he sees it as a key tool through which one can grasp reality better (Taleb-Khyar).

These characteristics that Foucault admire in literature form part of the novel's message because one notices that Kolocotronis highlights many issues that Foucault characterize true fiction with. For instance, she is able to deliver opposing ideas including, mainly, the fact that Muslims are innocent and polite and this is done through Muslim

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

characters' behaviour in the novel. Furthermore, the novelist challenges the dominant discourse through portraying Islam as a religion of good principles and not violence. This has been proved through the way Muslim characters deal with each other as well as with non-Muslim characters. In addition to that, she uses this literary text as a tool through which the reader can comprehend the reality of 9/11 attacks by depicting the chaos and horror Muslims are living in during this period. And as Taleb-Khayr concludes: "True fiction does not correspond to reality; it does not reflect it, it adds to it, and thus produces truth by creating a truth game" (196). This feature is present in Kolocotronis' work for her novel is not merely a reflection of the sufferings of Muslim characters. Instead, she highlights their reactions to non-Muslims' mistreatment which leads to the creation of another truth, that is of Muslims as innocent people.

2.9. The Analysis of Lugones' Approach in the Novel

2.9.1. Thick Vs. Transparent Characters

Maria Lugones uses the terms "transparent" and "thick" in order to refer to two different classified categories. "Transparent" members are conceived as such if their interests are considered as "the interests of the most dominant construction of the group" (Saba n.p.). That is, they are related to the mainstream or the majority in any group. However, "[i]ndividuals are thick if they are aware of their otherness in the group" (qtd. in Saba n.p.). That is, the latter is related to the minorities or people who are labeled as the "Other". In *Innocent People*, one can differentiate between Muslim and non-Muslim characters considering Muslim characters as "thick members" and non-Muslim characters as "transparent members".

In the novel, Uthman, a Muslim character, is arrested just because he "started talking about the World Trade Center attacks, blaming the Jews and the government" (Kolocotronis

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

55). Uthman is considered as a “thick” member in the American society since he, as a Muslim character, is “aware of... [his] otherness in the group” (qtd. in Saba n.p.). So, Uthman is arrested because “‘thick’ members ...are rendered non-sensical as they are reduced to voicing their concerns within the framework of additive analysis of transparent interests” (Saba n.p.). What is worse is that they arrest him and put him “on a list of suspected terrorists....[j]ust because he talks too much and gets angry sometimes” (Kolocotronis 56). Nothing proves he is a terrorist and still, he is imprisoned. Again, as a “thick member”, what he says cannot be considered as true and reliable since his ideas and perspectives do not serve the “transparent members” interests. He is blaming and opposing them that is why he is arrested and added to the “list of suspected terrorists” (Kolocotronis 56).

In the last chapter, Sadia attends a job interview by Mr John Watson. When they meet, Sadia refuses to shake her hand with him saying: “I’m sorry, I don’t shake hands with men” (Kolocotronis 175). Although she does so, John welcomes her and accepts her to work. She expects him to tell her that he will call her later on but instead, he says: “Sally, I think you’ll work out very well here at our facility. I’m impressed with your ability to communicate, and I think you will be a great help to our children here” (Kolocotronis 175). In this case, Sadia’s situation proves the opposite of Uthman’s one. Although Sadia is a “thick member” too, she is very welcome since she serves or helps in achieving the “transparent members” aim. This is the reason why Lugones wants these groups to resist in order to prove themselves as “active subjects”. Lugones urges them to appear as full individuals and do not allow groups who classify them to lead them to “fragmentation”. By “fragmentation”, Lugones means that the individual will perceive him/herself as passive and as the product of “the logic of purity” (Bendfeld 82). In other words, “fragmentation” is the result of the refusal of being “multiplicitous”. Such a self, according to Lugones, is consumed by the fact that certain people or groups are superior than others and that one group dominates the other (Bendfeld).

2.9.2. Lugones' Suggested Strategies of Resistance

2.9.2.1. Curdling/ Impure Separation

According to Lugones, subordinate groups cannot be completely separated from mainstream groups for it is impossible to reach a “pure” separation. Lugones ignores and criticizes “the internalized fragmentation of the colonizing gaze with its policing of the proper boundaries of community and to occupy public spaces in novel ways, enlarging our capacity for inclusive participation” (Shapiro 234). That is, she is against the dominator’s control and emphasis on separating groups of people. She suggests, instead, the possibility of including a wide range or a variety of people, ideas, perspectives, cultures, etc., including those of the marginalized groups. She is against the split for it leads to “fragmentation”. This point can be illustrated by referring to the Muslim character Sadia. The first time she and her son get out, after the attacks, she is disturbed by a person outside who “honks and yells something about going back home” (Kolocotronis 23). Sadia hears him and says to herself: “That’s happened before, and it always irritates because I want to tell the person that I am home. I start ranting” (Kolocotronis 23). Then, she adds: “I am so tired of that. What’s wrong with them? Do they have to stereotype everyone? That’s been happening to me for twenty years now. Why won’t they just stop it?” (Kolocotronis 23). Sadia’s insistence on America as her “home” goes hand in hand with what Lugones calls “curdling logic” (Lyslo 3). She provides this concept as an alternative to the logic of “split-separation/purity” (Lyslo 3). She sees the latter as a means through which people can be controlled. However, by “curdling logic”, she means that there is no place for the “clean separation of subjects/objects, rather, it is one which is unstable, fluid, anomalous- resisting the “naturalness” of a unified/objective homogenous or separated ‘essence’” (Lyslo 3). Furthermore, she insists on this “curdling logic” as a tool of resistance. Hence, one can say that Sadia epitomizes this “curdling logic” for it refuses and complains about the American characters’ stereotypes. By telling that American guy: “I am home”, she

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

is resisting the “logic of separation”. Although she is conscious of being a Muslim in a non-Muslim community, she rejects the “naturalness” of this separation. Sadia acts as a useful embodiment of Lugones’ belief that multiplicity is practiced for she argues: “Multiplicity is something that one *does*, as a strategy of resistance, rather *than* something that happens to one” (Bendfeld 102). Thus, by rejecting this belief in “pure separation”, one notices that Sadia is trying to *do* it.

When a Muslim friend suggests that they take their families and go back to their homes, Salahuddin replies angrily: “We came here for education and opportunities. My own wife and sons were born in this country. Am I supposed to uproot my family from their own home country just because of a few lunatics?” (Kolocotronis 35). As a result of being irritated, some Muslim characters start to think of leaving America. However, in this instance, Salahuddin’s reply indicates that these Muslims see this country as their home and hence, they cannot get out of their own country which proves his resistance to the “logic of purity which falsely creates “objective” subject positions” (Lyslo 3). Lugones is against this “logic of purity” relating it to “separation as splitting” (Bendfeld 96-97) while she strongly supports “separation as curdling” (Bendfeld 96-97). The former leads to grouping, stereotypes, and “fragmentation”. But the latter “is an exercise in impurity” (Bendfeld 96-97). That is, she compared the logic of separation to the act of “curdling”. “She uses the metaphor of curdling to express what happens when an emulsion curdles. When emulsions curdle, ingredients separate from each other, but they do not entirely separate” (Bendfeld 96-97). Stated differently, she opposes and criticizes the “pure” division of groups building on their race, religion, etc. because she sees this kind of division as unreachable. For her, in order for these groups to resist this thought and belief, they have to refuse it and integrate themselves as members in different “worlds” and “realities”.

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

2.9.2.2. The Multiplicitous Self

Closely connected to “the logic of curdling”, Lugones encourages individuals to express their multiplicity as a means of resistance. She sees this method of resistance as advantageous since it has a positive effect as she believes that these people’s “ability to occupy more than one ‘world’ ‘constitute[s] in part . . . the possibility of [their] future as creative being[s]” (Bendfeld 91). In this novel, one notices that there exist several obstacles that prevent Muslim characters to be “multiplicitous”. However, they do not succumb and try to occupy both “worlds”, the Muslim and the non-Muslim one. Hence, they seem to illustrate Lugones’ thought and their challenge, in particular, embodies her insistence on the fact that the person practices multiplicity rather than it happens by its own.

To illustrate the challenges that meet Muslim characters in order not to express their multiplicity, one can mention Sadia who says to her husband and Br. Hussein, when they are talking about leaving the country: “It’s terrible that I have to feel like a stranger in my own country just because I pray five times a day and wear a scarf” (Kolocotronis 36). She is calling for “multiplicity” and countering stereotypes. As if she wants people to get rid of that grouping and prejudice and avoid judging people building on their religion. In accordance with what Lugones calls “the multiplicitous self”, this example illustrates Sadia’s difficulty of being both Muslim and American because the American society is hostile towards Muslim characters. America does not welcome Muslims for they are seen as terrorists and as a result, Sadia “feel[s] like a stranger in [her] own country” (Kolocotronis 36) as she cannot practice her Islamic commitments. In addition to that, the president’s speech mentioned before indicates that in order for these Muslims to live in peace, they have to choose to be either with Americans or with the “terrorists” to use his term. Thus, putting these restrictions and obstacles on Muslims prevent Sadia from expressing her “multiplicitous self”.

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

However, Sadia seems to challenge these hindrances doing her best in order to express her multiplicity. For instance, when Sadia invites her friends to her house, she mentions:

My guest list includes friends from the Middle East, Pakistan and the United States, not to mention my Southeast Asian husband. My dinner will include potatoes and rice, American cake and Middle Eastern cake, as a sign of the struggle to know and get along with another. My life has rarely been dull since that day when I first met a foreign student (Kolocotronis 44).

The diversity of the guests' nationalities as well as the mixture of different kinds of food symbolizes Sadia's will to express her "multiplicitous self" and not being separated from one another especially because she includes an American guest too. This diversity seems intentional because it has a deep meaning which is to resist the "logic of purity" (Bendfeld 82) and call for "multiplicity" which Lugones sees as a way of resistance. Lugones strongly supports "multiplicity" and rejects the existence of a single culture and reality. She argues: "Social groups or aggregates are crisscrossed by relations of power; thus, though there are subaltern groups, none are mono+cultural or mono-logical, but complex, heterogenous, pluri-logical. Social reality is thus understood as multiple rather than fragmented" (Lugones, "Multiculturalism and Publicity" 175). That is, Lugones is indirectly supporting the coexistence of different groups seeing that the belief in the total separation of these groups as leading to "fragmentation".

While teaching in her classroom, Sadia receives a question from one of her Arab American students who wants to know whether she can consider herself as an American. Before answering, Sadia asks the students another question:

'Where is your home? Where do your friends live? Where do you feel most comfortable?'

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

Noora speaks up. 'I feel comfortable here and in Syria. When I'm here, I'm with my friends. When I go back to Syria, I see my grandparents and lots of other relatives. Can I be both Syrian and American?' 'Sure you can, Noora. I'm sure many of you have different places that are special to you.'.... 'Noora adds, 'Well, wherever we are, we know that we are Muslims.' 'Yes, Noora, we certainly are. We are all Muslims in America.'”(Kolocotronis 78).

This may symbolize the multiplicitous self that is, to live in two worlds. Noora's question is highly symbolic because it indicates this Muslim student's strong will to be both Syrian and American and hence, has a "multiplicitous self". She also highlights the fact that being a Muslim in America is not an obstacle because she feels at ease both in America and Syria and at the same time, whether in America or Syria, she knows that she is Muslim. Thus, the American characters do not show any signs of welcome to Muslim characters which may lead to the creation of what Lugones calls "fragmented subjects". However, from a Muslim perspective, symbolized by Noora, Muslim characters show their desire to have "multiplicitous selves" by being both Muslims and Americans and without having any difficulty living in both worlds. Their desire to live in the two "worlds" illustrates Lugones' clarification: "The multiple subject retains an understanding of each community she belongs to as its member" (Bendfeld 91). That is, these persons can live in both "worlds" without being hostile or hateful.

2.9.2.3. Double Vision

Sadia thinks: "Maybe the newspaper was wrong. Maybe the hijackers weren't Muslims. As terrible, as tragic as these events are, I start to feel hopeful. Maybe there will be an end to this nightmare" (Kolocotronis 19). Sadia is trying not to be consumed by the oppressor's reality. According to Lugones: "as we exercise double vision, it is clear that this

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

gives us a way of rejecting the reality of the oppressor as true even when we recognize that it rules our lives" (Lugones, "On Complex Communication" 79). Here, although Sadia knows very well that the reality of Muslims as terrorists dominate Muslim characters' lives, she is trying to reject this created fact through doubting the news. She is trying to convince herself that this is wrong and as a result she will be able not to be 'consumed' by this reality because she first rejects it and as a result she "feel[s] hopeful" (Kolocotronis 19).

Resisting the same logic of oppression and trying to reject its reality, Sadia adds:

When Salahuddin told me that Muslims may not have committed the attacks, it changed my outlook. My relief is unfounded, of course, because most of the people in the world still believe that Muslims were behind it, and they may have been. Still, this new piece of information, while not verified, makes me feel more optimistic than I've felt since I woke up last Tuesday morning (Kolocotronis 21).

Sadia is trying not to be consumed by the oppressor's reality. Lugones believes that ignoring this invented fact must not lead "to diminish one's sense of its power, but it is a call not to be consumed by it" (Lugones, "On Complex Communication" 79).

Supporting the same perspective, rejecting this fact leads Sadia to a state of "relief" and "optimism". Thus, again, she does not want to submit to this reality although it ruins Muslims' daily lives. She knows that Muslims in particular are accused but she finds hope and tries to believe what her husband says although she is not sure whether the piece of information he brings is true.

In another instance, after Salahuddin's imprisonment, his little son, Adam, starts asking how he can help his father get out of prison. Musa, his father's friend says:

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

Right now you can start by being good to your mama. That's first. Then, you can help your little brothers. And you can pray. You need to pray and ask Allah to help your dad, and to bring him home soon. Can you do that?" (Kolocotronis 165).

They know that Americans are hurting them but they want their Muslim sons to reject this reality and ask Allah for help rather than seeking revenge. This is an instance of Lugones' "double vision" because these characters are aware of the non-Muslim characters' racism towards them and at the same time their resistance to this racist attitude. These characters embody Lugones' "double vision" because by this concept she means "the creation and maintenance of an alternative to racist... perception, seeing oneself and one's company at once in the racist and the resistant construction" (Maria Lugones, "Musing: Reading the Nondiasporic from within Diasporas" 18).

2.9.2.4. Muslim Characters' Response to the "Logic of Oppression"

Throughout the whole novel, It has been proved that Sadia's way of thinking and behaving towards the attacks can be interpreted as a "response" (to use Lugones' term) because Sadia is always careful of dealing with the situation in an intelligent and polite way, encouraging even her children to do the same thing. She attempts to change that reality and make a difference without being rude or impolite. Still, one can consider another example that proves Sadia's wisdom in dealing with difficult situations before taking decisions. For example, while outside with her son, Sadeq, Sadia wants to select a book to buy. She says: "There are many books I'd like to buy. I choose just one. A thick volume about conflicts in American history, it may help me to get some perspective" (Kolocotronis 27). This example illustrates Sadia's response rather than reaction. It is interpreted as such because Lugones sees that "resistance is not reaction but response" (*Pilgrimages* 29). She believes that response is

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

more fruitful for it seeks change and difference rather than simply saying no to “what is being resisted” (*Pilgrimages* 29). Here, one notices that Sadia proves her strong and serious desire to change in a reasonable way. Instead of simply saying no to what non-Muslim characters think of them, she wants to make a difference and change that reality. In this case, for instance, she selects a very intelligent and thoughtful way to resist which is her focus on reading about the Americans’ conflicts in the past in particular in order to know how to deal with the current conflict between Muslim and non-Muslim characters. This is a reasonable way of dealing with this kind of struggles and illustrates this Muslim character’s good way of thinking.

In another instance, when Muslims are accused again of anthrax, Salahuddin, Sadia, and their kids are discussing the subject. The kids question whether Muslims are really guilty or not until Adam raises a question: “Mom, how can we let people know that Muslims are really nice? ... Some people just think that Muslims like to crash into buildings and make people sick. How can we let them know how Muslims really are?” (90). As if this young boy is building his “resistant intention” as he is trying to remove the negative conception. They are trying to resist in order to get rid of the passive image associated with them.

Sadia replies intelligently: “Well, I guess we already do some things. Last winter, when we had that big snowstorm, Muhammad and Sadeq volunteered to clear Mrs. Robinson’s sidewalk. Actually, they’ll need to take care of her leaves this weekend, too. I almost forgot” (90). She is teaching her son to return mistreatment with good behavior. She is teaching them to resist through their way of thinking and behaving in order to provide a good image and correct misconceptions.

Then Sadia adds:

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

Anyway, we can't control what other Muslims might do, or what people might think about Muslims. All we can do is to be good neighbors and good citizens. I would like to see you boys dress in a way that shows you're Muslims. With me, it's obvious, but you boys can hide behind your jeans and t-shirts (Kolocotronis 90).

This last example can be related to double vision too because she is teaching her sons to avoid taking into consideration people's way of thinking and behaving. This is another encouragement to reject the oppressor's reality. Therefore, Sadia wants them to resist politely, through wearing clothes that make them appear as Muslims, being good with non-Muslims, and treating them nice. This proves that Sadia is not afraid as she is urging her sons not to be afraid too to appear as Muslims, which is considered as a daring resistant behavior in an angry American society. Amin, then, comments: "I'm going to treat everyone nice, and then they'll be happy that I'm a Muslim" (Kolocotronis 90). Thus, all these instances illustrate Lugones' "response" rather than "reaction". They are considered as such because one notices that Muslim characters are using intelligent methods in order to resist. Their resistance is interpreted as a response rather than a reaction because Lugones "call[s] for responses rather than reactions. She considers responses to be more complex and attuned to the ways in which power structures operate....Reactions on the other hand, are quick, enacted physically, and thus contained in action" (Ortega 99-100). In this novel, then, one notices that Muslim characters in general and Sadia in particular are trying to resist without being rude with others or take physical action. Rather, they want to prove their innocence through polite behavior and nice treatment. They are also ready to be "good neighbors and good citizens", as mentioned by Sadia, and good Muslims. Hence, they want to inhabit both "worlds", to use Lugones' term.

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

After the conversation ends, Sadia tells her husband: "I want to get out into the community and make a difference" (Kolocotronis 91). Then, she discusses with her husband her desire to help people. This proves Sadia's intention to resist the negative image given to Muslims and show others that they are good using different ways like her sons' good behavior and way of thinking, their dress, and as it is clear in this example, her good deeds in the American society. She is a daring resistant who wants to go outside and prove to non-Muslim people that she is a good Muslim through "mak[ing] a difference" (Kolocotronis 91). One notices that Muslim characters, including adults and children, are doing their best in order to prove the opposite to what the majority think of them.

Another example can be interpreted as such is when Sadia calls Mrs Foster, who works in a local nursing home. Sadia and her sons want to visit people in that nursing house. So, the act of visiting itself can be interpreted as resistant for she is Muslim and the ones she aims to visit are not. As if she tries to show them Muslims' good intentions and principles, especially because she is friendly with them.

In addition to that, when she calls Mrs Foster to inform her about the visit, the latter asks her about her name. Sadia is hesitant which name to use commenting:

Every time I talk with someone I don't know, I have to decide which name to use. Legally, I'm Sally Abdullah. Occasionally, though, I go by Sally Pappas, my maiden name, and sometimes I go by Sadia Abdullah. I decide that this time I'd better let Mrs Foster know who I am, so at least she won't turn me away at the door when she realizes I'm a Muslim. 'My name is Sadia Abdullah.' Will she hang up on me now? (Kolocotronis 93).

This decision of using her Muslim name and appearing as a Muslim, in spite of all the threats Muslims are receiving, without being hesitant indicates Sadia's deep desire to resist all these

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

misconceptions as she wants to resist intelligently for she and her sons will appear as Muslims with good behavior in order to show that those who are behaving well are Muslims and hence the image given to them is wrong. This kind of resistance, that is response rather than reaction, opens the door “of seeing oneself as capable of overcoming fear and domination, and as being creative and skillful *in spite* of the perception from the dominant group that considers that self as unworthy, inferior, and expendable” (Ortega 100). Thus, although Sadia is seen as “unworthy” and “inferior” as a Muslim “self”, she shows a strong desire to be perceived in both Muslim and American “worlds”. She rejects being perceived as such and tries to deal with “the perception from the dominant group” positively.

Talking about the importance of wearing the scarf, Sadia declares: “When I started college, though, I realized that I wanted people to know that I’m a Muslim, and that covering is part of my Islamic identity” (Kolocotronis 103). Here Sadia is talking about her will to wear the scarf when she was at college. That is, long before the attacks. This, again, proves that Muslims are suffering from religious categorization before the attacks. Interestingly enough, wearing the scarf in order to show her “Islamic identity” proves her resistant character even before the attacks. Having such a strong resistant intention in mind, Lugones believes, can alter “the hegemonic organization of power effectively” (Moya 199). Thus, one can consider Sadia’s strong will to change and face everyone with her scarf as the first step towards change.

When her colleagues start to bother her for wearing the scarf, Laila, Maryam’s daughter, wants to give up. However, her father, Musa, tries to convince her and encourage her to resist and “to be able to stand up for her faith, pregnant or not” (Kolocotronis 111).

And then Sadia adds: “I can identify with Laila, even though I’m older than her. It’s hard when you grow up in a country and then, one day, you’re looked at as a potential terrorist”

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

(Kolocotronis 113). The first instance shows that all Muslim characters in the novel are careful of wearing the scarf as a tool of resistance in order not to give up. However, the second one indicates that the Muslim female, Sadia, with all her good intentions and desire to raise her sons as good Muslims feels sorry now for the fact of being viewed as “a potential terrorist” in her country is very difficult to cope with. Still, all the above-mentioned examples prove that she tries to challenge and overcome that perception to prove that Muslims are just innocent people.

2.9.2.5. Active Subjectivity

Lugones believes that individuals are “active subjects” so, they can make a difference and contribute to “resistant meaning-making” (Change et al. n.p.). Furthermore, by resistance, Lugones does not mean simply physical action but also “the dispositions, thoughts, and glances that make critiques of oppression thinkable” (Chang et al. n.p.). In *Innocent People*, Muslim characters in general and Sadia in particular prove to be “active subjects” especially when Sadia says at the end of the novel:

A year ago today, it is said, nineteen Muslim men hijacked and destroyed four airplanes, in horrific acts that caused the deaths of almost three thousand people. According to the reports, they were acting under the banner of Islam. That, supposedly, was their jihad” (Kolocotronis 177).

Sadia’s use of the word “supposedly” in an ironic way proves her intention to show that those who are responsible of the death of this huge number of people, in case they are Muslims, are not doing the *right* jihad.

Then, she adds:

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

For the past year I have struggled to wear my scarf, keep my independence, protect my family and help my friends. We almost lost the restaurant, and for a few days I thought I had lost my husband. We're stronger now. I wear my scarf without apology, I'm able to let Muhammad live far away from home, and I have a new job. The restaurant is thriving again. My husband is stronger, too, for his ordeal. It hasn't always been easy, but I'm making it. This is my jihad" (Kolocotronis 178).

This concluding quote of the novel shows Sadia's ability to make a difference successfully although she faces lots of obstacles. She is now able to do many things she could not do before. This clarification after that long struggle proves Sadia's ability to act as an "active subject" because she makes changes and resists successfully. In addition to that, the last sentence in the novel indicates that all what she does including her good behaviour, intentions, way of treating non-Muslims, etc. embody the *right* jihad. Put differently, she opposes the logic of treating all Muslims as terrorists and considering jihad as killing innocent people and committing crimes. Rather, she proves that jihad is not what the majority of Americans think. Thus, her intentional as well as physical ability to go against the grain illustrates Lugones "active subjectivity". Furthermore, she is not the only character who acts as such since other Muslim characters also prove to be willing to resist and that is what Lugones calls for because she "moves away from the notion of agency to that of active subjectivity whose backing comes...from other resisters who are aware of both the reduction of their lives and their multiplicity" (Dipietro, McWeeny, and Roshanravan 79). So, she believes that "active subjectivity" is supported by others who share the same feeling of inferiority and categorization but at the same time they are "multiple". Hence, in this novel, Muslim characters prove to occupy more than one "world". They are aware of their origin,

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

their Muslim identity, as well as their American one. They believe and are willing to occupy all these “worlds”

2.10. The Analysis of Selected Relevant Symbols in the Novel

In this novel, the reader notices that Kolocotronis uses several ways to symbolize the situation and future of Muslims. To start with, the title of the novel, *Innocent People*, is symbolic for it indicates the real purpose of the writer which is to show the image of Muslims and remove the negative associations related to them.

In another instance, when Sadia describes the distraction her children are suffering from, she mentions her son, Amin who “[m]ost of the time ... just talks to himself, making up stories about superheroes who always win over evil” (Kolocotronis 12). The reference to winning over evil is symbolic for this may indicate that one day, Muslims will prove their innocence and win over evil.

Also, when Laila, Maryam’s daughter, gives birth to a little baby in the concluding chapters, she named the little girl Sakeena. The name is symbolic for in Arabic it means ‘quietness’. Thus, this symbolizes these characters’ hope for peace and quietness in the future, especially because Laila before giving birth to Sakeena is portrayed as a character who is most of the time confused and afraid of what will happen in the future. That is why the name she chooses for her little baby is highly symbolic.

Everyone knows that Ramadan is a special month for Muslims. When this month approaches,

A local reporter interviewed some Muslims in the area, asking how Ramadan would be different this year. Most had the same message as our imam, who

Chapter Two: Strategies of Resistance in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* (2003)

said, 'Ramadan is always a special month. The terror and difficulties of the last two months will make it more special' (Kolocotronis 125).

In Muslims' culture, in general, Ramadan is a month of peace and union. However, the imam indicates that this year it will be "more special" and he relates it to the attacks. This is a symbol of Muslim characters' union, solidarity, and strength. Additionally, this symbolizes the fact that their union this year will be "more special" because of the attacks so, they will use it as a way to resist the threat they are living in.

2.11. Conclusion

In conclusion, it has been proved throughout the chapter that Kolocotronis depicts Muslim American characters as victims of the Western discourse. As a result, they are shown as living in a chaos soon after the attacks because of non-Muslims' accusations, though Muslims are victims themselves. Hence, this entity has been perceived as "thick" that forms a threat to the United States. Therefore, Kolocotronis portrays the journey of this group of Muslims as struggling to challenge such an established fact and live in harmony with non-Muslims in the same society.

Chapter Three
The Challenge of
Misconceptions in Amy
Waldman's *The Submission*
(2011)

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

3.1. Introduction

Like in Kolocotronis' *Innocent People*, Muslim characters in Waldman's *The Submission* also fall victims of the discourse the non-Muslim majority was affected by. The main focus of this chapter, then, will be the way the discourse of Islam, reinforced mainly by media, influence the non-Muslim majority in the novel, which leads to the perception of Muslims as the ultimate enemy and a serious threat to the county. Therefore, the core of scrutiny, in this chapter, will be the analysis of the situation of Muslim-Americans in struggle with a tough society and 9/11 attacks' aftermath.

To achieve the stated purpose, the researcher will rely heavily on Foucault's interpretation of discourse, its effect on individuals, and the latter's possibility to challenge this established discourse. Besides to this, light is shed on Lugones' thought for she strongly supports categorized groups, pays a special attention to their reality, and urges them to resist in order to prove a different truth, which is the real one. Thus, these two figures' ideas will be illustrated in the novel at hand.

3.2. The Discourse of Islam

Discourse has a deep effect on the individuals' perceptions of things and the way they look at the world around them because it is powerful enough to have such an effect. In other words, "discourse generates the world of our everyday life" (Whisnant 6), that is the reality shaped in the everyday world is the result of the power of discourse. This point is well illustrated in the novel by referring to the conversation that takes place between Paul and Sami soon after the attacks. At the beginning of the novel, Paul, a member in the jury, is

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

informed by his secretary about the attacks. However, Sami's reply proves that Arabs have been blamed even before the attacks.

Edith called, sobbing 'It's falling down, it's falling down,' the nursery-rhyme words, then the mobile network went dead. 'Hello? Hello? Honey?' all around, then a silence of Pompeian density so disturbing that Paul was grateful when Sami, his driver, broke it to say, 'Oh sir, I hope it's not the Arabs,' which of course it would turn out to be (Waldman 13).

Sami's reply indicates that Arabs are the first entity to be blamed since they have been accused long before the attacks. These accusations are the creation of discourse and the latter, as it is stated before, affects the Americans' views of Arabs in general and Muslims in particular. Thus, this truth of Muslims as terrorists and Islam as a religion of terror is merely the effect of old "power relations" since "the already-existing power relations in the social body also affected the way in which knowledge was produced" (Alim 15).

In the novel, the effect of discourse on shaping Americans' view of Muslims is highlighted since they have been lead to oppose Muslim characters and "[a] year after the attack, news about Muslims arrested or suspected, the constant parsing of Islam's 'true' nature, had become background noise for Mo" (Waldman 38). The fact that they are affected to the extent of mistreating Muslims emphasizes Foucault's perspective on discourse and the vital role it plays "in the social construction of reality" (Whisnant 6). This proves that the Americans are highly affected by the reality of Muslims as terrorists and this reality is highlighted after the attacks for the image of 'true' Islam affected Muslims deeply which proves that its representation is distorted. In this instance then, Mohammad illustrates the impact of creating such an image on Muslim characters because after the attacks,

Muslims are also isolated from the society especially in America. They are not wanted as neighbours or colleagues by Americans. This prejudice and racist

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

attitude towards Muslims are so strong that Barrack Obama, the President of the USA, was even attacked by this racist ideology. The New Yorker magazine illustrated Barack Obama in a Muslim robe and his wife, Michelle Obama, with a machine gun and Usama Bin Laden on the background on its cover page in July, 2008 (Büyükgebiz 231).

Thus, the Americans' racism towards Muslims went to the extreme, to an extent they misrepresent even their president.

One of the American characters that well illustrate the power of discourse in shaping reality and people's view of things is Paul, a member in the jury. For Paul, Khan's design is an issue that has to be taken seriously and Khan himself is "a problem to solve" (Waldman 51). That is why in one situation Paul "drew a line down the middle and titled the columns 'For Khan' and 'Against Khan'....In the 'Against' column, his pen scratched vigorously: backlash, distraction, families divided, raising \$\$\$ harder, governor/politics....Under both columns, with the heading 'Unpredictable,' he wrote: violence" (Waldman 50). Paul's jotted down ideas prove that he is the product of discourse for his opinion towards Muslims in general and Khan in particular is totally distorted. Thus, he is merely a product of discourse and "[c]ertain discourses in certain contexts have the power to convince people to accept statements as true. This power can have no relation to any objective correctness of the statement" (Whisnant 6). In other words, although there is no 'objective correctness' of the reality of Muslims as terrorists, discourse is powerful enough to affect several characters, including Paul, to accept this created reality as "true". There is a hint here that the created reality is subjective while Paul is generalizing Muslims as terrorists.

Furthermore, several other characters are depicted as effects of discourse including Frank and Alyssa Spier who seem to oppose Muslims to the extreme. For example, trying to defend his son who has been killed in the attacks,

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

Frank, Sean's father, was on the phone with a reporter: 'Yes, we plan to fight this until our last breath. What? No, sir, this is not Islamophobia. Because phobia means fear and I'm not afraid of them. You can print my address in your newspaper so they can come find me.' A pause. 'They killed my son. Is that reason enough for you? And I don't want one of their names over his grave.' Another pause. 'Yes, we found his body. Yes, we buried him in a graveyard. Jeez' (Waldman 56).

This angry and revolutionary father seems to be the product or the effect of the discourse of Islam and by referring to Muslims as 'them', he emphasizes, to use Foucault's term, the categorization of Muslims as the other or the enemy. Additionally, Alyssa Spier writes: "Islam was violent. It believed killing innocent people was acceptable. It didn't like women. It didn't like other religions. It was as hateful as her nausea. She was going to puke again. 'The problem with Islam is Islam.' She had one sentence" (Waldman 106). This means that Spier is also another effect of discourse for she has a totally negative opinion on Islam and its principles as it is clear in this example.

The power of discourse in changing perspectives can also be illustrated in the fact that Muslims start to face problems on behalf of Americans and soon after the attacks, "the content had included stories about new immigration difficulties, threats to mosques, the detention of Muslims" (Waldman 99). Hence, the discourse of Islam as a religion of terror leads to the mistreatment of Muslims in the novel and the reality of Muslims as terrorists is taken as a definite reality although it has not been proved.

In several parts of the novel, the reader notices that some non-Muslim characters try to find a reason to accuse Mo as it is clear in the following example:

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

The governor was watching herself on television. 'Even if Mr. Khan is not a security threat---and there is no reason to think he is---his finding his way to victory in this anonymous competition reminds us that radical Islamists could use our democratic institutions and our openness to advance their own agenda,' (Waldman 102).

The governor's speech indicates that she is trying to find an excuse to accuse Muslims for she clearly states that even if there is no convincing reason that Khan is a 'threat', still he is a Muslim and Muslims, according to her, have a plan which is to use Americans' 'openness' to achieve their objective. However, nothing proves that what she claims is true. This character's belief is merely a reflection of the effect of discourse and power because after the attacks, "Muslims are seen as a demographic bloc gaining power against the native population and a threat for the future of the civilization" (Büyükgemiz 232). This indicates that Americans are afraid of Muslims seeing them as dangerous to their religion, culture, and 'civilization' which may justify the creation of such a scene and hence, the construction of such a reality.

The discourse of Islam seems to be the result of certain misconceptions about the nature of this religion as it has been proved by several characters' declarations. For instance, when

Claire turned on the television, wanting to know what the shouting classes would make of this,... One intoned: 'As we all know by now, the terrorists who carried this out believed their act would get them to paradise, with the silks and wine, the pretty young boys and the dark-eyed virgins, and now it seems it has.' A second affirmed: 'Their remains are in that ground, too. He's made a tomb, a graveyard, for them, not the victims. He would know that the Arabic word for tomb and garden are the same' (Waldman 116).

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

These American characters' reactions to the Muslim memorial proves that they are deceived for their statements about Islam are completely wrong which prove them as effects of discourse.

Another misconception is highlighted when Asma reads in a newspaper:

Islam means submission---it makes slaves of its followers, and demands that people of other religions submit to it, too. Their goal is to impose Sharia, Islamic law, wherever they can, including the United States. They will tell you this isn't true, but the problem is that Islam also sanctions lying---the Islamic term for this is taqiya---to help the faith spread or to wage jihad. The Muslim who entered this memorial competition practiced taqiya by concealing his identity... (Waldman 132).

What Asma reads is another instance of Americans' dark image about Islam and the way they are used to empower the dominant discourse. However, when Asma reads that, she directly thinks of her father and family members and that "[n]one of those people had ever told her to wage war against non-Muslims or try to impose Sharia, although they probably wouldn't rely on the women to do that. Certainly no one had told her to lie" (Waldman 133). Thus, as a Muslim character, Asma represents the other side of the coin. She is a voice of the true Islam for she thinks of her Muslim parents and her true principles and realizes that what is written is wrong since as a Muslim herself, she has not been raised to lie or to consider non-Muslims as her enemy.

In this novel, the Americans consider Muslims as their first enemy as they cannot act in a tolerant way for they emphasize their hate in several occasions. For instance, when

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

[t]he Rally to Protect Sacred Ground kicked off on a balmy Saturday morning in a plaza opposite the site, [t]he members of both the Memorial Defense Committee and Save America from Islam were there, gathered in a cordoned-off area in front of the stage. Behind them stretched a crowd of thousands: women holding signs that said NO TOLERANCE FOR THE INTOLERANT OR ISLAM KILLS OR NO VICTORY GARDEN OR KHAN IS A CON (Waldman 149).

All these signs highlight Americans' refusal to accept a Muslim design in their country. Furthermore, the only reason of these reactions is merely the designer's religion.

The image of Islam is completely distorted in this novel to an extent that Debbie's daughters threaten her to develop marital relationships with Muslims in order to get what they want from their mother. She has three daughters: Trisha, Alison, and Orly. The three of them "had signs saying NO ISLAM ZONE on their doors: Debbie wasn't allowed to talk about 'the cause,' as they disdainfully referred to it, in their rooms. When they didn't get their way, they threatened to marry Muslims" (Waldman 164). This is another instance of the deep negative impact of the discourse of Islam on non-Muslims.

According to Foucault, power relations do not exist only between the ruler and the ruled one. Rather, they are everywhere in society and "can be in play family relations, or within an institution, or an administration – or between a dominating and a dominated class power relations" (qtd. in Alim 15). Thus, as previously stated, one can consider the relation between Muslim and non-Muslim characters as a power relation which existed long before the attacks and had been reinforced by the 9/11 events. Hence, following Foucault's perspective, one can consider these characters as "subjects" for they are the product of these power relations and help in reinforcing them and making them work by following that dominant

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

discourse of Islam as a religion of terror. The following example well illustrates this point for some American characters' speech indicates they are tools to reinforce discourse and their perspectives on Muslims emphasize the power relations between them and the Muslim world.

For instance, the governor's man, a member in the jury, says:

‘Well, I’ll be honest here. I’ll be honest.’ ... ‘I’m not sure I want it with the name Mohammad attached to it. It doesn’t matter who he is. They will feel like they’ve won. All over the Muslim world they’ll be jumping up and down at our stupidity, our stupid tolerance.’... ‘Tolerance isn’t stupid,’ Claire said in a schoolmarmish tone. ‘Prejudice is’ (Waldman 18).

The governor's man speech gives a hint of the tense atmosphere that is dominating the meeting in particular and America in general. Furthermore, Claire's response highlights the Americans' sense of their superiority. The fact that they are referring to Muslims as the enemy indicates that there is a grouping and their acceptance of the memorial will give that enemy a sense of victory.

Another character whose speech exemplifies the old existing power relations between Muslims and non-Muslims is Sean who

tried to reclaim his audience's attention [saying]; ‘the jurors...find out they picked a Muslim, and they say, ‘Wow, that’s terrific, what a message that will send to Muslims, that we’re their friend, that we have nothing against Islam, because what did Islam ever do to us?’ (Waldman 86).

His words suggest that there are old and serious feuds between these two entities. This highlights Foucault's focus on power and the way it “reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

discourses, learning processes and everyday lives” (qtd. in Alim 15). Sean seems to underestimate and hate Muslims to the extreme for he seems sarcastic later when he says: “It wasn’t enough for Khan to demand his rights as a Muslim. Now his garden has rights, too...” (Waldman 150). He does not seem to be giving any importance to Khan as a Muslim, how can he value his design?

Although the discourse of Islam in America proves to be very powerful and deeply affected American characters in the novel, some of them, like Claire and Jack, seem to sympathize with Muslims though they do not make any powerful statements about the issue. For instance, Jack tells Claire: “There’s no evidence our Muslim population is a threat; why should we make them one?” (Waldman 200). It is clear that some American characters are aware of Muslims’ innocence and that nothing is proved against them. Jack’s opening of such a perspective goes hand in hand with Foucault’s opinion about truth for he raises the acceptance of certain statements as true as a serious issue to be analyzed. He argues:

‘How have we come to accept the types of knowledge that we presume to be legitimate, valid and true?’ In so doing, Foucault attempts to problematise that which we take to be self-evident... to draw attention to previously neglected issues of change and dimensions of knowledge and power relations (Woermann 112).

Stated differently, Foucault questions the forms of knowledge people take as definite and absolute and urge them to question the ancient perspective towards “knowledge and power relations” and hence, he is trying to emphasize the subjectivity of truth.

Furthermore, when Claire seems to defend the design urging the members not to change it for they believe it is the best memorial and they have to accept it, the historian replies: “History makes its own truths, new truths. It cannot be unwritten, we must acknowledge---” (Waldman 21). His answer justifies the construction of such a discourse

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

about Islam. It proves that when it comes to their interests, they can change their principles. That is, although they are convinced it is the suitable memorial, once they reveal the name and religion of the winner, they seek to change everything. In addition to that, his reply emphasizes Foucault's questioning of the status of truth. In another instance, Claire says: "history was liquid, unfixed" (Waldman 115). This illustrates the same point of truth as subjective and hence history as subjective too.

From a Muslim perspective, the idea of the subjectivity of truth is also highlighted when Mohammad says: "Something is always changing, being changed, outside our grasp" (Waldman 198). There is a hint here that statements are made beyond people's control and new truths and realities are always constructed.

In a conversation between Claire and Jack, Claire says:

'Sometimes I feel like I've got one leg in New York and one in America'
'New York is America.'

'You know what I mean---we think so differently, so atypically, here. We're such a minority in our own country. Liberals, I mean.'

'Which doesn't mean we're wrong.'

'Doesn't mean they are either.'

'So everyone's right? How's that supposed to work?'

'I just meant there are two sides to everything, including this. Probably more than two sides'" (Waldman 200).

Their conversation justifies their sympathetic attitude towards Muslim characters. They feel like "a minority in ...[their] own country" but still they are not opposing the majority. Instead, they believe that "there are two sides [or more] to everything" (Waldman 200). Their perspective towards the way minorities are treated in general and Muslims in particular illustrates Foucault's idea concerning the issue of knowledge and truth. They believe there is

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

no one objective truth but there are 'truths' in every domain. This may symbolize the novelist's support of the multiplicity of truth and opposition of Muslims' mistreatment which opens the door to the questioning of certain established ideas as Foucault emphasizes:

[T]he focus of analysis shifts from studying individuals (for example, children, black people, women) to studying the system of ideas that constitute the identity of those individuals (for example, childhood, blackness, femininity). In decentering the subject, the theorist opens up discourses to alternate conceptions of current practices" (Woermann 114).

Thus, as the example illustrates, Foucault urges theorists to question ideas, systems, and concepts rather than specific "individuals".

3.3. Media's Contribution to Reinforcing Discourse

Although the discourse of Islam deeply affected the Americans through several means, one cannot deny the fact that media contribute to a large extent in strengthening the image of Islam as a religion of terror and violence. Similar to Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* where characters are highly affected by media, Waldman's *The Submission* also puts special emphasis on media and its power in shaping people's perspectives and delivering several messages about Islam and Muslims, especially because the author herself is a journalist. For example, when the designer's name is revealed but not yet announced, an American character asks Paul, a member in the jury, about the nature of the winner. Paul replies in surprise: "The Post?" Paul warbled. "Yes, the *New York Post*. They're saying a Muslim has won the memorial competition. You told me---" (Waldman 51). This indicates that before declaring that the winner is a Muslim, some people have already known that the selected design is that of a Muslim and the reason is the *New York Post* as a medium. To emphasize, "Paul reached the newsstand. There it was and going fast---the paper the *Post*, the author Alyssa Spier, and the photo of an unidentifiable man in a balaclava, scary as a terrorist. The headline:

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

MYSTERY MUSLIM MEMORIAL MESS” (Waldman 51-52). The headline itself shows media’s dramatization of the news. Instead of simply saying the winner is a Muslim, they dramatize it by referring to the memorial as a ‘mystery’ and a ‘mess’. This way of delivering information affects the receivers’ perspective towards the given pieces of information. “This image is further fuelled by the media, which both by using value-laden language and by giving it disproportional weight and coverage results in sustained stereotypes” (Ahlin & Carler 1).

Even the journalists and ordinary people who are broadcast tend to express their hate of Muslims as they emphasize the fact that they want their voices to be heard to all the members of the American society. For instance, On NY1, Sean Gallagher, founder of the Memorial Support Committee says: “‘It’s like being stabbed in the heart to hear that a Muslim could build this, stabbed in the heart,’ he said. ‘We want that message to go out to the jury loud and clear’” (Waldman 83). His words emphasize his refusal to accept a design by a Muslim anyway which is again the impact of discourse. Furthermore, media are tools that encourage such opinions to be heard. As a result of highlighting the truth of Muslims as guilty, “the families were opposed to the Muslim, as they called him” (Waldman 84). This proves that these families represent the effect of media and discourse as well because as a result of media’s “negative coverage”, people start to perceive “such negative messages as ‘truths’” (Allen 8).

In another instance, when Jeannie Sciorfello, a *Daily News* reporter, googled Mo’s name, she got: “‘Mohammad Khan’: the ‘John Smith’ of the Muslim world” (Waldman 93). So, internet as another medium provides attractive titles that give a hint of the hidden message they want to transmit. This selected title seems sarcastic for it symbolizes Khan as a Muslim hero for his ability to achieve part of Muslims’ objective by winning the competition.

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

The following example also highlights the power of media to shape perspectives as well as to dramatize events. Claire watches on TV.:

‘an assault on America’s Judeo-Christian heritage, an attempt to change its cultural landscape. It would appear to be a covert attempt at Islamization,’ the paper intoned. ‘Two decades of multicultural appeasement have led to this: we’ve invited the enemy into our home to decorate.’ The members of Save America from Islam dominated cable news with well-lathed lines---their leader, Debbie Dawson, saying, ‘Muslims believe it is okay to lie to convert people to their truth.’ And ‘Look at the history: Muslims build mosques wherever they’ve conquered. They could never get away with putting a mosque at this site, so they’ve come up with something sneakier: an Islamic garden, this martyr’s paradise, it’s like a code to jihadis. And ,they’ve smuggled it in our memorial---it’s the Trojan horse’ (Waldman 117).

This news indicates that those Muslims are very dangerous and they have an intention to conquer the non-Muslim world. The way the nature of Islam and Muslims is broadcast encourages non-Muslim Americans to react and fight against the memorial for it is considered as the first step towards the achievement of Muslims’ intentions. Islam hence is shown as a serious danger that must be gotten rid of and Muslims are generalized as “extremists” without taking into consideration the difference among people in any religion. That is, when it comes to Muslims, they are seen as the same and “diversity and differences are ignored” (qtd. in Ahlin & Carler 4). It is that method of accepting certain ‘truths’ as they are that Foucault invites individuals to question so that they pave the way for other versions of the same “truth”.

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

Furthermore, media's representation of what they pretend as the reality of Muslims deeply affected non-Muslims' opinions as well as attitudes towards Muslims. The example that will follow shows the way an American character behaves aggressively as a result of media's influence:

The second headscarf pulling occurred less than a week after the rally. A man in a Queens shopping mall walked up to a Muslim woman pushing a baby stroller, tugged her headscarf back, and ran. The next took place in Boston. This perpetrator didn't flee---instead he waited for the police to arrest him so he could testify to the media: 'I saw that guy do it on the news, and I thought, we all need to be that brave, take a stand' More men copied him, and copycats copied the copycats, so within a week there had been more than a dozen incidents around the country. Some non-Muslim women put on headscarves in solidarity, but no one preyed on them (Waldman 164).

Throughout the whole novel, media act as a negative influence for they create distorted, negative, and bad images of Muslims without providing the receivers with any proof or evidence. To exemplify, one can refer to Paul who

couldn't turn on the television without confronting dark advertisements against the Garden. One showed frothing Iranians chanting 'Death to America,' stone-throwing Palestinians, burka-wearing women, RPG-toting Taliban, terrorist leaders in high-thread-count beards, nuclear bombs exploding, Muslims praying en masse, and of course Mohammad Khan, glowering beneath the words 'Save the Memorial.' No one knew who was paying for the ads---reporters could trace the group putatively behind them only as far as a post office box in Delaware (Waldman 167-168).

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

To comment on the way Muslims are shown on T.V., one can refer to Ahlin and Carler who consider this way of broadcast creating a deep split between “the West and Islam” as they consider media as well as politicians as responsible of creating the binary opposition “us” versus “them” (Ahlin & Carler 8).

Information about Mohammad is available in different languages but they all suggest that Khan is a threat and must be punished as indicated in this example:

The internet was full of references to him in languages couldn't read: Arabic, Urdu, Farsi. What he could read told him that he deserved the death penalty. CNN showed snippets of indignant clerics, marching children, and in Pakistan, a mob burning him in effigy. It wasn't even a flattering picture (Waldman 240).

Another instance that shows Muslims as the enemy and media's emphasis on this point is “Lou Sarge, New York's most popular right-wing radio host, [who i]n the months after the attack ... had added the tagline ‘I Slam Islam’ to his show” (waldman 41). This proves that media are just trying to worsen the situation by broadcasting only the images and events that distort the picture of Islam and Muslims which may lead to the construction of a certain reality that almost everyone considers as true and acts building on such a construction (Ahlin & Carler 5).

3.4. Muslim Characters as a Threat

Due to media's negative coverage of Islam and the power of the discourse of Islam as a religion of violence, Muslim characters are seen as threatening and dangerous in the novel. For instance, after revealing the winner's name and religion, the American characters, starting from the members of the jury, feel extremely threatened. Leo's words to Claire prove his anxiety and fear towards the situation for he says:

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

‘Claire, I absolutely agree with you---it’s unconscionable to even think of stripping this man of his victory. But people are afraid. Two years on we still don’t know whether we’re up against a handful of zealots who got lucky, or a global conspiracy of a billion Muslims who hate the West, even if they live in it. We’re rarely rational in the face of threats to our personal safety, let alone our national security’ (Waldman 20).

His words symbolize the voice of the American nation in general who see Muslims as a serious threat as he indicates pushing his colleagues not to trust the enemy and to be aware of the danger of selecting such a design.

Muslim characters are looked at with suspicious eyes directly after the attacks. While trying to travel, “Mo’s bag was taken for a fine-tooth combing while he was quarantined for questioning in a windowless room. The agents’ expressions remained pleasant, free of insinuation that he had done anything wrong. An ‘informational interview,’ they called it” (Waldman 24). Thus, they start looking at and questioning Mo as a suspect terrorist although there is no evidence proving he is one but being a Muslim is the reason of treating him as such. As it has been mentioned above, partly due to media’s repeated negative coverage of Muslims, non-Muslims see this reality as the definite and true version without considering any other perspectives on the same issue. So, Looking at Muslims as a threat and treating them as a special group is partly due to media’s influence.

American characters perceive Islam with a skeptical view to an extent that they start to doubt everything as the words of the radio host Lou Sarge, when he had a meeting with Otto Toner, indicate:

‘Maybe there’s something sneaky, maybe they’re planning tunnels underneath. Or planting---putting---something dangerous in that memorial I mean, how do

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

we know the danger's just symbolic here? Maybe this becomes some kind of base for them. I mean, has anyone really checked out this Mohammad Khan? Is he the Manchurian Candidate of Islam?' (Waldman 117-118).

This kind of doubts leads one to call into attention Altwaiji's perspective on this issue for he sees that after the attacks, there was no clear distinction between fighting against "terrorism" or against Islam as a religion. The same critic believes that the president George W. Bush is, to a large extent, responsible of creating such a generalization referring to the same president's speech when he constructed the reality of Muslims as targeting the West's "freedom of religion" (qtd. in Altwaiji 68) considering them as completely opposing the West and hence, a serious threat that must be resisted.

The threats began soon after Mo's official anointment. By phone, by letter, by e-mail, his countrymen promised to burn him as the terrorists had incinerated their victims, to stab him in the heart as he was stabbing America. The FBI placed him under watch. Agents much like his interrogators in Los Angeles posed, ineptly, as his assistants. In their presence, Emmanuel Roi wore the look of an ancient Brahman forced to host untouchables. Next came the picketers. Two, or three, or ten of them, mostly women, foot-darned a circle in the park across from his house. They held signs with by-now familiar slogans---NO MECCA IN MANHATTAN OR STOP JI-HIDING---and at the sight of Mo, they hooted, shouted, and rattles" (Waldman 123).

This example serves as another instance of considering Muslims as a serious danger that they have to fight against. As it is clear, some of them seek revenge for the designer is seen as guilty though he has no bad intentions in mind as he proves through his words and deeds.

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

Furthermore, the discourse of Muslims as the enemy deeply affected non-Muslims to an extent that they mistreat certain “brown nations like the Indians” by mistake (Altwaiji 68).

In addition to that, Debbie also proves to have the same perspective towards Muslims by saying: “For generations immigrants came to this country and assimilated, accepted American values. But Muslims want to change America---no, they want to conquer it. Our Constitution protects religious freedom, but Islam is not a religion! It’s a political ideology, a totalitarian one” (Waldman 151). This illustrates the extent of anger Americans are reacting with by showing no tolerant attitudes towards Muslims and accusing them of all the aggressive and negative acts.

Debbie continues to accuse Muslims of plotting in order to destroy America just because Islam is not the dominant religion there. She is accusing Muslims of being a threat to the whole world and not just her country because she alludes that Muslims leave their traces, of building mosques in particular, wherever they go. And by designing this garden to help Americans heal, Mohammad, who represents Muslims all over the world, is intending to leave his traces as the following quote clarifies:

‘This is what they’ve done all over the world, all through history: they destroy something, then build an Islamic symbol of conquest in the same place. Babur tore down Ram’s temple in and put up a mosque. The Ottomans conquered Constantinople and made the Hagia Sophia---what else?---a mosque. Here, one set of Muslims destroys the buildings and now another comes along to put a paradise there for his dead brothers. For all we know this was part of the plan all along’” (Waldman 130-131).

When Mohammad insists that he will not leave his design or attribute it to another architect, several Americans start to take things seriously by organizing manifestations against

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

the designer and Islam in general. Through their manifestations, they attempt to change the situation for they see their country at risk. For instance, when Sean gathers with people, he imitates and mocks the way Muslims pray. Then, his members chanted: “ ‘Protect sacred ground!’ ‘Save America from Islam!’ the SAFIs chanted” (Waldman 151). Their chants illustrate their view of Islam as a dangerous and serious threat to their ‘sacred’ country and that is why they want to get rid of it as soon as possible. These characters act as products of discourse that affects “public sphere through representations which results in the formation of social beliefs to categorize whole nations” (Altwaiji 74).

3.5. Muslim Characters’ Counter to Misrepresentation Through Multiple Channels

As it has been argued above, the discourse of Islam as a religion of terror and violence deeply affects the American characters. That effect was mainly the result of media’s exaggerated broadcast of the attacks on the World Trade Center. American characters’ perception of Islam, mainly as a result of media’s impact, leads to the emergence of oppositional power relations among Muslim and non-Muslim characters in the novel. Consequently, Muslim characters are perceived as a menace that is threatening the country, especially because the non-Muslim characters believe that Muhammad Khan’s design is part of Muslims’ intrigue to invade the whole world. However, as Foucault argues: “Where there is power, there is resistance” (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 95). In order to counter American characters’ misconception and misrepresentation, Muslim characters (though badly treated) choose to resist following several strategies that negate and remove the negative image they have been associated with. Muslim characters are not depicted as violent or aggressive in their reactions which prove their innocence and willingness to live peacefully in America.

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

3.5.1. Resistance Through Sarcasm

Since the researcher sheds light on the 'power relation' between Muslim and non-Muslim characters in the novel, it is essential to consider some characters' resistance too since power and resistance are seen as closely connected, according to Foucault. He believes that resistance is an essential ingredient to any 'power relation' and if no one resists, this relation cannot be considered as such. However, he sees resistance positively arguing that people then, are not merely 'passive receivers' in this relation. Rather, they play an active role (Mills, *Michel Foucault*). In Waldman's *The Submission*, Muslim characters attempt to resist the fact of being seen as terrorists but the focus is mainly on Mohammad Khan since he is the main character in the novel and the one who revives the World Trade Center's attacks. In many instances, Mo seems sarcastic in his reactions to non-Muslims. His sarcasm seems to be originated as a result of their accusation. He knows that he is innocent and that his design's purpose was to help the Americans heal and not the opposite. That is why he seems sarcastic in several cases for maybe he sees these accusations as ridiculous. For instance, while talking with Paul about his design, Mo says:

'I could change my name,' Khan said, when Paul had finished ordering coffee.

'Many architects have,' Paul said. 'Mostly Jewish ones.'

'It was a joke.' 'My great-grandfather---he was Rubinsky, then my grandfather comes to America and suddenly he's Rubin. What's in a name? Nothing, everything. We all self-improve, change with the times.'

'It's a little more complicated than that, picking a name that hides your roots, your origins, your ethnicity.'

'Rubin hardly hides anything'

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

‘It reveals less than Rubinsky. Not everyone is prepared to remake themselves to rise in America’” (Waldman 66).

Though Mo seems kidding, he is very serious in reality for he sees that changing his name may hide his ‘roots’ and ‘origins’ which proves his pride of being Muslim and that he is not afraid of facing non-Muslim accusations and misconceptions. Additionally, his last answer indicates that he is not ready to change anything in order to live in America. He prefers to keep his name which deeply represents his religion and faces Non-Muslims’ accusations till the last moment. The same example highlights also Foucault’s idea concerning resistance’s opposition to ‘power relations’ seeing it as unwelcome or unwanted because of its nature which is opposition. In this case, then, one can say that the relation between Paul and Mo is a ‘power relation’ and Paul is trying to normalize the fact of changing one’s name because Mo’s insistence not to is seen as resistance and opposition in this relation.

While Pinball interrogates Mo, the latter

hid his disdain for the bland cuts of their jackets; the openness of their faces, so unquestioning despite all their questions. The artlessness of their interrogation. But when Pinball asked point-blank ‘Do you know any Islamic terrorists?’ Mo couldn’t help but snort in derision

‘Is that a yes or a no?’ Pinball said.

‘What do you think?’ Mo snapped, his anger crowning” (Waldman 26).

Mo’s anger can be explained by the fact that as an individual, he is “tie[d] to his own identity in a constraining way” (Foucault, *The Subject and Power* 781). That is, he is acting as an active individual, but still in a respectful way. His anger illustrates his unease about being seen only as a terrorist and extremist although he is an American too.

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

3.5.2. Resistance Through Polite Behaviour

Although Mohammad Khan has been provoked to a large extent after the design's selection, he has never reacted aggressively. In many instances, it is clear that he seems angry and disappointed as a result of non-Muslims' stressful interviews and behavior. Still, he tries to be polite as much as he can in order to show them the real image of Islam and proves they are wrong in judging a nation building on religion. For example, when he is asked whether he has any relation to terrorists, the question seems to him trivial but he answers: " 'No,' [Mo] said with forced politeness. 'No, I don't.'" (Waldman 27). Again, there is always an emphasis on politeness and respect in Mo's answers which proves that he is a good and innocent Muslim American citizen.

Mo's good intention is proved when he tells Laila: "I did this for them [meaning the families] and they don't appreciate it" (Waldman 114). This indicates that he does not plan for anything as non-Muslim characters claim. Rather, he does not expect such a reaction to such a good design that he creates to support them. However, when he is accused of being a terrorist, he resists and is deeply touched. Whenever the occasion is suitable, he tries to show resistant actions but in a polite way in order to show his good character. For instance, although "[h]is effort to avoid being seen as a criminal was making him act like one, feel like one. And yet he had been, with a few merited exceptions, a good kid and was a good man, legally speaking" (Waldman 27).

Mo is not the only Muslim character who tries to resist and correct certain misconceptions about his religion. Actually, all Muslim characters do their best to contribute in a way or another. For example, when Sean meets Zahira, the woman that he mistreats, the latter tries to defend her religion's principles toward women especially when Sean says:

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

‘we don’t make women cover their hair in this country’. Zahira replies: ‘No, we don’t make women cover their hair.’ She put the stress on ‘we’. It seemed to amuse her. ‘But women are free to choose to, as I did. No one is making me do anything’” (Waldman 182).

The image of Muslim women also seems completely distorted in the Americans’ perception. However, Zahira dares facing Sean and defending her religion in a courageous way to prove the opposite. In this case, then, one can relate Zahira’s “mode of resistance” to Foucault since he strongly supports the idea of facing certain “practices”, that may categorize certain groups, whenever they appear (Milchman & Rosenberg 71). Hence, once this Western character seems to categorize Muslims and Zahira acts as a victim who has been mistreated by him, she deals with the situation powerfully and tries to correct the image of Muslim women.

In addition to the image of women, Sean has another misconception concerning the idea of paradise. He thinks that this design symbolizes Muslims’ paradise and it acts as a way of indirect colonization by saying:

‘It’s an Islamic garden...It’s a paradise for murderers. A way to take us over, to colonize us.’ Zahira replies: ‘But for me, no architect can create paradise. Only God can. When Muslims think about paradise, the hope we feel about getting there, the exhilaration at the possibility---it’s not about trees, or silks, or jewels, or beautiful women or boys or whatever you’ve been led to believe. It’s about God. God. The description of paradise in the Quran is just a way to convey to our limited imaginations the ecstasy we will feel in God’s presence’” (Waldman 182-183).

Zahira’s strong and daring reply indicates that she is a strong Muslim woman who knows the principles of her religion very well and is very convinced of it. She refers paradise to the

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

power of God and not Mo or any other human being to release this non-Muslim American character's worries.

Malik, as a Muslim too, seems to defend Mo saying: "It's you who's created the bind, Lou. If Khan fights for his rights he's an aggressive, angry Muslim waging stealth jihad. If he gives in, he's conceding they weren't his rights to begin with" (Waldman 210). There is a hint in his speech that Mo is accused because of his religion and no matter the way he reacts, he will be perceived negatively. Actually, this perception of Muslims is part of the existence of power and the latter cannot be avoided. That is, in order to stress and emphasize one's reality, "we might change our positions on the web [like a captured fly], but there is no jumping off" (Milchman & Rosenberg 102). Stated differently, one cannot avoid power but s/he can work on emphasizing a true picture of her/himself so that they will no longer be perceived as inferior in a certain power relation. Thus, the existence of power, these non-Muslim characters as effects of discourse, and the perception of Islam negatively, cannot be denied or rejected but Mo, as a Muslim, can alter his "position on the web".

In fact, all Muslim characters in the novel try to resist the negative image they have been associated with and provide non-Muslims with the real good image. In this case, Asma Anwar loses her husband in the attacks and is trying to correct certain misconceptions through media. For example, in the public hearing, she says:

'My husband was a man of peace because he was a Muslim. That is our tradition. That is what our prophet, peace be upon him, taught. You care for widows and orphans, as Mr. Nasruddin has done for me and my child. You have mixed up these bad Muslims, these bad people, and Islam. Millions of people all over the world have done good things because Islam tells them to' (Waldman 230-231).

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

She is telling them, indirectly, not to generalize and to take into consideration the good things Muslims achieve 'all over the worlds' rather than taking only *naturalized* reality and judging a nation building on that reality.

What Mo says in an instance proves Muslim characters' innocence as the following example illustrates: "People read my face like a text, but the text I wrote, I couldn't even read" (Waldman 240). This indicates his good and innocent intentions for he sees that his design is interpreted in several ways and the sensation it causes is extremely serious and leads to serious results while he does not expect these consequences.

3.5.3. Resistance Through Coldness and Stubbornness

In addition to sarcasm and polite behavior, Muslim characters, Mo in particular, choose sometimes to react coldly and being stubborn to submit to non-Muslims' accusations and attempt to convince Mo to withdraw. For example, when Mo has been interviewed, the narrator describes:

The 'interview' ended as capriciously as it had begun. Without explanation, they asked to photograph and fingerprint him. Instead of refusing, as he believed was his right, he allowed them to press down his fingers as if he were a paralytic, an acquiescence that marked off the man who left the room from the one who had entered (Waldman 28).

Doing these robotic movements, Mo is resisting the fact of being a terrorist. His reaction indicates that he is deeply hurt to an extent that he does not refuse although he knows that it is his right.

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

In order to urge Mo to withdraw, some non-Muslim characters provoke him and comment on his insistence that he tries to help the Americans heal in a sarcastic way. For instance, Paul says:

‘I don’t know why anyone who loves America, wants it to heal, would subject it to the kind of battle the selection of a Muslim would cause. Think of Solomon’s baby.’

‘Shouldn’t you be making that point to the people gearing up for battle? I’ve done nothing but design a garden.’ (Waldman 65.).

That is, they want Mo to prove his claims are true by withdrawing while he insists to stay for he believes that he does not mean to hurt the victims’ families.

The following example well illustrates Muslim characters’ stubbornness in submitting to non-Muslim claims. In this case, Malik is urging Mo not to withdraw by insisting that as an American, Mo has the right to be the winner and there is no reason to be changed by saying:

Perhaps Malik was the man to make the case that Mo had the same right as any other American to win. He had decided, in that French fun house of a restaurant where he’d met Rubin, that he would not give in to pressure to withdraw, nor would he reassure anyone that he was ‘moderate’ or ‘safe’ or Sufi, whatever adjective would allow Americans to sleep without worrying that he had placed a bomb under their pillow. It was exactly because they had nothing to worry about from him that he wanted to let them worry (Waldman 78).

Furthermore, Mo’s stubbornness is clear in his insistence on the fact that he wants to keep those opposing Muslims anxious because in reality there is no reason for anxiety. This indicates Mo’s paradoxical way of thinking for he is resisting in a way that makes him more

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

suspicious. Mo “refused to prove his innocence. He knew this position was right, but it was like keeping his arms in stocks with no padlock. His muscles ached” (Waldman 209). Again, Mo’s reaction can be related to Foucault’s emphasis on “power relations” and “resistance” as closely connected, seeing the former as leading to several “forms of resistance” (Smart 130).

Highlighting Muslims’ resistance, one has to mention that the characters’ resistance differs in the novel. For instance, Mo

had grown a beard on his return from Kabul merely to assert his right to wear a beard, to play with the assumptions about his religiosity it might create. [Laila] would never adopt a headscarf for the same reason. He imagined himself as indifferent to the opinions of others. She really was (Waldman 114).

This example shows how both of Mo and Laila want to counter those misconceptions but their attitudes toward the same subject differ. For example, Mo chooses to grow a beard in order to emphasize his religious identity while Laila chooses not to wear the scarf for she does not care about non-Muslims’ opinions. The narrator describes Mo the day of the hearing:

He had grown the beard to play with perceptions and misconceptions, to argue against the attempt to define him. If he shaved, would he be losing the argument or ending it? Was he betraying his religion? No, but it would look that way. Was he betraying himself? That question shook the hand holding the razor (Waldman 213).

Here the beard acts as a symbol of Mo’s Muslim identity because he sees that it plays a key role in changing perspectives. This brings to our mind Foucault’s focus on “the forms of resistance [to power] and...its effects” (Smart 134) because Mo’s beard is seen as a way of resistance for he wants to appear as a Muslim rather than being simply a Muslim. Furthermore, this misconception and discourse of Islam and Muslims can be interpreted as “effects” of power.

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

In a certain moment, Mo wants to mention all the influences on the design by focusing on the non-Islamic ones to show them that if the selected design has been done by a non-Muslim one, it will not create that chaos, disappointment, and opposition. Suddenly, he decides not to for he believes that if he does so, he will admit indirectly that what they claim about Islam and Muslims is true as the following quotation indicates. When he tries to clarify, he

had intended to emphasize all the non-Islamic influences on the Garden, to show that if critics were evaluating the same design by anyone not named Mohammad, they would have seen its ranging roots. But the heckling suckled his rage, and he decided, in that moment, that to downplay any Islamic influence was to concede the stigma attached to it (Waldman 217)

From time to time, they find an excuse to convince him to withdraw. In addition to what is mentioned above, after Asma's death, Alyssa Spier asks Mo:

'What are you going to do?' 'Are you going to withdraw?'

Khan ignored her, walking off in long, measured strides, and she scurried to keep up with him, feeling like a cartoon mouse. 'Do you feel responsible?' she asked. 'For Asma Anwar's death?'

He heeled on her so abruptly it gave her a sharp fright. After what she'd written about Islam and violence, it would be almost funny, she thought, for a Muslim--especially this one---to go postal on her (Waldman 260).

Then, she accuses Mo of "hurt[ing] so many of the families' feelings" (Waldman 261). Although Asma is a Muslim character and has been stabbed for she defends Islam and Mo's

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

design still, Mo is so stubborn for he refuses to withdraw even for that reason. No one is able to convince him that he is wrong. He is courageous enough to act stubbornly in such situations. In addition to his perseverance, Mo also dares to face her fearlessly emphasizing his American identity as well as his rights as any other American as this quotation shows:

‘Offended so many Americans? Was that what you said?’ Khan said. He was moving toward her. They were only a couple of feet apart, giving her no choice but to walk backward. ‘I am an American, too,’ he said, continuing to advance on her. ‘Put that in your paper. I, Mohammad Khan, am an American, and I have the same rights as every other American.’ ... ‘I am an American. That’s the only quote I’m going to give you. I am an American.’ (Waldman 261).

In this instance, Mo and Alyssa illustrate Foucault’s “power relation” in which he believes that there must be “two bodies (or minds) pushing or pulling against each other” (Taylor 24) so that these “power relations” can change. That is, they are not stable and can be touched through individuals’ resistance.

Mo fights back and resists till the last moment the fact of being weak or having even the intention of withdrawing as he clarifies: “‘But I didn’t give in---withdraw---because he asked me to,’ Mo protested over Edith’s speech. ‘Rubin pressuring me only made me fight harder’” (Waldman 289). This proves that whenever they insist, he insists too not to submit to their will. Additionally, he tries to prove that he will never give up his design, although it causes a serious problem and a deep split between Muslim and non-Muslim nations, especially in America. As an instance, one can refer to the question that has been asked to Mo: “ ‘Do you still think about the Garden? Did you keep the design in your head?’ Mo smiled. ‘You could say I never stopped thinking about it’” (Waldman 296). His smile means a

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

lot for he sees the question as trivial since his design always seems important to him and as worthy of perseverance and resistance.

However, one can notice that Mo's stubbornness is seen as power in the eyes of non-Muslims who are symbolized by Paul in the following example:

This obstinacy would be Khan's undoing, Paul hoped. Yet perversely, Mo's stubbornness was also increasing Paul's respect, even affection for him, and perhaps salving his conscience, too. Khan had drive, Paul's drive. If this contest didn't make Mohammad Khan, something else would. He carried his own path within him (Waldman 139).

That is, his stubbornness to submit increases his respect and even if this design was not created, something else will make Mo a powerful and famous Muslim. This proves Mo as having a persevering character for he shows a strong determination to achieve his aim in spite of all the difficulties he faces.

3.5.4. Resistance Through Dialogue

The desire and spirit of resistance is also shown through dialogues or conversations among different Muslim characters in the novel. While discussing the same issue of Mo's design and the confusion it creates, they encourage each other not to be consumed by the logic of being guilty. Rather, when some characters seem to support Mo's withdrawal, others are always ready to remind them not to submit insisting on resistance in order to get rid of these misconceptions. For instance,

'What they say' Mrs Mahmoud continued conspiratorially, 'is that if we want to show we are loyal, we should tell this Mohammad Khan to stop trying to build his memorial. I think they are right,' she said, as her tongue worked to

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

extract a food particle from between her teeth. 'I would tell him, if I knew him'
(Waldman 135)

Since Mrs Mahmood seems ready for withdrawal, Asma, who always appear as weak, strongly replies: " 'No!'... 'He shouldn't stop doing anything! They can't just take this achievement away from him. It's like Pakistan taking away our election' ... Asma gritted her teeth. 'It's my memorial, too, auntie'" (Waldman 135-36). In this case, Mrs Mahmood seems willing to side with non-Muslims and convince Mo to withdraw so that she can live peacefully and stay in America. However, Asma, though a very simple woman, feels part of the memorial since her husband is one of the World Tower Center's victims. That is why she is strongly defending Mo and his memorial seeing it as a right that no one can take away.

While discussing the tagline with Laila, Mo says:

'The language makes me uncomfortable---to say I'm 'not a terrorist' has the result of connecting me to terrorism.'

'You're being connected to terrorism already, Mo---everytime one of those commercials runs on TV. We can't find out who's paying for them. We're powerless--- the networks laugh off our threat of a boycott because they know don't have the numbers. So you need to counter them. At least the MACC ad shows you as an architect, and that's a visual image that will stay with people'
(Waldman 174).

Laila is discussing the ad with Mo encouraging him to resist and 'counter' the fact of being a terrorist rather than thinking of his connection to terrorism for he is already associated with it. She wants him to take a step forward and prove himself as an architect rather than being discouraged by the created image. Mo is in need of change as he is willing to do something in order to change his position in this web because resistance is related to which position the

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

individual occupies in “power” but the effectiveness of this resistance and its positive results “depends on the discourses and social institutions within which we are situated.” (Chokr 13). That is, resistance does not lead always to fruitful consequences for this is dependent on the social and political milieu within which it is taking place.

Laila tells Khan:

So what's going on in this country isn't so new for me..., But I decided this time I wasn't going to make myself invisible and let others define me. And I certainly wasn't going to let them detain or deport people just because they were Muslim. I was making a lot more money at the law firm, obviously. But career didn't matter as much as ---those were my grandmother's, I hope I didn't lose them---

 (Waldman 176).

This time, Laila has a strong will to defend her religion even though that would be at the expense of her career. She has a strong will to prove herself as a Muslim and defend her Muslim people. Though she suffers as a Muslim before but this time, she decides not to be consumed by this reality. Rather, she will resist and fight back which leads the reader to relate her to Foucault's description of “oppositional acts” seeing them as “struggles which question the status of the individual” (Foucault, *The Subject and Power* 78). That is, they try to prove themselves and assert their identity as Muslims by providing non-Muslims with a true image of Islam. Laila's decision indicates that she is ready to shed light on her position as a Muslim and sacrifice everything, even her career, in order to alter her position as a Muslim in the power network.

While Mo discusses with his father, Salman, the same issue of the design, Salman seems to trust America clarifying to his son that the name Mohammad is “a statement of faith in this country” (Waldman 194). But since he never thinks of the Americans' opposition to

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

Muslims, he does not think of changing his son's name. But after all what happens, he seems to doubt, for the first time, whether America "has a place for" Muslims (Waldman 195). However, Mo unexpectedly replies: "'Baba, please,' Mo spoke softly. 'Of course it does. But sometimes America has to be pushed---it has to be reminded of what it is'" (Waldman 195). This quote proves Mo's strength and resistance to Americans' power and discourse through that simple design. As if his design acts as a reminder to the Americans for it may tend to remind them of their racism and prejudice because once they reveal that the winner is a Muslim, they perceive the design negatively though he is a Muslim American as they show their feelings of hatred and enmity. So, Mo "is rebelling against the ways in which ...[Muslims] are already defined, categorized and classified" (qtd. in Milchman & Rosenberg 69). The fact that Americans are perceived as producing this *absolute* truth about Islam and at the same time they claim civilization, openness, and honesty, Mo sees that they "need to be pushed" (Waldman 195) and he succeeded in doing so through his very simple design.

In addition to Leila, even Malik seems so willing to prove the opposite and resist Americans' perceptions because when Mo has been asked to withdraw, Issam Malik encourages him not to by saying: "No, no. We need to counter the backlash, not give in to it" (Waldman 195). Almost every Muslim character is encouraging Mo not to withdraw for they see it as yielding to non-Muslims' wills and threats.

The day of the hearing, Mo clarifies: "I was honored to have my design selected for the memorial. I want nothing more than to do justice to all the lives that were taken on that terrible day" (Waldman 216). Mo is not afraid of facing all the Americans the day of the hearing and saying out loud his intention behind designing such a memorial. As an American, he feels as one and that is why he feels also concerned. As a result, he creates such a design in order to help the Americans heal and to share with them.

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

3.6. Lugones' Theory of Resistance Applied to the Novel

As the researcher has already mentioned in the previous chapters, Maria Lugones, like Foucault, believes in marginalized groups or categorized people to resist, talk back, and prove themselves. By so doing, they can change the constructed reality and put into existence its alternative. In *the Submission*, Waldman depicts Muslim characters as willing to resist their reality of being terrorists although several of them are badly treated, physically, and hurt, emotionally.

3.6.1. Thick Vs. Transparent Characters

To start with, one can refer to Lugones' use of the terms "transparent" and "thick" while referring to groups that have the power to categorize and those that have been classified. In one instance, Sami, the driver of Paul, soon after the 9/11 attacks tells him: "Oh sir, I hope it's not the Arabs. Sami wasn't Arab, but he was Muslim" (Waldman 13). Sami's expectation that Arabs may be blamed of the attacks proves him as a "thick member" because he is conscious of his "otherness in the group" (qtd. in Saba n.p.). That is, he is aware that as a Muslim, the followers of the same religion will be accused. And since his question is addressed to Paul, he is again aware of him as a "transparent member". Furthermore, Paul knows that Sami is Muslim "but never dwelt on it. Now, despite all efforts otherwise, he felt uncomfortable, and three months later, when a sorrowful Sami---was he ever any other way?-- -begged leave to return to Pakistan because his father was dying, Paul was relieved" (Waldman 13) as he promises him of remaining in the same job after his return but he does not and employs a Russian instead. Thus, this also proves Paul's awareness of his belonging to the majority and to the group that is agreed on because he has the same belief as that of the "transparent members" which well illustrates Lugones' argument as it is clear in the following quotation: "The false universalization of 'transparent' members' interests as representative of

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

the entire group marginalizes 'thick' members 'through erasure'" (DiPietro, McWeeny, & Roshanravan 95). Furthermore, Paul never takes Sami's religion into consideration but the discourse of the attacks and the mood it pervades lead him to doubt hiring a Muslim and as a result, he gets rid of him, which illustrates this American character's prejudice.

3.6.2. Lugones' Suggested Strategies of Resistance:

3.6.2.1. Curdling/ Impure Separation

When Alyssa Spier accuses Khan of affecting the families deeply by producing this design, he replies angrily:

'I am an American, too,' he said, continuing to advance on her. 'Put that in your paper. I, Mohammad Khan, am an American, and I have the same rights as every other American.' ... 'I am an American. That's the only quote I'm going to give you. I am an American.' (Waldman 261).

Khan's strong reply shows him as a "curdled" character because he cannot accept the fact of being classified or seen as an enemy. For him, he is part of the American society that is why he emphasizes his American nationality while facing Alyssa fearlessly, who is accusing him of hurting the families while he tries to help them heal. Khan's emphasis on his American identity is a way of resisting the "logic of purity" (Roelofs). Like Logunes' mayonnaise, his Western identity cannot be completely separated from his Muslim one. He can only be a Muslim American. Khan's insistence on inhabiting both 'worlds', the Muslim and American ones, well illustrates Lugones' belief in the impossibility of reaching a "pure separation" as clarified in the following quote:

When something curdles, rather than completely separating, the parts actually 'coalesce toward' one another. The parts are interlocked and intermeshed,

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

rather than distinct. On the other hand, splitting or separating something 'impure,' into its 'pure' elements, is an act of power, a colonial logic (Chavez & Griffin 8).

That is, there is always something in common that relate different groups to each other that is why they can never be completely separated. Furthermore, Lugones clarifies the fact that the purpose of reaching that "purity" is the product of "power" and "colonial logic", a logic that she initiates her theory to resist.

3.6.2.2. The Multiplicitous Self

As the researcher has already mentioned, Lugones strongly argues that reality cannot be "fragmented" and that it is always "multiple". Hence, for her, marginalized groups cannot occupy just one "world" (Lugones, "Multiculturalism and Publicity" 175). In this novel, several Muslim characters illustrate this idea by showing their willingness to live in both "worlds": the Muslim as well as the American one. Several instances in the novel show their feelings as American characters without showing racism or hatred toward non-Muslims. For example, when Sarge asks Mo about his feeling the day of the attack, the latter answers: "I felt devastated, like all of us. Like a hole had been blasted in me" (Waldman 188). Mo's answer indicates his honest feeling toward the victims like any other American. He has been deeply hurt since he is part of that country and feels as such without being racist in terms of religion. Then, when they carry on the discussion on 9/11 events as well as the design, Mo says: "I wanted to do something for my country...It's as simple as that" (Waldman 189). His reply again proves his innocence and that he has been touched too and that is why he wants to contribute and help his people (the Americans) heal. What emphasizes his true feelings is his clarification: "I'm an American, so it was the attack on America I was moved to

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

commemorate” (Waldman 80). Whenever the occasion arises, he benefits to show his good attitude and way of thinking. He sees himself as an American citizen and not the enemy.

In addition to Khan, Asma also is depicted as a character who is deeply hurt because she lost her husband in the terrorist attack. Thus, she shares the same feeling as anyone of the victims’ families. Furthermore, she gives birth to a little boy in America that is why she is expressing her anger, publicly, toward the Americans’ prejudice, raising few essential questions:

How can you pretend we and our traditions are not part of this place? Does my husband matter less than all of your relatives?... “ ‘We were grateful for that building... We are grateful. We have all tried to give back to America. But also, I want to know, my son---he is Muslim, but he is also American. Or isn’t he? You tell me: What should I tell my son?’ (Waldman 231).

As it is clarified by this quote, she also wants her son to “inhabit more than one world at the same time” (Mcweeny 297-98), emphasizing his Muslim and American identities and willing him to occupy both.

Although Mo has been interviewed by different American characters and not the same one, they all focus on his feeling toward the attacks, the victims’ families, and the country. So, in addition to Sarge, Pinball also highlights the same topic by asking Mo: “While questioning Mo, Pinball asks: “ ‘Do you love this country, Mohammad?’ [Mo replies:] ‘As much as you do.’ The answer appeared to displease them” (Waldman 25). This example pictures the two opposing sides. On one hand, Mo expresses his love and true sentiments towards the Americans while Pinball is not satisfied by hearing this answer which may symbolize the Americans’ refusal of unity and “multiplicity”.

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

Actually, Mo and Asma are no exception in the novel because several other Muslim characters show the same willingness to prove themselves as both American and Muslim. After receiving harshness and mistreatment on behalf of the Americans, a group of Muslims “held signs: WE ALSO ARE AMERICANS and ISLAM IS NOT A THREAT and MUSLIMS DIED THAT DAY, TOO and BIGOTS=IDIOTS” (Waldman 152). These Muslims want to emphasize the reality of Islam as a religion of peace and at the same time they are focusing on their Americanness. Their emphasis on both “worlds” illustrate Lugones’ belief in the fact that individuals who are “debased” and “muted” must have the courage to resist such “abstractions” because they “understand ...[their] own fragmentation and ...[their] own multiplicity” (*Pilgrimages* 11-12). To relate her thought to these Muslim characters’ resistance, one can say that they are the ones who are suffering from racism and as a result, they are “fragmented” and at the same time, they know, maybe better than the non-Muslim Americans, their “multiplicitous selves”. Consequently, they are resisting to get rid of “fragmentation” and live in two “worlds”.

Also, Laila who plays an interesting role throughout the novel tries from time to time to boost Khan’s confidence in his American identity and this helps him resist incessantly in order to achieve a peaceful living in America. For example, when Khan seems hesitant about “do[ing] the ad”, Laila encourages him saying: “ ‘Do it as an American, because you don’t like what’s happening in your country” (Waldman 176). Her encouragement from time to time raises Khan’s morale to keep fighting to prove his innocence as a Muslim American.

All Muslim characters in the novel picture Lugones’ support of the world as “heterogeneous” and “complex” (Lugones, “Multiculturalism and Publicity” 175). Malik is another character who tries to contribute through clarifying the true meaning of jihad: “ ‘Our jihad---and I use the word mindfully,’ Malik was saying primly, ‘is to show that it is

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

possible to be both good Muslims and loyal Americans, to worship God and care for your country. God will be the judge, of this as of all things” (Waldman 275-76). Through his words, he is shedding light on the fact that as Muslims, they can be both Muslims and Americans as they can behave well in both “worlds”. There is a hint here that there is no need for that chaos and misunderstanding for there is no “underlying ‘I’ that is the ‘true’ self” (Lugones, *Pilgrimages* 11-12) and as a result, they can live in “multiplicity”.

Khan’s faith and strong belief in America is originated in his parents’ idealization of this country because when he talks to his father, the latter shows a strong belief in America but his son’s design with the chaos it creates makes him doubt whether America still “has a place for [them]” (Waldman 194-95). However, Khan shows a strong belief in their belonging to this country by saying: “‘Baba, please’, Mo spoke softly. ‘Of course it does’” (Waldman 194-195). He is fighting to reach such a result but he has faith in America not to kick them out.

Still, Mo’s father is not the only one who seems hesitant whether Americans will accept to live in “multiplicity” and harmony with the Muslims. Another character who expresses the same doubt is named Ansar who reacted to a character who tells Mo that he “show[s] that Muslims want to live in peace in America” (Waldman 79). Ansar, “who ran a foreign-policy lobby, asked in a more challenging tone: ‘But does America want to live in peace with Muslims?’” (Waldman 79). This indicates some Muslims’ serious worries about their future in America. Although they are willing to live peacefully in this country still, they are not certain whether their resistance will lead them to fruitful results or not.

To conclude this part, one can emphasize Muslim characters’ strong desire to live in both “worlds” without facing any difficulty having “two selves” as Mo optimistically states: “Muslims, Jews, Christians, they all pray to one God” (Waldman 190). This means that one

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

should not discriminate others based on their religion because although three different religions exist in America, God is one. As if he is trying to say that they all have the same origin; that is why they can live as “multiplicitous” rather than categorizing and marginalizing others.

3.6.2.3. Double Vision

Although all Muslim characters suffer from racism, hate, mistreatment, and prejudice in the novel, Mo is depicted as the main character the attention of non-Muslims focus on since his memorial is considered as the main reason behind that chaos. However, this Muslim character is portrayed as a man who is courageous and positively indifferent to Western misrepresentations. This makes him as a character who exemplifies Lugones' concept of “double vision” because for her, when a person “exercise[s] double vision”, the same person neglects the negative constructed image or the created “reality” although the same person is completely aware of the role this “reality” plays and that it damages his/her value. Additionally, she insists that this kind of practice must not lead to one's feeling of inferiority. Rather, she wants individuals not to be affected by this “reality” (Lugones, “On Complex Communication” 79). For example, when Mo attends the conference, he receives sharp criticism because of the design he contributes with and he feels highly disappointed. Still, “[t]rying to pretend nothing unusual had transpired, Mo went to work the day after his press conference” (Waldman 106). Behaving this way, Mo is “exercise[ing] double vision” because though he is conscious of non-Muslim Americans' reception of his memorial and misrepresentation of Islam and Muslims. Still, he goes to work as if everything is natural and nothing bad happens. Mo's reaction, then, is not interpreted as a weakness. Rather, he is aware of everything surrounding him but attempting “not to be consumed by it” (Lugones, “On Complex Communication” 79).

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

The negative perception of Mo, his design, and religion deeply affect his psyche to the extent that he

began to put psychological distance between himself and the Mohammad Khan who was written and talked about, as if that were another man altogether ... Mo read that he was Pakistani, Saudi, and Qatari; that he was not an American citizen; that he had donated to organizations backing terrorism; that he had dated half the female architects in New York; that as a Muslim he didn't date at all; that his father ran a shady Islamic charity; that his brother---how badly Mo, as an only child, had wanted a brother!---had started a radical Muslim students' association at his university. He was called, besides decadent, abstinent, deviant, violent, insolent, abhorrent, aberrant, and typical. Neutering his unhappiness allowed him to read (Waldman 126).

This example reinforces the previous idea concerning Mo's practice of the "double vision". His attempt to distance his true self from the created one make him a "curdled" being who is resisting and trying to cope with this constructed reality. His reactions give readers a hint that he is trying to manage in order to live in harmony because "curdled/resisting subjects 'take hold of the double meaning' of their actions, selves, and ideas: reality is not unified, but is comprised of multiple worlds---and within each, 'both dominant and resistant logics are present'" (May 215). That is, the resistant individual supports "multiplicity" and can live in a "world" where different "logics" can operate rather than being stuck to the "unifi[cation] of reality" which is unachievable.

Another instance that proves Mo's rejection of non-Muslims' perception is when he meets with Paul to discuss the project and "Khan leaned elegantly back in his chair and crossed a thin leg" (Waldman 137). This example can be interpreted as Mo's attempt to

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

“exercise double vision” as a way of resisting that complicated and tense relationship between him and Paul which symbolizes the relation between Muslim and Non-Muslim Americans. Although he always disagree with Paul in their meetings, this time he feels at ease and shows his comfort which indicates his power and resistance. This can be related to Lugones’ belief that marginalized people are responsible of either reinforcing the image they have been associated with “by following the logic of purity” (Saba n.p.) or resisting it.

3.6.2.4. Active Subjectivity

As previously stated, Lugones opposes the belief that groups of people that are considered as inferior cannot resist and change the reality the mainstream act upon. She sees that they can make a difference and create another meaning that challenges the current one. For such a resistant action, she uses the term “Active Subjectivity”, strongly supporting the fact that individuals can be “Active Subjects”. In the novel, for instance, Khan acts as an active subject since he tries to make a difference. He behaves and thinks in a way that shows his strong desire to prove the opposite; that is Islam as a religion of peace and good principles. For example, after leaving with Laila an interview, he tells her: ““I was actually having fun. Everyday I’m different, Laila. I’m not the person you met three weeks ago. If this keeps up, in two weeks I won’t be the person you know now. You can’t misrepresent an object in motion”” (Waldman 155). His words show how tiresome he becomes because of these accusations. From time to time, he answers Americans’ serious or provoking questions in a sarcastic, cold, and funny way which proves that he is just going through the motions. But his last statement in particular shows him as an active subject who is moving, contributing, and making a difference that is why such a person cannot be “misrepresented”. There is a hint in his last statement that he is not a static and passive receiver. Rather, he is a dynamic Muslim who can possibly make meaning even through this way of thinking because according to

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

Lugones, resistance is not merely physical action, but even the “thoughts” of opposition and disagreement can be considered as resistance.

Laila's reply to Khan's words also show her as an active subject for she is encouraging him to be strong enough to resist the reality of terrorism he has been associated with. She strongly answers: ““You're underestimating your own solidity. I saw it in that first meeting... Mohammad Khan is intact. You're like your steel trees”” (Waldman 155). Her encouragement to Khan proves her critique of negatively perceiving Islam and Muslims. Here again, her “thoughts” of the reality they are living in act as a way of resistance and also as an active subject who is willing to contribute to the current situation and tiring perception of Islam and Muslims.

3.7. Interpreting Selected Symbols from the Novel

Like Kolocotronis, Waldman also enriches her novel with several symbols that seem closely connected to the situation of Islam and Muslims in this period. For instance, Paul says: “ ‘You seem to think this is a game, Mr. Khan.’ [Khan replies:] ‘It is a game. One for which you made the rules. And now you're trying to change them’” (Waldman 65). This symbolizes the fact that America planned for everything and accused Muslims because it is targeting them. That is why Khan refers to the situation as a “game” that America has prepared its rules, i.e., though Americans are taking part of this game but they do not know how to play.

In a seminar, Henry Moore, the British counterterrorism expert, interviews Mo. After a long discussion, “Mo stared out the window. The sun, in the gray sky, looked like it has been sunk in dirty water” (Waldman 44). The sun here may symbolize Islam as a pure religion being distorted and negatively perceived because of the Western misrepresentation symbolized by the “gray sky”. The sun may also symbolize the design that aims at helping the

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

Americans heal which may lead to a brighter future being misinterpreted by the victims' families and their anti-Islamic ideologies symbolized by the "gray sky".

After Asma delivers her baby, she names him "Abdul Karim, Servant of the Most Generous" (Waldman 72). The selected name symbolizes her hope in the generosity of God to save them from the current situation and take care of the little baby. In addition to that, the tolerance of Islam and its support of multiplicity and welcome of different cultures is symbolized by the MACC's welcome of different members as the following quote emphasizes: "The group [of the MACC's executive committee] was striking in its diversity: South Asians, African Americans, Arabs; bearded men and clean-shaven, in suits and in djellabas; two women in headscarves and one---striking and black-haired in an aubergine suit--without" (Waldman 79).

In the first page of the novel, the writer starts with an interesting quote: "Like the cypress tree, which holds its head high and is free within the confines of a garden, I, too, feel free in this world, and I am not bound by its attachments" (Waldman n.p.) This comparison is interesting and symbolic because it may symbolize the fact that Muslims are not bound by this world's "attachments". Rather, they are free and must feel it in America, especially because Muslim characters in this novel are Americans too.

3.8. Conclusion

As a final saying, one can mention the fact that Waldman's endeavour to paint the image of Muslim-Americans in the wake of the attacks leads readers to re-consider the discourse of Islam as a religion of terror and Muslims as terrorists. It has been shown that Muslim characters are portrayed positively as they, politely, aspire to challenge their constructed reality as being a threat. Waldman, then, sheds light on this reality as well as their

Chapter Three: The Challenge of Misconceptions in Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011)

attempt to undermine it. Further, she depicts them as polite, innocent, and having good principles. This shows Waldman's sympathy with Muslims though she is not a Muslim.

Chapter Four

A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

4.1. Introduction

The present researcher will initiate this chapter by showing the common ideas in which Foucault and Lugones meet. In addition to that, since the previous chapters dealt with Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* and Waldman's *The Submission* separately, this chapter will be devoted to a comparative analysis of these two novels jointly. That is, the present comparison will be dealt with in a point-by-point process in both works together in order to demonstrate the similarities and differences between them. The center of attention, then, will shift to the analysis of "truth" from a postmodern perspective in the same novels, aiming at examining Kolocotronis and Waldman's representation of the "truth" of Muslim Americans as alterable. Besides, the researcher sheds light also on the New Historicist approach because its advocates have a similar perspective to that of postmodernists. In other words, they reject the objectivity of any established fact and insist on subjective reality.

4.2. Foucault Versus Lugones: Common and Different Points

Although Michel Foucault and Maria Lugones seem to be two different thinkers whose thoughts and ideas are far from each other, certain shared and common points have been detected between these two theorists that have been adopted in the present study. As inferred from both theorists' biographies, both of them share the same postmodernist background and the keen interest in minorities' resistance to the dominant discourse. However, before tackling their view of resistance, the researcher notices that they have a similar view towards the concept of discourse though they did not use the same term to define it.

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

To start with, Foucault sees discourse as a set of “practices” that create the individuals, ideas, and images, etc. that they “speak” about. That is, discourse is productive rather than existing separately as a concept. Thus, because discourse gives birth to other things, one can consider any situation as a “discursive structure” if some ideas and points of view are dominant in a certain situation and having their effects in the same situation. As an instance, one can refer to the discourse of “femininity” and “masculinity” in which “women and men behave within a certain range of parameters when defining themselves as gendered subjects” (Mills, *Discourse* 16). Thus, their awareness of their classification and their points of view towards the subject is an “effect” of discourse. That is, as a result of “the discourse of femininity”, women have a certain view of the way they have to dress, look, and behave (Mills, *Discourse*). Furthermore, Foucault believes that discourse plays a key role in shaping individuals that he calls “subjects”. He sees discourse as a useful tool to form these individuals, emphasizing their active role to question and oppose the dominant discourse in addition to their ability to change their situation (Mills, *Discourses of Difference*).

Similar to Foucault’s discourse, Lugones also develops the notion of “structure” that she considers as responsible of creating other things. Like Foucault, she defines it as a form of “practices” in any society considering these “practices” as resulting in the formation and definition of individuals (McWeeny). Stated differently, she believes that structure forms individuals “in the sense of giving them emotions, beliefs, norms, desires, and intentions that are their own” (Lugones, *Pilgrimages* 60). That is, she does not consider individuals as free persons who are aware of the way they feel and think. Rather, she considers them with their attitudes as the product of structure. Like discourse, Lugones’ structure also produces two groups of individuals: “transparent” and “thick” ones. The former have the same norms and beliefs the dominant structure dictates while the latter is a naturalized group created by the same structure. Similar to Foucault, Lugones too gives importance to these “thick members”

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

roles to challenge this naturalized reality and contribute to the production of a different meaning (Saba).

Although Foucault strongly believes in the power of discourse and its effectiveness, he seriously questions its powerful production. Said differently, he raises the issue of having the right to speak and producing a powerful discourse. He argues that many ideas are seen from a variety of perspectives but some of these points of views are taken seriously while others are not (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*). Thus, Foucault's main concern is not related to which discourse is correct and gives correct information. Rather, "he is concerned with the mechanics whereby one becomes produced as the dominant discourse ... whereas the other is treated with suspicion and is sited both metaphorically and literally at the margins of society" (Mills, *Discourse* 17).

Similar to Foucault's interest in the production of dominant discourse, Lugones also notices that certain groups of individuals are able to produce a strong structure because they are "subjects of will and power" (Lugones, *Pilgrimages* 212). She called these individuals whose way of thinking is taken seriously as the "planners" or "strategists" while she takes into consideration also the "tactics". The latter, she believes, are weak and their statements are not taken seriously and hence cannot contribute to structure formation for they are not powerful enough and their voice is not considered as importance-worthy to be taken seriously.

As mentioned, both of them raise the same issue related to those whose speech is taken seriously. Furthermore, both theorists relate the power of establishing authoritative speech to a certain element. Foucault, for instance, reveals that the production of the dominant discourse or what he calls "a single center" is caused by knowledge, seeing its creation as misleading for categorized people will believe such a produced knowledge as absolute and stable (Maboloc). In addition to that, he considers knowledge as the product of power. Thus, those who occupy a powerful position can produce "speech" that has a powerful effect and will be

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

considered as authoritative knowledge. However, though other individuals may produce a similar “speech”, theirs cannot be considered as dominant since they do not occupy the same position which is a powerful one (Mills, *Michel Foucault*). Simply put, Foucault argues that power is what makes the difference.

Similarly, Lugones associated the establishment of certain realities with what she terms as “the logic of purity”. However, the latter is implicitly related to power because “the logic of purity” is the logic of individuals who consider themselves as superior and reasonable. In other words, she believes that based on the same logic, certain powerful and *superior* individuals establish the truth of “thick” individuals as inferior and define them based on their race, culture, religion, etc. According to her then, as a result of following this “logic”, certain negatively perceived groups are created that she referred to as “fragmented subjects” (Saba n.p.). Thus, like Foucault, she considers power as a key reason for establishing dominant discourse.

Building on what the researcher has already mentioned, since both theorists question the acceptance of certain “statements” and the exclusion of others as they both relate this issue to power (Foucault referred explicitly to knowledge and power while Lugones referred to “the logic of purity” which is a form of power), it is quite interesting to mention that both of them argue that the creation of these groups of individuals as a result of discourse is purposeful. For example, Foucault believes that the aim is to categorize people and create certain norms in order to control those people (“On the Notion of Truth”). Building on the same perspective, Lugones too sees that the main objective behind categorizing people and following this “logic of purity” is to maintain “social control” (Lugones, *Pilgrimages* 3) and to give themselves a satisfactory position and meaning because, she believes, if the “transparent members” do not create other members who are considered as inferior, weak, etc. compared to them, they will not have that position of superiority and importance. That is, they create these groups, define

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

them, and generalize that definition without taking into consideration the importance of these individuals just to define themselves as superior (Lugones, *Pilgrimages*). Hence, both of Foucault and Lugones agree that there is a purposeful strategy behind creating such realities and norms in any society.

In addition to highlighting the creation of certain realities, Foucault and Lugones consider also the role individuals play to reinforce or weaken the established facts and hence, categorizations. For Foucault, power, as a process, is held by individuals. That is, they participate in making it function in society. Foucault meant that individuals do not passively receive power strategies. Rather, they are its “vehicles” (Mills, *Michel Foucault* 35). In other words, power is not applied to them, they participate in the power network through their “relations” with other individuals as well as with “institutions”.

Lugones views the role minorities or categorized groups play from a similar perspective as that of Foucault. She considers these groups’ acceptance of their classification and behaving following the same “logic of purity” as a responsibility and contribution to their inferiority. For her, if these people are consumed by the idea of their being disempowered and inferior, they will simply “become agents of oppression” (Saba n.p.). That is, they will play an active role in a scene plotted behind and against them. Consequently, Lugones urges them not to be consumed by this “logic”. In order to reach that, they have to stop seeing themselves as classified groups because she believes that perception as a resistance itself. Hence, both of Foucault and Lugones agree that individuals contribute to their meaning making through the way they receive such classifications and generalizations.

As it has already been mentioned, both of Foucault and Lugones confirm the fact that the main effect of discourse and power is the establishment of a certain truth about certain groups. Then, this truth is generalized and as a result, certain people are perceived from a

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

certain perspective and seen as alike. Foucault, for example, refers to such generalizations as “abstractions” (“The Subject and Power” 781) while Lugones considers the treatment and perception of certain individuals as identical as a result of “the logic of purity” (*Pilgrimages* 3) that intends to classify society. Furthermore, both of them seem optimistic about and call for resistance in order for individuals to prove themselves.

In addition to that, Foucault and Lugones focus on individuals’ silence towards certain forms of power. Foucault considers silence as “a shelter for power” (*The History of Sexuality* 101) for it can help in strengthening and reinforcing its effects. The same idea was also highlighted by Lugones who considers people’s silence as a passive reaction to their classification as “impure” and “thick”. That is, she shed light on people’s ability to contribute and take action in order to create a different history or another discourse that can have its effects too rather than simply receiving negative images and perceptions and keep gazing at their negative impact on their future. She confirms her strong belief in the positive role people can play by arguing: “[H]istory is of me and you” (*Pilgrimages* 4), meaning that everyone can contribute in order to change the current “history”.

Thus, these two theorists’ sharp criticism of silence and acceptance of certain generalizations suggest and indicate their support and call for resistance. As it has been clarified, both of them share the same belief concerning individuals’ role in reinforcing the dominance of a certain discourse or weakening it. To clarify more, one can refer to Foucault who strongly argues that even though certain discourses prove to be very powerful and dominant still, there can exist other discourses which do not go in the same direction i.e. “contradictory discourses” (*The History of Sexuality* 101). In the same way, Lugones calls for people’s “walking against” (*Pilgrimages* 4) certain ways of perception. In order to reach such an aim, she believes, they must ignore “the logic” of separating and classifying people itself

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

before taking action. For her, the way they think about and perceive their situation plays a key role in paving the way for a different discourse to come into existence (*Pilgrimages*).

Hence, both of them share the same view towards resistance. Foucault interprets resistance as a set of “struggles which question the status of the individual” (“The Subject and Power” 781). This means that one has to think of his current situation and the way s/he is perceived and affected by “power relations” and then, s/he calls for change, highlight his/her rights, and try to achieve the purpose they hoped for. Additionally, Lugones views resistance as an opposition too. However, her main concern is the results of this opposition or resistance. She calls for taking action in order to prove individuals’ “manyness” and at the same time she highlights the fact that this purpose must be achieved and recognized; otherwise, these individuals’ efforts will be in vain. Stated differently, she urges them to prove the existence of another reality which is theirs and make it acceptable (*Pilgrimages*).

To emphasize the same point and illustrate more, one can refer to other ways of interpreting resistance. Foucault considers resistant acts as a way of refusing to accept and submit to the created “abstractions” (“The Subject and Power” 781). That is, it can be inferred that resistance is an attempt to create a different picture and hence, a different society. Similar to this view, Lugones sheds light on people’s opposition to their inferiority and was thirsty to affect them prove the opposite. Therefore, Lugones also aims at proving that “we all exist, and our actions have meaning” (Moya 200). So, the aim is to prove the existence of another image and this may lead to a new way of perception.

In addition to what has been mentioned, both theorists agree on the dominance of certain forms of knowledge over others, relating it to power; as they believe that this dominance of knowledge is the one that must be resisted. Foucault, for example, considers knowledge as closely connected to power and discourse, emphasizing the fact that knowledge

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

is present “everywhere”, highlighting its impact on the way people think and behave for it gives them “an image of the world” (Maboloc 144). However, he also focuses on the relativity of “truth” to different societies. That is, he believes that each society has its own “regime of truth”. In other words, every society accepts some discourses as true and follows that truth which is not natural. Hence, Foucault sees resistance as a way of questioning this knowledge and refusing to submit to its effects for he considers resistance as an embodiment to a refusal of “a form of power” (“The Subject and Power” 781). And knowledge can be considered as its form since he believes that those who occupy powerful positions are considered as knowledgeable and their “statements” are true because of their *powerful* position. So, he calls attention for the possibility of other discourses and truths to exist.

Lugones, though she does not use the same terms as those of Foucault, has almost the same perspective towards many ideas. Like Foucault, she also interrogates the existence and power of certain truths that are taken as the only correct existing versions, arguing that “some worlds of sense are hegemonic” (Moya 200). By that, she means that some people’s perspectives are treated as “common sense” while others’ are not. Therefore, in a similar way like that of Foucault, she wants individuals whose perspectives are not taken seriously to take action and resist in order to prove that not only one “world” exists which is that of the powerful but there are other “worlds of sense” (Moya 200). She calls for people’s resistance of such a “technique” and emphasis on their “meaning” and “existence” (Moya).

However, though Foucault and Lugones emphasize the fact that certain perspectives are dominant and seen as the only correct fact while others are rejected and hidden, they are not consumed by this fact. Rather, they want individuals to question this established fact and form another meaning. Foucault, for instance, sees truth as the effect of power relations, considering it as created and constructed for the sake of “circulation and operation of

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

statements” (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 133). He sees that each society has a system of truth that it follows i.e. there are “techniques” that societies pursue in order to make certain “statements” function as “true”. Stated differently, the same truth is dealt with from a variety of perspectives in different societies (Foucault, *Power/ Knowledge*). Thus, he sees that this established “truth should always be questioned” (Maboloc 152). This means that he does not believe in these invented facts to be the only version that individuals must follow. Instead, he wants them to open the door for other truths to exist by questioning the current one.

In a similar way, Lugones also questions that status of certain established truths. Though, unlike Foucault, she does not refer to these facts as truth, she implicitly refers to the same concept. For her, certain facts are created about “thick” members as “non-sensical”. She believes that there is a logic based on which such facts are created and then made as the norm that individuals in the society follow. However, she calls those individuals who are believed to be as such not to submit to such underestimation. Instead, she insists on these groups’ persistence in order to make their “worlds of sense” and create a different meaning (Saba). Therefore, like Foucault, she wants individuals to prove their reality which is different from the established one and hence, they create a different meaning of themselves.

Therefore, although Foucault and Lugones are two different theorists, both of them share the same belief in the positive role individuals can play to resist the dominant discourse and prove themselves. Furthermore, they indirectly share the same opinion when it comes to reality or truth and its fixity for both of them believe that categorized people can provide a different reality of themselves. It is not surprising to have such opinions since both of them are postmodern theorists. Still, though very similar, especially in their view towards power and resistance, Foucault and Lugones differ in many ideas including the way each one of them defined power.

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

While Foucault rejects the relation of power to domination, Lugones sees it as closely connected to dominion and oppression. Thus, in Foucault's opinion, power is not defined as one group's dominance over another. Rather, he claims that it must be perceived as a tactic or a process which "individuals" are considered as its "vehicles". Thus, they are active tools through which power functions in the form of relations (Mills, *Michel Foucault*). Lugones, on the other hand, sees power as one group's authority over another (*Pilgrimages*). However, though they differ in the way they define power, both of them consider it as a key ingredient in defining other people and emphasizing a certain discourse as dominant.

4.3. Similarities and Differences Between the Two Novels

4.3.1. Islam as a Dangerous Religion in both Novels

Both of Kolocotronis and Waldman depict Islam as a religion that is negatively perceived in their *Innocent People* and *The Submission* respectively. Moreover, that negative perception of Islam is generated as a result of the power of the discourse of Islam as a religion of violence and terror. Further, both novelists spotlight Muslim characters' awareness of the image associated with them as well as their expectation of being accused once they hear the news of the World Trade Center's destruction. This focus proves Muslims' struggle and suffering long before the 9/11 attacks. The latter just worsen the situation, as it can be inferred from both works. As an example, one can refer to the driver Sami, in *Innocent People*, and the Black Muslim Maryam, in *The Submission*. These two characters, when they first hear the news, expect Muslims to be blamed for they have already experienced some racist attitudes towards Islam and Muslims long before the attacks. Sami suggests to Paul that even if the Arabs have no relation to that, they "would turn out to be" (Waldman 13) while Maryam is not surprised at all to see such accusations related to Muslims for she has already experienced racism towards her blackness before her religion.

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

Such an emphasis on Islam as a religion of the enemy results in a clear boundary between Muslims and non-Muslims in the world of the novel. Thus, the Us/Them binary is created and having its effects on power relations among characters. As a result of all these constructions, Muslim characters are perceived negatively. Both writers paint characters as effects of emphasizing and normalizing the true nature of Islam, which is the religion of the enemy. For instance, Uthman is arrested soon after the events because of his religion and a “war on terror” is declared (Kolocotronis). In Waldman’s work too, Muslims become under suspicion of committing this crime. In addition to that, some American characters prove to be deeply affected by the discourse of Islam like Paul, Frank, Alyssa Spier, and several others. These characters explicitly express their anger and hate towards Islam in general and Khan in particular. However, their position as effects of discourse is proved because they show their accusations of Khan whether he is guilty or not, as illustrated by the governor’s speech who clearly argues that even if there is no evidence against Khan and his design, he is considered as a “threat” because of his religion.

4.3.2. Media’s Active Role

Throughout both novels, the writers shed light on the active role media played soon after the attacks, highlighting its effect on the characters. In both novels, media are portrayed as a means through which the image of Muslims is completely distorted. That is, discourse’s negative construction of Islam has been reinforced by media. Stated differently, the latter contributes to “normalizing the truth” (“Foucault: Power is Everywhere”) of Islam. For example, in *Innocent People*, when some characters, including Sadia, first hear the news, they become completely terrified as the American characters start to get influenced by the bad image provided through television and other means. As for *The Submission*, Waldman gives a great importance to the power of media in forming the Americans’ perspectives towards Muslims. In this novel too, American characters start to perceive and treat Muslims

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

negatively. Furthermore, only the victims' families who express their deep anger toward and hate of Muslims are broadcast while those who are not generalizing all Muslims as terrorists do not appear on the television. Therefore, it can be inferred that media's purpose is to strengthen this hegemonic discourse and make it appear as the only existing "norm".

It has been noticed also that both novelists show that media dramatize the 9/11 attacks through the way they cover them. That is, they do not broadcast facts as they really happen. Rather, they show them in an exaggerated way to worsen the image. This may justify the fact that the state constructs "relations between individuals" in order to make its system work (Bällan n.p.). Actually, it succeeded in making it work for as a result of dramatizing the attacks and distorting the image of Islam, Muslim characters in both novels start to appear as the Other and the enemy America has to get rid of. Muslims are perceived in both works as having the intention to conquer America and benefit from its people's open-mindedness in order to achieve their purpose. However, in both novels, media broadcast the details of the attacks and accuse Muslims of committing such a crime without providing any evidence that proves the terrorism of Muslims. Still, they succeeded in affecting non-Muslim characters' views of Islam and Muslims.

4.3.3. The Distorted Image of Muslims

Both authors depict media's exaggeration in covering 9/11 events as resulting in the non-Muslim characters' mistreatment of Muslims. Moreover, Muslim characters in both works are looked at with suspicious eyes in the wake of the attacks. In *Innocent People* for instance, Salahuddin starts to be threatened as his restaurant has been attacked. Sadia starts to receive "phone threats" (Kolocotronis 15). The character whose name is 'Osama' has been badly treated because of associating his name with that of 'Osama Bin Laden', in addition to several other characters and cases in the same novel. Similarly, in *The Submission*, Mo suffers

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

from these misconceptions for he is controlled all the time. His innocent words and gestures are interpreted in several different ways, though no evidence against him is provided. Further, non-Muslim characters like Debbie, Sarge, in addition to others keep accusing Muslims of conquering the world in general and America in particular. They perceive them as extremely dangerous and as a result, they call for “sav[ing] America from Islam” (Waldman 151).

Therefore, one notices that throughout both novels, Kolocotronis and Waldman focus on relating the suffering and mistreatment of Muslims to the hegemony of discourse and its power to classify Muslim characters as the enemy. Additionally, they also highlight the importance of media in reinforcing such a constructed discourse. Hence, they focus on media’s encouragement of verbal and physical abuse. However, both authors give a room to “thick members”, to use Lugones’ term, to resist the dominant discourse by following different strategies.

4.3.4. Similarities in Muslim Characters’ Resistance to the Hegemonic Discourse in the Selected Works

While highlighting the chaos Muslim characters suffer from after 9/11 attacks, Kolocotronis and Waldman portray the same characters as following several strategies in order to prove their innocence. Further, Muslim characters, in both novels, aim at providing the non-Muslim majority with a good image of Islam. To start with, Muslim characters use dialogue among them as a key strategy and behave politely with non-Muslims in an attempt to correct misconceptions. In *Innocent People*, dialogue is used among several characters in order to remind each other to be good Muslims, even if they are mistreated. For example, the dialogue between Sadia and Salahuddin, between Hussein and Imran, and several other characters is done just to keep each other attached to the principles of Islam and not to generalize all non-Muslims as bad or racist. Likewise, dialogue acts as a means several

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

Muslim characters use in the novel so that they encourage each other not to submit to the hegemonic discourse that is pervading their lives and to defend their religion. To illustrate, one can refer to the conversation between Laila and Khan, Khan and his father, and Khan and Issam Malik.

Muslim characters are extremely cautious in their behavior toward non-Muslim ones in both works. That is, they insist on providing a good image of their religion through their politeness. Their insistence on resisting these misconceptions is an attempt to open the door for a different discourse to exist. They aim at making the discourse of Islam as a good religion to come into existence and be accepted by the non-Muslim majority. To insist on Muslims' politeness, Kolocotronis and Waldman focus on the behaviour of Sadia and Khan, respectively.

In addition to the above mentioned strategies, both novelists show Muslim characters' willingness to become "curdled" and "multiplicitous", develop a "double vision", and act as "active subjects" as ways of resistance. In *Innocent People*, for example, Sadia is depicted as a character who resists stereotypes by insisting on America as her "home" (Kolocotronis). Additionally, several other characters behave in the same way in the face of "the logic of purity" (*Pilgrimages*). Similarly, Waldman puts a special emphasis on Khan as a "curdled" character who insists on his *Americaness*. Put differently, he highlights the impossibility of separating his American identity from his Muslim one. Thus, he can only be a Muslim American.

As for "double vision", Muslims in both worlds follow the technique of ignoring the dominant discourse, though they are aware of its dominance over their lives. For instance, Sadia tries hard to reject the reality of Muslims as terrorists and responsible of the attacks by questioning the news, focusing on her husband's opinion when he opens new doors for the

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

news, and all these things lead to her sense of “relief” and “optimism” (Kolocotronis). That is, she is portrayed as a character who is not “consumed” by such a discourse. Similarly, Waldman depicts Khan as positively indifferent to non-Muslim misconceptions, though the latter are deeply affecting his life. Still, he does not feel inferior; it is just a way not to be “consumed” by this constructed image.

Both of Kolocotronis and Waldman paint several Muslim characters who act as “active subjects” who attempt to make a difference in society by contributing to “resistant meaning-making” (Chang et al. n.p.) as demanded by Lugones. That is, she calls individuals to play a positive role in altering their constructed and naturalized reality (*Pilgrimages*). Sadia, in Kolocotronis’ novel, is a character who struggles throughout the whole novel to change her situation and ends by successfully making a difference in her life which is considered, according to her, as the right “jihad” (Kolocotronis 178). As for Waldman, she depicts Khan as an “active subject” who refuses to submit to misconceptions and be misrepresented. Thus, he proves to be an active individual who is trying to make a difference throughout the whole novel.

4.3.5. Differences in Muslim Characters’ Resistance to the Hegemonic Discourse in both Novels

In addition to the similar ways of resisting the logic of separating Muslim and non-Muslim groups, Kolocotronis and Waldman also refer to other methods of resistance that they do not deal with similarly like using teaching as a key means of resistance in *Innocent People* and resisting situations sarcastically and stubbornly in *The Submission*. In the former, parents as well as teachers are very careful of the way kids interpret facts. Therefore, they insist on focusing, both at home and in classrooms, on teaching them to avoid stereotyping people or

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

associating certain images with them without having any proof. Such a method, however, is not used by Waldman.

As for the other detected differences, Waldman creates the character of Khan as a sarcastic one, who reacts to accusations ridiculously. His certainty of his innocence leads him to respond in such a way, though he is very serious indeed. Furthermore, he is depicted as an extremely stubborn character who strongly denies non-Muslims' attempts to convince him to withdraw, declaring his refusal to give up his design despite the serious problem it causes. Therefore, though very similar in the way they depict Muslim characters' resistance to the dominant discourse, Kolocotronis and Waldman also differ in some suggested ways of resistance, as clarified.

4.4. The Subjectivity of Truth from a Postmodern Perspective in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

It has been proved throughout the previous chapters that both of Michel Foucault and Maria Lugones support categorized, marginalized or mistreated groups' resistance. That is, both theorists strongly believe in individuals' ability to challenge certain established "truths" and provide and emphasize the other version of the coin. Furthermore, this insistence on "multiplicity" and the creation of a new "truth" is closely connected to the postmodern concept of "truth". For postmodernists then, "it is more accurate to speak of multiple *realities* ... than a single reality" (Nicol 8). In other words, postmodernists celebrated the multiplicity and hence the "subjectivity" of realities. However, they saw that in order to reach such an aim, one has to focus on "knowledge" production because "[s]ubjective perception of different people produces knowledge through which they constitute subjective realities" (Sheeba 184). Stated differently, postmodernists rejected the "universality" or "objectivity" of "truth" seeing that if individuals are perceived from a variety of perspectives, different

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

versions of reality can be accepted in any society rather than generalizing one version over a group of people.

In Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* and Waldman's *The Submission*, then, the researcher notices that both novelists shed light on the situation in America after the 9/11 events, highlighting non-Muslim Americans' reaction and perception of Muslims in general and Muslim-Americans in particular as terrorists. Additionally, both novelists try to open the door for Muslim-Americans' perspectives towards the event and seem to sympathize with them by giving them the voice and opportunity to oppose that dominant "truth" of Islam as a religion of terror. For instance, in Kolocotronis' novel, when the news spread and Muslims were negatively broadcast, Sadia reacts: "How can they just start accusing Muslims? Don't they know what Islam stands for? Muslims couldn't have done this!" (Kolocotronis 11). There is a hint, in her reply, of "truth subjectivity" because the fact of raising these questions indicates her emphasis on Islam's good nature. In addition to that, this example illustrates postmodernists' emphasis on "the existence of different worldviews and concepts of reality rather than one "correct" or "true" [version]" (Potgieter & Walt 238) because she implicitly suggests the existence of another reality, which is that of Islam as a religion of peace rather than accepting the negative image of Islam as the *only* reality which exemplifies, again, postmodernists' insistence on "reality ...[as] construct[ed] by individuals, a particular group, community, or class of persons" (Potgieter & Walt 238). That is, one must not take any reality as the only and definite one because it is not natural but "constructed".

Throughout *Innocent People*, a special emphasis is put on Muslim characters' insistence on their good image. For example, when Uthman says angrily: "The Jews are out to defeat the Muslims in this land. And they will not stop until they succeed. I think" (Kolocotronis 34), Salahuddin comments: "It's a terrible situation. But if we start saying 'the Jews this' or 'the Jews that,' then we're no better than people who are saying 'the Muslims

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

this' or 'the Muslims that'" (Kolocotronis 35). This shows Muslims' perseverance to prove their innocence and hence emphasize the existence of a different reality that non-Muslim American characters could not perceive as a result of the powerful influence of the dominant discourse. Thus, Salahuddin's opposition to the idea of generalizing a certain truth on the Jews well illustrates the postmodernists' "impulse to deconstruct totalising systems of knowledge, meaning or belief" (Potgieter & Walt 239). That is, they highly rejected treating certain "truths" and realities as "absolute"; and Salahuddin, in this case, and all Muslim characters in this novel are thirsty to prove their will and see their reality as terrorists "deconstructed".

Another instance where Salahuddin shows his desire to avoid "absolute truth" is when he tells his son, Sadeq:

I'd like to agree with the brother [in the mosque] when he said that Muslims had nothing to do with the attacks. But it's not right for us to blame someone else, either. Also, we have to be careful about throwing around all these theories. People say this and people say that, but we shouldn't say anything unless we're certain (Kolocotronis 84).

In this example, Salahuddin shows his good principles as a Muslim and at the same time, he illustrates the postmodernists' belief in the absence of "objective reality, truth, value, reason, ... [seeing them as] social constructions" (Moreland 79). Hence, Salahuddin, as a mistreated character and a victim of what postmodernists call "objective reality", shows his appreciation of this brother's declaration of the real "truth" about Muslims. Still, he advises his son not to associate a certain reality with any group of people without being "certain".

While the majority of non-Muslim characters seem very harsh and extremely attached to the fact of Islam as a religion of violence, Muslim characters seem hopeful and optimistic towards the possibility of the Americans' belief in and acceptance of a different discourse that is provided by Muslims. The following example illustrates this point, when Imran says: "The

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

American people are still suffering from the shock of the attacks. We just need to be patient. I think things will turn around” (Kolocotronis 49). This character seems to excuse non-Muslims for their reaction showing his optimism in a fruitful and prosperous future. This character’s hope in change in the future goes hand in hand with the postmodernists’ rejection of “signifieds” and with them “[t]he idea of any stable or permanent reality disappears” (Ma 1340). Imran, then, shows his rejection of the “signified” terrorism and threat as temporary emphasizing his belief in non-Muslims’ acceptance of “subjectivity” in the future.

Therefore, one notices that Kolocotronis shows Muslim characters’ willingness to challenge the established “truth” of Muslims as terrorists, a “truth” that came into existence as a result of the “power relations” between Muslim and non-Muslim characters in the novel. As Prinsloo argues: “The power relations between the subjugated and the elite are maintained and perpetuated through existing and accepted forms of knowledge. Foucault coined the term “power/knowledge” to convey the idea that power is established through recognized forms of knowledge” (811). That is, when a certain truth is constructed and “accepted”, the “power relation” is solidified and strengthened. However, the same critic indicates that this modernist view of the possibility of solidifying a certain reality has been challenged by the postmodernists. In this novel, then, Muslim characters try to weaken the “power relation” between them and non-Muslim ones by refusing such a generalization about Islam.

Like Kolocotronis, Waldman also paints several Muslim characters who are “in the throes of a battle for domination by a superpower that insists on seeing the Muslims and Islam through Orientalization, while itself being nothing less than a reflection of all that it finds offensive about this fantastical Islam” (Al-Quaderi & Habibullah 40). Stated differently, the negative perception of Islam on behalf of non-Muslim characters is clearly shown in the novel because Muslim characters are always pictured as good, positive, and defending their religious principles in a polite way. However, non-Muslim Americans, all

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

the time, perceive them as terrorists, violent, and the enemy they have to get rid of, while they, themselves, appear as having the features they accuse Muslims of. For instance, when the American character Rubin tells a Muslim woman: “Have you ever held up a sign that said, ‘Murder in the name of my religion is wrong?’ ... ‘Of course it’s wrong,’ the woman said steadily, ‘but discriminating on the basis of religion is wrong, too’” (Waldman 152). This quote, then, emphasizes what is mentioned above; that is non-Muslim characters perceive Muslims negatively while they neglect their own “truth”. Another instance that proves the same perspective is Khan’s clarification to the audience: “‘Apparently the jury agreed: everyone knows by now they chose my design.’ He gestured at illustrations of a garden, placed on an easel to his right. ‘It seems they just have a problem with the designer’” (Waldman 91-92). That is, they classify Muslims as terrorists and racist while rejecting the design by being racist toward Islam as the religion of the designer though his nationality is American.

According to Al-Quaderi and Habibullah, America and the West share the same opinion and as a result, they are responsible of “shap[ing] the news, decid[ing] what is news and how it is news” (42). These two critics’ argument emphasizes the fake nature of “truth” and indicates that its construction is based merely on interests. Furthermore, the same argument justifies media’s dramatization of events in a negative way, as previously mentioned. For example,

the anchorman began to practice saying ‘Muslim’---‘the *New York Post* is reporting that a Muslim has been selected’---with just the right note of ironic surprise on the first syllable. ‘The jury’s not talking, but stay tuned,’ he continued in a confiding tone that masked that he had nothing to confide (Waldman 58).

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

His practice of pronouncing the word “Muslim” and his attempt to show confidence in and certainty of the pieces of information he is delivering while he is not certain at all justifies the fact that “the government’s version of events ... is accepted by an intimidated public” (McFadden 7). That is, the anchorman’s lack of confidence in and true understanding of Islam and Muslims lead him to accept the dominant “version” which is that of Muslims as bad and therefore, the winner cannot be a Muslim.

There is a hint, however, that what they claim as the true nature of Islam is not a definite or permanent “truth”; that is it is changeable as the following example indicates:

You know, [Laila tells Mo about the ad] when you stood up for yourself in front of the whole country, I thought you were so brave, I had never seen that kind of confidence in a man. You put yourself on the line. But now I see that it was about you: *your* design, *your* reputation, *your* place in history. You will put yourself on the line for your own interests but no one else’s (Waldman 177).

So, as the example shows, Laila is pushing Mo to challenge the established truth of him as a terrorist and not an architect. She wants him to yearn for “another level of Truth beyond that first level” (Salman 180-181) which proves that history is not “absolute” and hence, any constructed “truth” is not too. The same idea is also emphasized when one refers to Roi who tells Mo: “You may make history with it [meaning the design]” (Waldman 109). This means that new historical “truths” are created depending on the events that are taking place. In this case, for instance, Mo will contribute to history because his design will lead to the construction of a “truth” about Islam and Muslims as happens exactly in the novel.

In the same work, one notices that light is shed on the subjectivity of history not only on behalf of Muslims but non-Muslim characters too open the door for other possible perspectives. This indirect rejection of objective reality maybe interpreted as Waldman’s

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

sympathy with Muslims. For instance, when talking about the design, Alyssa tells Fred: “Everyone liked to give history a little twist when they could” (Waldman 59). Thus, Khan is seen as making his own touch to a certain established historical truth. Said differently, the 9/11 events are considered as a historical incident which produced the discourse of Islam and Muslims as guilty and responsible of this event’s victims. However, in the world of the novel, Khan is trying to challenge this well established fact and Muslim characters are thirsty to prove their innocence and good principles. This shows Muslims’ support of the postmodern thought that considers the world as consisting of “differing viewpoints and perspectives” (Ma 1339) and hence, realities.

Another hint of truth’s subjectivity is clear when the narrator describes: “NY1 kept replaying the same story on Asma Anwar’s death, but Sean watched it each time as if it were new” (Waldman 261). This description illustrates the fact that the way certain events are perceived can change through time as it is not always seen from the same perspective. This example well illustrates this idea although Sean is not depicted as a character who sympathizes with Muslims. That is, although he has seen the same event from a different angle each time he watches TV, he has never considered Asma as a Muslim victim. She is seen as an enemy. Furthermore, his way of perceiving Asma and all Muslim characters negatively is maybe justified for how a certain truth is meant to be perceived is controlled as Naseem argues:

The most popular authors on terrorism in the United States during this period were those who repeated the same ‘truth’, and they were also the figures who (re)spoke this ‘truth’ to large audiences across almost every media platform from television to print and radio to the Internet (Naseem 457).

That is, media are controlled to deliver certain messages in order to shape the audience’s perspectives towards things. In this case for instance, Sean is able to see the same reality

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

differently but he could not see Asma's innocence which proves Naseem's opinion. That is, Sean's perspective is controlled.

After taking serious procedures towards Khan, no proof against him is found but still he is considered as a terrorist. For example,

On ROI's behalf, Khan had made a trip to Afghanistan earlier in the year, but he had no known or identifiable link to any organization on the terrorist watch list. He had made no political contributions to fringe candidates or, for that matter, to mainstream ones. His only membership appeared to be in the American Institute of Architects. There was nothing to suggest he was an extremist. Anything but: he seemed all-American, even in his ambition" (Waldman 49).

Thus, although his terrorism has not been proved and he seems American, he has been labeled as a dangerous terrorist who wants to harm the Americans through his design. This truth about Khan's terrorism goes hand in hand with Naseem's argument who considers "the production of 'true' knowledge about the Evildoer [as a] reanimate[ion of] major narratives and discursive practices that were prominent in Western encounters with Islam from the Middle Ages" (Naseem 464).

What reinforces the previous idea is the following example in which the narrator describes the perception of Khan as a terrorist in an interesting way: "Facts were not found but made, and once made, alive, defying anyone to tall them from truth. Strangers analyzed, judged, and invented him [meaning Khan]" (Waldman 126). This proves that Khan's association with terrorism is "invented", believed, and non-Muslims treat him building on this image while, as clarified in the previous paragraph, nothing is proved against him. Hence, the way Khan is perceived justifies Naseem's emphasis on the role of media in shaping the Americans' view of Muslims in the wake of 9/11 events. He considers media as the primary

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

source they relied on in order to get “knowledge”, seeing it as “strongly propagandist, and largely biased” (Naseem 457).

4.5. New Historicism

4.5.1. New Historicism in Relation to Postmodernism

Both of postmodernism and New Historicism meet in their denial of the acceptance of certain historical facts as the only official versions that are created or formed “on the basis of ‘historical knowledge’” (Shafique and Akhtar 137). Further, they reject the fact that such facts are used to decide on the way people and society will follow in the future. That is why the postmodernists put certain restrictions on the power of “historical knowledge” to be the only version that everyone must follow and as a result, they relate that questioning to the fictional world. Stated differently, postmodernists opposed the idea of “objectively” interpreting what lays beneath the historical fact. For them, then, history cannot be treated as a definite fact that is unchangeable. Rather, they consider it as “speculative” (Shafique & Akhtar 140).

To emphasize more, one can refer to the postmodernist Karl Popper who clearly states: “I do admit that at any moment we are prisoners caught in the framework of our theories...[and] our past experiences ... But we are prisoners in Pickwickian sense: if we try, we can break out of our framework any time” (qtd. in Shafique & Akhtar 141). This means that though certain facts or versions of reality dominate people, they can change their limited views towards the same facts, if they want to. In a similar way, Foucault assumes that historians cannot change and deny the fact that in reality, “no one can erase all personal inputs from their historical understanding” (Shafique & Akhtar 141). That is, all the historical facts that have been considered as “objective” are not free from the subjective touch that is why history can never be objective.

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

The postmodernists, then, raise such questions in relation to the acceptance of “historical knowledge” as stable and try to confirm the opposite in order to prove that historians are no longer superior and creators of “objective” versions. Additionally, they also shed light on the clear distinction between history and fiction, seeing them as closely interrelated and their separation as impossible. Moreover, they believe that historians, as previously stated, add their touch to the fact they want to produce and what they add is based on the “message” they want to deliver. Therefore, the postmodernists consider “[t]he historians’ concerns ...[as the] same as that of a novelist presenting a story” (Shafique & Akhtar 142). That is, both of the historian and the novelist have a certain message they want to deliver based on which they follow the angle from which to see a certain fact. Therefore, as the postmodernist critic Linda Hutcheon claims: “[B]oth history and fiction are discourses ‘human construct’” (qtd. in Shafique & Akhtar 142) that are mainly interested in the introduction of “meaning”.

4.5.2. An Overview of New Historicism and its Tenets

New Historicism is a literary theory that appeared in the 1980s and came as a reaction against the previous theories that claimed that literary texts must be analyzed in isolation. That is, the reader is expected to focus on the text only in order to interpret it. Stated differently, they want readers to separate the text from history, society, the writer’s biography, etc. New Historicism, then, appeared with different claims that oppose such thoughts. It emphasizes the text’s close connection to its background, seeing “works of literature as historical texts” (qtd. in Serdaroğlu 785-786) because its main concern is to doubt past events or history and its authority. That is, New Historicists are suspicious of the fact that history is “objective”. They consider the literary text as part of history and the events that took place in society and it cannot be “a separate entity” (Serdaroğlu 785-786) from real historical events

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

because it is “a product of the social, political, and cultural elements of its time” (Serdaroğlu 785-786).

Additionally, New Historicists, unlike the New Critics, believe that meaning in a literary text cannot be complete without relating it to its background. Then, supporting such a claim leads them to consider the literary work as a product that can be interpreted from a variety of perspectives. That is, they deny the fact that a literary work can have a single interpretation that fits all readers and all times. Therefore, their belief in the multiplicity of readings and interpretations illustrates the fact that “New Historicism deconstructs and reconstructs the truth-ness of history as well as its universal and traditional representation” (Serdaroğlu 785-786). This means that New Historicists consider historical truths as questionable and changeable. They see that throughout time and depending on the present discourse and beliefs in any society, certain historical facts can be “reconstructed”. That is, there is no one ultimate, true version of history. However, it must be noted that New Historicism, with its strict focus on the text’s relatedness to history, does not pay attention to history but the way it is represented. In other words, it “deals with the representations of history rather than the history itself since it believes that there is not one history but multiple histories” (Serdaroğlu 785). Thus, the focus is on the way certain historical facts are interpreted from a variety of perspectives which lead to the production of “histories”.

Although both of old and New historicists are mainly concerned with history, their view of this field is different as they raise different questions when it comes to examining certain historical issues. Old historians, for example, raise questions such as the following: “What happened?” and “What does the event tell us about history?” while New Historicists ask questions differently like: “How has the event been interpreted?” and “What do the interpretations tell us about the interpreters?”(qtd. in “New Historicism, Cultural Studies (1980s-present)”). This indicates that their view of history is not the same for the former seem

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

to trust the reflection of historical facts as a reliable source while the latter doubt the authenticity of history for the first idea they think about is “interpretation”; that is there is a subjective touch. Stated differently, New historicists reject the view of history as a “fact”, emphasizing its nature as “strictly a matter of interpretation” (qtd. in “New Historicism, Cultural Studies (1980s-present)”). They simply highlight the contribution of individuals as “subjective interpreters” of events that happen around them (“New Historicism, Cultural Studies (1980s-present)”).

The above-mentioned New Historicist principle was originated by this critical approach’s founding figure Stephen Greenblatt (1943-), an American literary theorist. Greenblatt argues that this theory does not postulate historical events as “unalterable and inexorable” (Serdaroğlu 786). Rather, its main aim is to determine the fact that individuals’ contribution to the establishment of history is restricted. Further, he undermines the power of these individuals as the only source of constructing history and seeing the latter only through the same source’s perspective (Serdaroğlu 786). Advocating the same idea, the postmodern critic Linda Hutcheon also rejects the objectivity of the past because she believes that perspectives change depending on circumstances. That is, the narrator of the events has a different viewpoint than the one traditionally agreed upon. That is, she believes that “history is subjective” (Serdaroğlu 790). In addition to that, Greenblatt calls into attention the fact that the “historian is the product” of his time. Thus, he can only know and interpret based on his present situation (Veenstra 181).

Greenblatt also contributed by shedding light on the fact that “texts not only document the social forces that inform and constitute history and society but also feature prominently in the social processes themselves which fashion both individual identity and the sociohistorical situation” (Veenstra 174). This means that he highlights the text’s important role to form ideas and construct facts by providing a different version or interpretation of the same

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

historical event. He sees that the text is not merely a reflection of certain social and historical events. Instead, it takes part in shaping individuals' points of views towards the same historical fact that was considered as the ultimate one. Greenblatt, then, illustrates this point by referring to poetry. For him, to read a poem and analyze it based on the words on the page without relating it to its background means a rejection of its essential elements. That is, to divest the poem from its "sociohistorical context" (Veenstra 176) is impossible because one can reach the possible meaning of the same poem through this context. That is, for Greenblatt, to analyze the poem by separating it from its context cannot be acceptable because by doing so, one is missing the value of this poem (Veenstra 176).

For Greenblatt, "[h]istorical and literary texts may engage the whole of the sociohistorical context, but they will most certainly engage the most immediate element of this context: the self of the reader" (Veenstra 182). Here again, a special emphasis is put on the active role of these texts. That is, they carefully reflect history, add to it, and touch the reader's "identity" too. For him, texts are infused with ideas that challenge "abstractions" and "generalizations". The same texts, he argues, cannot be included in that same history of "generalizations". That is why he sees them as affecting the reader's identity (Veenstra). Moreover, Greenblatt relates "the world of the text" (qtd. in Veenstra 184) to Michel Foucault's perspective on power. That is, like discourse that can never be separated from the "social structure" from which it originates, he sees that this "world" cannot be separated from the "historical context". This means that the context affects the text's meaning that is why it cannot be detached from it (Veenstra).

According to Greenblatt, literature can never be separated from history since it is always created as a result of several "social and cultural" conditions in the background. Further, he affirms that "literature constitutes another vision of history" (Rahman17). That is,

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

literature plays a role in changing people's perspectives by opening new doors towards their perception of history as having one static version. Hence, Greenblatt confirms the close connection between history and literature, tending to blur the distinction between these two fields (Rahman 17).

New Historicists attempted to contribute by “claim[ing] to speak for the marginalized, the oppressed, and for everything peripheral a society turns its back on” (Veenstra 193). That is, their aim is to call attention to who/what has been neglected in society. To do so, they try to open the readers' eyes to what lies beneath the surface. They raise their awareness of the other face of the coin which is the existence of an unnoticed “truth” (Veenstra). Therefore, Greenblatt considers the “author, text, reader, and society” (Veenstra 198) as interrelated because the “author” and the “text” are the product of certain historical and social circumstances as they affect the “reader” and the latter will also contribute by providing different interpretations.

Hence, New Historicism calls for paying attention to history, society, and culture while analyzing a literary work and the effect of this background on the author. Such emphasis, the New Historicists believe, will contribute to the text's meaning-making (King). Through history in the background, New Historicists examine the literary work and find out the silent historical facts in the same work (Raj 211). Said differently, New Historicists consider the “historical” background as the one that defines the significance and possible interpretation of a certain literary work, and not the text studied separately. Furthermore, literature can be considered as a means that opens the readers' eyes to certain issues that were taking place in a certain period of time. Therefore, the “context of a text interprets the meaning of the [same] text and the society in which it is written” (Rahman 10).

New Historicism “has given scholars new opportunities to cross the boundaries separating history, anthropology, art, politics, literature and economics” (Rahman 22).

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

However, although the New Historicists argue that literature is closely related to history and reject the existence of any limits separating them, neither the latter nor the former can provide individuals with an objective, stable, and permanent reality as the following quote emphasizes: “no discourse, imaginative or archival, gives access to unchanging truths” (qtd. in Gheorghiu 8). In addition to that, New Historicists’ insistence on the “text” as deeply rooted in history is very similar to Foucault’s view of the “text” that is perceived as free from all the forces that contribute to its production as meaningless. That is, the “text” cannot hold meaning if it is not related to other elements that helped in its creation for it cannot be created from nothingness (U.R. 22). The New Historicists deeply insist on that impossible separation between the context and literature because for them, “[t]he historical, social and material backgrounds in writing build up a historical atmosphere of literature” (Fu 100). That is, they see the historical background as informative to the literary work and forming its basis.

The historian is the person who gathers information from archives and shows the origin of these pieces of information through including “footnotes”. Then, these, and other, “sources” are considered as the historical background or “context”. The latter, then, forms the basis to which other publications “contribute” (Ngoshi 14). In addition to that, what confirms and emphasizes the subjectivity of history is White’s opinion who argues that history is formed of a collection of “lived stories, individual and collective” (qtd. in Ngoshi 14). The role of this historian, then, is merely to discover and reveal such stories and re-narrate or re-state them in a new story (qtd. in Ngoshi 14).

Literature and history cannot be separated. Rather, a special emphasis must be put on “the literature of fact” and the way literature and history meet and cover parts of each other (qtd. in Ngoshi 14). That is, the historian and the “imaginative” writer meet in many points that is why one has to pay attention to both narrators’ perspectives and how they are similar and agree with each other. Actually, the issue of history and literature and the possibility of

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

separating these two fields, or not, is a topic that was open for debate, in both literature and history studies, for a long time. The reason critics in these two fields could not reach a satisfactory solution is the result of historians' conviction that history is "objective" and hence cannot be covered by literature. Therefore, these two fields could not reach a contact zone for a long time. However, the nowadays shared agreement, held by historians and writers, to be part of each other is the result of the appearance of New Historicism, for the latter calls for a lack of distinction between these two areas. Thus, as the American theorist, Louis Montrose, who is another essential figure in New Historicism, summarized the key principle of this theory as being its interest in "the textuality of history and the historicity of texts" (qtd. in Ngoshi15). Therefore, the New Historicists clearly highlight their focus on the close connection and impossible separation between the literary work and its context (Ngoshi 15).

By "the historicity of texts", Montrose signifies that all texts are history, society, culture, etc. related while the "textuality of history" means that history is "fictional" and "constructed", the idea that Foucault highly emphasized arguing that old historians are responsible of creating historical facts that "comply with the dominant ideology of the state" while he insists that history as "objective" does not exist because its production is influenced and limited by the interests of certain "groups" and "institutions" (Mambrol). Therefore, "New Historicism... proposes that history is always written with the historian's present context and with its need in mind. All history writing is about interpreting the past for the sake of the present" (Mambrol). This means that each period has its own conditions and circumstances which play a role in forming the image of the past that serves the present. For the New Historicists, then, the 'textualisation' of history is dealt with through "ideology or outlook or discursive practice of its own time" (qtd. in Gheorghiu 1300). That is, while narrating a historical fact, this narrator's point of view, attitude, and discourse of the "time" also contribute to the production of this fact.

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

To well illustrate the importance of literature and history in relation to each other, one can refer to the researcher Hazel Tafadzwa Ngoshi, again, who considers literature as an essential key to the understanding of certain historical facts, exemplifying his argument by referring to “African” and “African American” literature. Ngoshi sees that the “image” of Africans has been dealt with in literature and similarly, the “African American image” has been described through the portrayal of “slavery” in literature, with the touch of these writers’ added, of course (16). Moreover, when these narrators focus on a certain period or event in their works, “they are making history” (qtd. in Ngoshi 17). But they are contributing, at the same time, by delivering certain messages related to expressing these narrators’ perspectives, emphasizing some cultural aspects, influencing other people about the future, etc (Ngoshi 17).

To emphasize Ngoshi’s perspective, one can call attention to New Historicism as being mainly interested in “the historical, social and cultural contexts” (Rahman 1) of the writer’s time during which the piece of work is created. That is, the literary work is the result of the conditions the writer is living in. New Historicists, therefore, highly believe that the “author’s times” (Rahman 1) are attentively reflected in the literary work and contribute to the production of its meaning. Furthermore, supporters of New Historicism claim that the “themes” and characters the author deals with in his/her literary work are the ones that are widespread in his/her time. As a result, they believe that history is no longer “objective” since literature can create history (Rahman 1).

New Historicists “assume that every work is a product of the historic moment that created it” (“New Historicism, Cultural Studies (1980s-present)”). That is, they strongly believe that literary texts are keys through which one understands the period of their production. Through the use of imagination, these texts present a faithful image of particular historical events. In addition to that, they argue that since these literary productions are closely connected to “other discourses..., they are part of a history that is still being written”

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

(qtd. in Rahman 17). Stated differently, there is a hint in this quote that history is dynamic because literary works provide different perspectives and opinions towards historical events and hence different versions. Thus, they are, in a way, contributing to shaping history and the latter “is still being written” (qtd. in Rahman17). New Historicists consider “texts as agents and makers of history” (Rahman 18). Since, as stated above, they see no distinction between the two fields, they highlight the great importance of literature in making history. The main purpose of these theorists, then, is to scrutinize the way literary works add to history, copy some historical events as they are exactly, and sometimes they “challenge other cultural discourses” (Rahman 18) that are produced in the era during which the work is created or other eras. That is why New Historicists give importance to the features of the period during which the work is produced (Rahman).

While New Historicism is highly concerned with literature and its close connection with history, they also put a special emphasis on the relation between literary works and “the world”, between the literary works and “the meaning” they create. Thus, they see the receivers of these texts and their interpretations as highly essential and importance worthy. Additionally, advocates of New Historicism call attention to both the “circumstance” in which the work is produced and “the material effects” (Rahman 21) the work has created. By doing so, they consider this kind of criticism as an opposition to every theory that emphasizes the inclusion of meaning inside the literary text without being affected by any outside circumstances (Rahman). Consequently, for them, the literary work is “a context for other material and cultural aspects as they are for it” (Rahman 22). This means that literature is related to its context as it forms a context itself too.

4.5.3. New Historicism Applied to *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

As the researcher has clearly shown in the previous parts, both of Kolocotronis and Waldman reveal some real events and seem to have a perspective towards them in their

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

Innocent People and *The Submission*, respectively. Thus, the New Historicist thought seem to exist in both works. Consequently, the present researcher notices that the application of the aforementioned theory to the previously mentioned novels is pertinent.

To start with, one of the main tenets of New Historicism is that the literary work is a reflection of the context in which it was produced. Thus, to better understand *Innocent People* and *The Submission*, a reference to the historical circumstances that preceded their publication is seen as necessary. As it has been shown in the previous two chapters, Muslim Americans are portrayed as extremely mistreated by the non-Muslim majority. The threat they experience and suffer from is a reality-inspired one. Considine, for instance, in his article “The Racialization of Islam in the United States: Islamophobia, Hate Crimes, and “Flying while Brown”” put special emphasis on the non-Muslim Americans’ perception of Islam and Muslims as a serious danger and threat to the country which lead to their mistreatment in all the domains in the wake of the attacks. To summarize the main ideas of his article, one can start with this author’s reference to the fact that soon after the attacks,

fear and hatred of American Muslims have ‘moved from the fringes of American society to the mainstream’. [Furthermore,] candidates of the Republican Party made several controversial comments including, ‘Islam hates us,’ ‘[Muslims are] uncorked animals,’ and ‘I would not advocate that we put a Muslim in charge of this nation’ (Considine 1).

This proves that the non-Muslim majority misconception of Muslims in both novels is taken from the latter’s reality that followed the attacks. Further, Waldman portrays lots of characters who use similar slogans that emphasize their hate and refusal of Islam.

What reinforces the true nature of the reality lived by Muslim Americans is the fact that a good sum of money (about \$42.9 million) was spent, in a period of eight years, in order to strengthen and advocate “the spread of anti-Muslim and anti-Islam rhetoric in the United

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

States” (qtd. in Considine 2). At the same time, the same critic highlights the fact that such a reaction on behalf of non-Muslim Americans is, to a certain extent, justified because such misbehavior towards Muslims proved to be the result of the impact of political discourse as well as media (Considine 8). In addition to non-Muslims’ discontent with the presence of Muslims in America as well as their hatred of this group, a large number of Americans consider racism and racist attitudes towards Muslims as justified and legal. Such attitude definitely reinforces the discourse of Islam as a religion of terror (Considine 9).

Added to what has been mentioned, in the wake of the attacks, Muslims and every person who *seems* to be a Muslim suffer from “hate crimes” (Considine 9). Moreover, the discourse of Islam as a violent religion and its followers abuse women led to the appearance of racist attitudes towards Muslims even in airports. A certain belief that stemmed from the government indicated that Muslim Americans must be carefully controlled and followed because they are a serious danger to “national security”. As a result, Muslims were treated in a special way, which shows doubt and mistrust on behalf of the non-Muslim Americans (Considine). Therefore, one can say that the situation of Muslim Americans was serious and worse to an extent that the non-Muslims’ hate and misconception of this group “affect [even] the lives of people with ‘Muslim-like’ appearances in the United States” (Considine 12).

As previously mentioned, the New Historicists consider the literary texts as historical ones that are extremely close to their background. To well illustrate, one can refer to Kolocotronis and Waldman’s novels as historical ones. They can be considered as such since both works help readers get closer to the American society and the Muslim condition after 9/11 attacks. These two novels prove to be not merely pieces of art but also a faithful depiction of real issues that took place and are part of history. For example, in both works, the American society is depicted as a challenge to Muslims to live in because light is shed on American characters’ misconception of Islam and mistreatment of Muslims who, they

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

assume, form a threat to the American peaceful society. In Kolocotronis' work, Muslim characters start to feel threatened like having their restaurants and houses attacked as well as receiving threats through phone calls. Similarly, Waldman also shows the way Muslim characters are perceived after the attacks. They too receive threats through phones, letters, etc. as they have been questioned from time to time. Hence, this proves these two novels' close connection to their background because this kind of threats existed in reality soon after the attacks.

The New Historicists also consider the meaning of the literary work and the way it is interpreted as essentially related to this text's background or context, as opposed to the belief in the capacity of the reader to find meaning in the text by rejecting its background. This leads the present researcher to interpret Kolocotronis and Waldman's novels in relation to their context, which is the wake of the attacks. However, the New Historicists do not show great interest in the historical fact itself but the way it is represented because for them, historical facts are not stable but can be questioned. In the selected case studies, for instance, the reader notices that although both novelists paint the reality of Muslim and non-Muslim Americans' struggle, s/he does not feel that they are supporting Muslims' mistreatment. That is, though soon after the attacks, Muslims were blamed of this catastrophe and the West's perception of Islam as a religion of violence and terror was strengthened, these two American novelists do not seem to side with this thought. They indirectly question the historical fact of the attacks by depicting Muslim characters as innocent, peaceful, respectful, and having good principles. Thus, they did not merely depict this historical event as it is. Rather, they added their touch to interpret this event and open the door for a different perspective. This well illustrates the New Historicists' mistrust of history as a "fact" seeing it as an "interpretation". In this case, then, these two novelists show readers a different interpretation of or perspective toward the same historical fact that has a long story of accusing Muslims. They show readers that there are

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

good Muslims and Bad Muslims rather than depicting all Muslim characters as terrorists and violent. Stated differently, throughout both novels, the authors show their discontent at the Americans' racism towards Islam and Muslims by depicting the latter as good characters.

Then, Kolocotronis and Waldman's depiction of this historical event from a different perspective, to a certain extent, leads one to call into attention Greenblatt and Hutcheon's conception of history as "subjective". Greenblatt, for example, considers the narrator's perspective as unavoidable to deliver the message s/he wants to behind any historical fact. In *Innocent People*, for example, Kolocotronis does not reinforce the image of terrorism associated with Muslims. Instead, she provides readers with a good image of Muslims. By doing so, she tries to call attention to a different perspective of the principles of Islam and Muslims. Likewise, Waldman highlights the good principles of Muslims by emphasizing their polite reactions to non-Muslims' mistreatment. Further, she sheds light in several instances on the "subjectivity" of history. For instance, Alyssa tells Fred: "Everyone liked to give history a little twist when they could" (Waldman 59). This example illustrates the New Historicists' belief that history cannot be objective for the personal touch is always added and as a result, the historical fact is constructed. Thus, Alyssa's words show that everyone wants to add his/her opinion when possible and hence, the message of Waldman here is that history can never be objective.

In the same novel, Waldman depicts the historian as a character who seems to reject the "objectivity" of history. While having a conversation with Claire, the historian says: "History makes its own truths, new truths" (Waldman 21). Thus, as a historian, who is in the field, is declaring that there are always changes added to historical facts. His words mean that history can never be stable. It is always subject to change. Moreover, in another occasion, Claire describes history as "unfixed" (Waldman 115). All these descriptions of history suggest that the author tries to emphasize history's dynamic nature and that individuals can

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

never have the same static version that is applicable to all times and all situations. In addition to that, throughout both novels, Muslim characters are shown as victims themselves of the attacks through portraying them as being caught by the harsh treatment of the dominant majority as a result of the influence of the discourse of institutions. This way of painting them is also an implicit support of the “subjectivity” of history and an emphasis on a different interpretation.

The New Historicists, in general, and Greenblatt, in particular, indicate also the importance of the text in shaping individuals’ perspectives towards facts because they reflect these facts in the context, add a new aspect or perspective to this reality, and affect readers. So, in both novels, readers notice that Kolocotronis and Waldman depict the 9/11 attacks as a historical fact and its impact on the American society. However, they do not follow the same dominant discourse but they open the readers’ eyes to a new angle. Consequently, readers, including Muslim and non-Muslim ones, will be aware of the other face of the coin, which is the truth of Muslims as innocent. Most importantly, Greenblatt claims that these texts are filled with ideas that defy the established and constructed discourse. Thus, as it has been explained, these two authors refuse to submit to the “generalizations” that consider all Muslims as terrorists. Kolocotronis and Waldman’s texts, then, well illustrate the New Historicists’ principle of focusing on what has been rejected, hidden, and unnoticed. One of their aims is to shed light on the groups that “society turns its back on” (Veenstra 193). So, as it has been clarified, both novelists reveal the power of 9/11 discourse and its impact on Muslim Americans as a group that the non-Muslim majority “turns its back on” (Veenstra 193).

However, it must be clarified that when these novels open the door for new possibilities of interpretation and give different meanings to historical facts, this does not mean that the truth they provide readers with is the ultimate and objective one. Rather, the

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

New Historicists consider all kinds of “truths”, historical or real, as subject to change, depending on circumstances. Therefore, the depiction of the reality of Muslims as victims in these two novels maybe portrayed from a completely different point of view in other literary works. In this case, both authors’ awareness of the political issues stemmed from their personal experiences. Waldman, for example, began her career as a journalist dealing with political and social problems before engaging in the fictional world. As for Kolocotronis, she is an American convert to Islam. Moreover, all her publications, fiction and non-fiction revolve around Islam and Muslim Americans. Thus, as a Muslim American herself, she can provide readers with a faithful description of their real image and the constructed one.

As it has been previously mentioned, the New Historicists consider the text as affected by its context as well as the writer’s experience and Montrose refers to that as the “historicity of texts”. In both *Innocent People* and *The Submission*, the writers’ creation of events is influenced by their historical and personal background “and the readers’ interpreting process are the manifestation of the historicity of text” (Fu 100). That is, the texts are affected by the United States’ background as they affected readers after their publications and all these procedures embody “the historicity of text”. As for the “textuality of history”, it has been clarified above that it refers to the “fictionality” and “subjectivity” of history. Therefore, Kolocotronis and Waldman are influenced by the social and historical conditions. Hence, their “[l]iterary creation becomes [their] weapon to reconsider history and criticize reality” (Fu 100). That is, by creating these works, they attempt to make such a historical event, that affected the whole world and not only America, open to criticism and interpretation rather than blindly accepting the created reality of Muslims because as Foucault clarified, the historian creates only versions that support “the dominant ideology of the state” (Mambrol).

These writers, then, contributed to the history of Muslim Americans by providing a faithful image of their daily struggle. Through the publication of these works, they prove that

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

literature contributes to “making history” (qtd. in Ngoshi 17). Furthermore, advocates of New Historicism believe that the characters depicted in literary works are taken from the writer’s society. In this case, then, All types of Muslim and non-Muslim characters both novelists dealt with were common in the American society after the attacks. Non-Muslims, for instance, are portrayed as affected by the dominant discourse, which lead to their mistreatment of Muslims and their classification as a threat to their country. Several characters like Sean, Alyssa and many others are outstanding examples of hate and racism. As for Muslims, they are depicted as struggling in the fact of such hate, deeply hurt, and aiming at changing their image and showing their good principles to the world. Consequently, due to these two writers’ attempt to add a new aspect to such a well established historical fact, their texts can be considered as part of a history that is still being written” (qtd. in Rahman 17). This result, then, justifies the New Historicists’ claim that literature is influenced by its background while it has an effect too. Thus, it forms a background or a context to other texts too. And here the importance of the interrelation between history and literature lies.

Since texts are considered as deeply affected by their historical, social, and cultural background, these texts too are filled with political and social aspects and messages (Rahman 19). This reinforces the previous idea related to texts as contexts. So, both of Kolocotronis and Waldman succeed in providing their readers with a historical and social background because their fictional works open the reader’s eyes to “the textuality of history” (U.R. 176). In addition to that, such works can be considered as a context to other texts themselves because their effects can have a significant impact to change perspectives because “the power of the perspective of reader, of writer and the power emanating in the form of knowledge subvert the power of a single truth” (U.R. 183). Said differently, changing viewpoints leads to challenging the established “truth” that is considered as the ultimate and definite one.

Chapter Four: A Comparative Analysis of the Representation of Muslim Characters and Their Truth in *Innocent People* and *The Submission*

4.6. Conclusion

To wrap up, it is worth mentioning that both of Kolocotronis and Waldman provide a faithful image of the reality of Muslim Americans after the attacks. However, it has been proved that they apparently sympathize with this group and reject generalizing all Muslims as guilty. This has been proved through the analysis of these characters' situation in the novels at hand, illustrating the New Historicists' principles and view of history as subjective as well as the postmodern concept of truth. These novelists, then, provide readers with a different truth of Muslims, emphasize the subjectivity of history, and show the close connection between history and literature through providing a faithful image of the condition of Muslim Americans in the wake of 9/11 attacks.

General Conclusion

GENERAL CONCLUSION

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The present study delved deeper in Linda-Jamilah Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* and Amy Waldman's *The Submission* in order to explore the power of discourse in purporting that Islam is a religion of terror and violence. Besides, it underscored the reactions of Muslim American characters to face the non-Muslim majority's misconceptions. Stated differently, it sought to elucidate the strategies followed by Muslim characters to undermine this image and prove the good nature of Islam.

The first chapter was meant to provide an overview of the most applicable theories that appeared relevant to the present research. It elucidated the concept of discourse and its interrelation with power and knowledge as well as Foucault's elaboration on individuals' resistance to any established discourse. Furthermore, It threw light on Lugones' examination of generalizations over certain groups based on their gender, race, religion, etc. as it focused on her suggested strategies individuals must follow to challenge established truths. The last part of the chapter was devoted to the explanation of "truth" from a postmodern perspective. All these ideas are considered as the cornerstone of this study because they served as theoretical underpinnings based on which the analysis of the two novels was done.

The second and third chapters were entirely restricted to the analytical part of this research. The former was dedicated to Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* and the latter to Waldman's *The Submission*. Both chapters introduced a brief description of the condition of Muslims after the attacks by shedding light on daily struggles of Muslim American characters. In both novels, the researcher aspired to analyze the power and effect of the discourse generated by the attacks and the characters' attempt to follow several strategies to prove a different reality. To do so, the researcher relied heavily on Michel Foucault and Maria Lugones.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The fourth chapter was initiated by a comparison between Foucault and Lugones' ideas in order to bring these two theorists together, in the hope of facilitating the task for the readers to find the link between them. Also, a comparative analysis between the two selected novels was conducted with a special emphasis on similarities in order to check whether these two authors have the same purpose which is correcting the image associated with Islam and Muslims. To emphasize this point, the remaining part of the chapter was given to the postmodern and New Historicist concepts of subjectivity. This aspect was analyzed in both novels together in order to prove the link between these novelists' depiction of Muslim American characters and their attitude and perspective towards the concept of truth and history as objective.

Furthermore, both Kolocotronis and Waldman strived to demonstrate that Muslim characters face hardships in the wake of the attacks, though the majority is American. Moreover, both writers tried to show how their Muslim characters fall victims of a constructed discourse. In addition to that, Muslims in both cases are shown as making an effort in order to undermine their established truth. In addition to that, though strongly refusing to submit to such misconceptions, Muslim characters are portrayed as willing to live with non-Muslims in harmony without considering religion as a barrier. That is, they do not seem to hold feelings of hate and prejudice against non-Muslims.

The present study, then, found out that both of Kolocotronis and Waldman, as it has been shown throughout this work, have successfully crafted narratives that re-constructed certain misconceptions about Islam and Muslims. To reach this purpose, the two novelists set the events of their works after the attacks as they published them after this event too. Furthermore, they paint the image of Muslim characters positively by depicting them as innocent, having good principles, and resistant to such a created discourse. However, though they attempt to challenge and resist following several strategies, Muslim characters in both

GENERAL CONCLUSION

works do not show any impolite or disrespectful behavior. Thus, their reaction to such a victimizing discourse emphasizes the two novelists' attempt to remove the negative image associated with this group.

The results also show that the writers' shared circumstances justify their emphasis on the subjectivity of truth and history. That is, as a historical event, the 9/11 attacks established the fact of Muslims as terrorists and dangerous. However, the novelists' efforts to undermine this truth are considered as successful to provide readers with a different image as they open the doors for a different interpretation of this historical fact. Therefore, these two literary texts are a reflection of their contexts. However, in the context, there exists a powerful discourse that defines Muslims as the enemy while these texts, through reflecting this historical fact, attempted to prove the opposite, which will add another perspective that suggests that history is subjective and that there exist truth(s). Thus, the two novels well illustrate the New Historicists' belief in the subjectivity of history as well as the postmodernists' emphasis on the multiplicity of truth.

It is hoped, then, that this analytical study has given a new as well as a meaningful interpretation to these two interesting literary works, for no study to the best of my knowledge, has tackled the same aspect in these two novels together. In addition to that, one can mention that certain obstacles have hindered the current research including the lack of scholarship that examines literary works using the approaches of Michel Foucault and Maria Lugones.

Last but not least, the researcher finds it interesting to mention that other studies can be initiated starting from the ideas tackled here. The closest topic is the study of the psyche of Muslim characters in relation to the narrative structure in both novels. In addition to that, a good new stand can be about the analysis of some characters' journey to achieve individuality by adopting Louis Althusser's ideas concerning ideology.

Works Cited

WORKS CITED

WORKS CITED

1. Primary Sources

Kolocotronis, Linda-Jamilah. *Innocent People*. USA: Leathers, 2003.

Waldman, Amy. *The Submission*. USA: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.

2. Secondary Sources

Books

Boxall, Peter. *Twenty-First-Century Fiction: A Critical Introduction*. USA: Cambridge UP, 2013.

Chavez, Karma R., and Cindy L. Griffin, eds. *Standing in the Intersection: Feminist Voices, Feminist Practices in Communication Studies*. USA: New York State UP, 2012.

Dipietro, Pedro J., Jennifer McWeeny, and Shireen Roshanravan. *Speaking Face to Face: The Visionary Philosophy of Maria Lugones*. USA: New York State UP, 2019.

Dreyfus, Hubert L., and Paul Rainbow, eds. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. 2nd ed. USA: Chicago UP, 1983.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Vol. 1. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

-----, *The Politics of Truth*. 2nd ed. Ed. Sylvere Lotringer & Lysa Hochroth. U.S.A.: Semiotext(e), 1997.

-----, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.

Gutting, Gary, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

Keeble, Arin. *The 9/11 Novel: Trauma, Politics, and Identity*. North Carolina: McFarland, 2014.

WORKS CITED

- Lugones, Maria. *Pilgrimages/Peregrinajes: Theorizing Coalition Against Multiple Oppressions*. USA: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.
- May, Vivian M. *Pursuing Intersectionality, Unsettling Dominant Imaginaries*. UK: Routledge, 2015.
- Mihăilescu, Dana, Roxana Oltean, and Mihaela Precup. *Mapping Generations of Traumatic Memory in American Narratives*. UK: Cambridge, 2014.
- Milchman, Alan, and Alan Rosenberg, eds. *Foucault and Heidegger: Critical Encounters*. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 2003.
- Mills, Sara. *Discourse*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- , *Discourses of Difference: An Analysis of Women's Travel Writing and Colonialism*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- , *Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Nicol, Bran. *The Cambridge Introduction to Postmodern Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009.
- Ortega, Mariana. *In-Between: Latina Feminist Phenomenology, Multiplicity, and the Self*. USA: New York State UP, 2016.
- Parikh, Crystal and Daniel Kim. *The Cambridge Companion to Asian American Literature*. USA: Cambridge UP, 2015.
- Rainbow, Paul, ed. *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.
- Rudaityté, Regina. *Literature in Society*. UK; Cambridge, 2012.
- Smart, Barry, ed. *Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Taylor, Dianna, ed. *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts*. New York: Acumen, 2011.
- Young, Robert. *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

WORKS CITED

Articles

- Ahmed, Saifuddin, and Jorg Matthes. "Media representation of Muslims and Islam from 2000 to 2015: A Meta-analysis." *International Communication Gazette* 79.3 (June 2016): 219-244.
- Al-Ibia, Salim E. "Islam and Terrorism in Post 9/11th Literature." *Studies in Literature and Language* 10. 2 (2015): 19-25.
- Altwaiji, Mubarak. "Post 9/11 American Novel: Political Orientations in Representing Arabs." *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 22.1 (2019): 63-77.
- Al-Quaderi, Golam G., and Habibullah. "Islam and Edward Said: An Overview." *Journal of Postcolonial Cultures and Societies* 4.4 (2013): 37-56.
- Ajala, Imene. "Muslims in France and Great Britain: Issues of Securitization, Identities and Loyalties Post 9/11." *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 34.2 (2014): 123-133.
- Alim, Eray. "Sovereign Power, Disciplinary Power and Biopower: How to Make Sense of Foucault's Conceptualization of Power Mechanism?" *International Journal of Economics and Administrative Researches* 2.1 (2019): 13-24.
- Anushiravani, Alireza, and Abolfazl Khademi. "Representation of Islam in Post 9/11 English Novels." *Research Journal of Language, Literature and Humanities* 2.8 (August 2015): 1-13.
- Băllan, Sergiu. "M. Foucault's View on Power Relations." *Cogito. Multidisciplinary Research Journal* 2 (2010): 55-61.
- Bird, Benjamin. "History, Emotion, and the Body: Mourning in Post-9/11 Fiction." *Literature Compass* 4.3 (2007): 561-575.
- Büyükgebiz, Mustafa. "How the Enemy Has Changed: Islamophobia and Post 9/11 Syndrome in John Le Carre's Novel *A Most Wanted Man*." *Sayı* 25 (2016): 228-235.

WORKS CITED

- Considine, Craig. "The Racialization of Islam in the United States: Islamophobia, Hate Crimes, and 'Flying while Brown'." *Religions* 8.165 (2017): 1-19.
- Diaconu, Mircea A. "Truth and Knowledge in Postmodernism." *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 137 (2014) : 165-169.
- Foucault, Michel. "The Subject and Power." *Critical Inquiry* 8.4 (Summer 1982): 777-795.
- Fu, Meiling. "Textuality of History and Historicity of Text: New Historical Analysis of Ian McEwan's *Black Dogs*." *English Language and Literature Studies* 6.3 (2016): 98-102.
- Gheorghiu, Oana-Celiaă. "The Ultimate Other of the 21st Century: The Muslim Terrorist in the Mass-Media and Contemporary." *CCI* 3 (2014): 1299-1308.
- Hodge, David R., Tarek Zidan, and Altaf Husain. "The Islamic Community in Post-9/11 America: Which Muslims are Likely to Report Being Called Offensive Names?" *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought* 36.1-2 (2017): 117-132.
- Lugones, Maria. "Multiculturalism and Publicity." *Hypatia* 15.3 (Summer 2000):175-181.
- .. "On Complex Communication." *Hypatia* 21.3 (Summer 2006): 76-85.
- .. "Toward a Decolonial Feminism." *Hypatia* 25.4 (Fall 2010): 742-759.
- .. "Musing: Reading the Nondiasporic from within Diasporas." *Hypatia* 29.1 (Winter 2014): 18-22.
- Ma, Li. "Indeterminacy in Postmodern Fiction." *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 4.6 (November 2013): 1338-1342.
- Maboloc, Christopher R. "Consumerism and the Post-9/11 Paranoia: Michel Foucault on Power, Resistance, and Critical Thought." *Philosophia* 44 (2016):143–154.
- McFadden, Ronan. "The Reliability of the Narrator in Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children* and Gabriel Garcia Marquez's *One Hundred Years of Solitude*." *Opticon*1826 5 (Autumn 2008): 1-10.

WORKS CITED

- McWeeny, Jen. "Liberating Anger, Embodying Knowledge: A Comparative Study of Maria Lugones and Zen Master Hakuin." *Hypatia* 25.2 (Spring 2010): 295-315.
- Moore, Ashley. "American Muslim Minorities: The New Human Rights Struggle." *Human Rights & Human Welfare* (2010): 91-99.
- Moreland, J.P. "Truth, Contemporary Philosophy, and the Postmodern Turn." *JETS* 48.1 (March 2005): 77-88.
- Moya, Paula M. L. Rev. of *Pilgramages/Peregrinajes: Theorizing Coalition against Multiple Oppressions*, by María Lugones. *Hypatia* 21.3 (Summer 2006): 197-202.
- Mulley, D.V. "Modern and Post-modern British Literature." India: Shivaji University Press, 2012.
- Mydin, Raihanah M., Ruzy Hashim, and Noraini Yusof. "Islamophobia and Muslim Minorities in Post 9/11 Women's Fiction." *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*. Spec. Issue of *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 1 (2015): 108-117.
- Naseem, Azra. "The Literal Truth about Terrorism: An Analysis of Post-9/11 Popular US Non-Fiction Books on Terrorism." *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 5.3 (December 2012): 455-467.
- Nath, Shanjendu. "The Concept of Reality from Postmodern Perspectives." *Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research* 3.5 (2014): 26-30.
- Ngoshi, Hazel Tafadzwa. "'The Historicity of Texts and the Textuality of History': A Note on Why Reading Zimbabwean Autobiography Should Be Historicised" *Imbizo* 6.1 (2015): 12-21.
- Nimmer, Livio. "De-Contextualization in the Terrorism Discourse: A Social Constructionist View." *ENDC Proceedings* 14 (2011): 223-240.

WORKS CITED

- Polonska-Kimunguyi, Eva, and Marie Gillespie. "Terrorism Discourse on French International Broadcasting: France 24 and the Case of Charlie Hebdo Attacks in Paris." *European Journal of Communication* 31.5 (2016): 568-583.
- Potgieter, Ferdinand, and Johannes Van der Walt. "Postmodern Relativism and the Challenge to Overcome the 'Value-Vacuum'." *Stellenbosch Theological Journal* 1.1 (2015): 235–254.
- Prinsloo, Christiaan. "Reality in Dutch Novels: Developing a Postmodern Literary-Based Ontology." *Journal of Literature and Art Studies* 5.10 (October 2015): 807-819.
- Raj, Prayer E. "Fashioning Text and Context: A Study on New Historicism." *LangLit* 2.1 (August 2015) :212-216.
- Rane, Halim, and Mohamad Abdalla. "Mass Media Islam: The Impact of Media Imagery on Public Opinion." *Australian Journalism Review* 30.1 (n.d.): 39-49.
- Roberts, Marc. "The production of the Psychiatric Subject: Power, Knowledge and Michel Foucault." *Nursing Philosophy* 6 (2005): 33-42.
- Roelofs, Monique. "Navigating Frames of Address: Maria Lugones on Language, Bodies, Things, and Places." *Hypatia* 31.2 (Spring 2016): 370-387.
- Rouse, Joseph. "Power/Knowledge." *Division I Faculty Publications* 34 (2005): 1-20.
- Saba, Fatima. "Who Counts as a Muslim? Identity, Multiplicity and Politics." *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 31.3 (2011): n. pag.
- Salman, Volha K. "Understanding Post-Postmodernism." *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 23 (2009) : 179-194.
- Santini, Sylvano, and Roxanne Lapidus. "Michel Foucault: Literature and the Arts: A Report from the Colloquium at Cerisy-la-Salle, June 23-30, 2001." *SubStance* 31.1 (2002): 77-84.
- Serdaroğlu, Duygu. "A New Historicist Approach to Kazuo Ishiguro's *When We Were Orphans*" *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences* 16.3 (2017): 785-795.

WORKS CITED

- Shafique, Muhammad, and Muhammad Javed Akhtar. "Limiting the Authority of Historical Knowledge': Postmodern Critique of 'Historicism' and 'History'" *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences* 32.1 (2012):137-146.
- Shapiro, Ester R. Rev. of *Pilgrimages/Peregrinajes: Theorizing Coalition against Multiple Oppressions*, by Maria Lugones. *NWSA* 17.2 (Summer 2005): 233-235.
- Sheeba. "Postmodern literature: Practices and Theory." *Excellence International Journal of Education and Research* 4.3 (March 2017): 181-190.
- Sian, Katy, Ian Law, and S. Sayyid. "The Media and Muslims in the UK." *Ethnicity and Racism Studies* (March 2012): 229-272.
- Smith, Christopher. "Anti-Islamic Sentiment and Media Framing during the 9/11 Decade." *Journal of Religion and Society* 15 (2013): 1-15.
- Szostak, Rick. "Modernism, Postmodernism, and Interdisciplinarity." *Issues in Integrative Studies* 25 (2007): 32-83.
- Taleb-Khyar, Mohamed B. "Literature in Michel Foucault's Writings." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies* 1.2 (Spring 2000): 185-196.
- Terman, Rochelle. "Islamophobia and Media Portrayals of Muslim Women: A Computational Text Analysis of U.S. News Coverage." *International Studies Quarterly* 61.3 (November 2017): 489-502.
- Veenstra, Jan R. "The New Historicism of Stephen Greenblatt: On Poetics of Culture and the Interpretation of Shakespeare." *History and Theory* 34.3 (October 1995): 174-198.
- Woermann, Minka. "Interpreting Foucault: An Evaluation of a Foucauldian Critique of Education." *South African Journal of Education* 32 (2012): 111-120.
- Yerli, Kenan. "On Deconstruction and New Historicism." *Journal of Turk and Islam World Social Studies* 4.13 (2017): 60-64.
- Yusof, Sofia H., et al. "The Framing of International Media on Islam and Terrorism." *European Scientific Journal* 9.8 (March 2013): 104-121.

WORKS CITED

Zyl, Susan V., and Ulrike Kistner. "Introduction: Literature and Art as Diagnosis and Dissent in the Work of Michel Foucault." *JLS/TLW* 22.3-4 (December 2006): 200-210.

Theses and Dissertations

Ahlin, Martin, and Nicklas Carler. "Media and the Muslims: A thesis on media framing & priming in Argentina." Diss. West University, 2011.

Bendfeld, Mary A. "Conflicted Identities: The Challenge of Maria Lugones to Theories of Oppression." Diss. Dalhousie University, 2000.

Cvek, Sven. "9/11: Event, Trauma, Nation, Globalization." Diss. Zagreb University, 2009.

Gheorghiu, Oana-Celia. "Literature, Politics and the Media. Anglo-American Representation of 9/11." Diss. Galati University, 2016.

"Islamophobia and the Media: The portrayal of islam since 9/11 and an analysis of the Danish Cartoon Controversy in South Africa." Diss. Stellenbosch University, 2008.

Kervinen, Jaana. "The Question of Truth: Postmodernism in Brandon Sanderson's *Alcatraz* Series." Diss. Tampere University, 2013.

King, Conor. "Cultural Context: An Argument for New Historicism over Postmodernism in Analyzing Popular Literature." Diss. John Carroll University, 2018.

Rahman, Hisham T. "A Study from a New Historicist Approach of Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman*." Diss. Middle East University, 2016.

Rottier, Aneta. "The Branding of Arab Muslims in the U.S. after 9/11 Religion as a New Dimension of Differentiation." Diss. 2016.

U.R. Anusha. "Paradigms of Power Subversion: A Comparative Study of the New Historicist Fiction of Rushdie and Tharoor." Diss. Pondicherry University, 2006.

Zakiuddin, Almas. "'Modernizing' Islam: The Imam Discourse in Bangladesh." Diss. British Columbia University, 2012.

WORKS CITED

Webliography

Proceedings

Chang, Yi-Ting, et al. 'Feminism, Intersectionality, Decolonialism: The Work of Maria

Lugones.' Towards Decolonial Feminisms: A Conference Inspired by the Work of Maria Lugones. May 2018. Penn State University.

Chokr, Nader N. 'Foucault on Power and Resistance: Another Take --Toward a Post-postmodern Political Philosophy.' Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Society for European Philosophy. Aug. 2004. Greenwich University, UK.

Pritam, Thakur. 'Tharoor's *The Great Indian Novel* as a Postmodernist Text.' Proceedings of National Seminar on Postmodern Literary Theory and Literature. Jan. 2012. Nanded, India.

Somatkar, B. W. 'Postmodernism.' Proceedings of National Seminar on Postmodern Literary Theory and Literature. Jan. 2012. Nanded, India.

Wakchaure, Suresh. 'What is Postmodernism?' Proceedings of National Seminar on Postmodern Literary Theory and Literature. Jan. 2012. Nanded, India.

Other Electronic Sources

Allen, Chris. "A Review of the Evidence Relating to the Representation of Muslims and Islam in the British media." Unpublished paper, 2012.

"Foucault: Power Is Everywhere." *Powercube*. N.d. Retrieved from:

<https://www.powercube.net/other-forms-of-power/foucault-power-is-everywhere/>. 20 Apr. 2019.

Lyslo. "Curdling Logic in Feminist Scientific Inquiry." Unpublished essay, n.d.

WORKS CITED

Mambrol, Nasrullah. "The Textuality of History and the Historicity of Texts." *Literary*

Theory and Criticism. N.d. Retrieved from <https://literariness.org/2016/10/17/the-textuality-of-history-and-the-historicity-of-texts/>. 18 Jan. 2020.

"New Historicism, Cultural Studies." *OWL*. N.d. Retrieved from:

https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/subject_specific_writing/writing_in_literature/literary_theory_and_schools_of_criticism/new_historicism_cultural_studies.html. 10 Jan. 2020.

"On the Notion of Truth: From Modernism to Postmodernism." Unpublished paper, n.d.

Sørensen, Mathias K. "Foucault on Power Relations." 2014. Retrieved from:

http://www.irenees.net/bdf_fiche-notions-242_fr.html. 25 Aug. 2019.

"Technologies of the Self." Unpublished paper, n.d.

Whisnant, Clayton. "Foucault & Discourse." Unpublished essay, n.d.

Appendices

APPENDICES

Appendix 01: Linda-Jamilah Kolocotronis Biography and Summary of her novel *Innocent People* (2003)

Biography

Linda-Jamilah Kolocotronis (b.1956) is an American Muslim writer, of Greek origin, who is known for her Islamic themes. She wrote several significant works of fiction such as *Innocent People* (2003) and the *Echoes Series* (2006). Her only non-fiction work is entitled *Islamic Jihad: A Historical Perspective* (1990).

Summary

Kolocotronis' *Innocent People* was published after September 11th, attacks on the World Trade Center. This novel mainly deals with some Muslim families, their daily struggles after the attacks, psychological state, and the crimes targeted against them because of their religious beliefs. Apparently, Kolocotronis produced this work as a reaction to the negative associations related to Muslims.

APPENDICES

Appendix 02: Biography of Amy Waldman and Summary of her Novel *The Submission* (2011)

Biography

Amy Waldman (b. 1969) is a famous American author and journalist. She worked as a reporter in the New York Times. Her most important work is *The Submission* (2011). She was awarded the Berlin prize 2010. In addition to that, she received several awards after publishing this novel. Some of them include: *Entertainment Weekly's* Favorite Novel of 2011 and Amazon Best Books of the Month, August 2011, and others.

Summary

Waldman's *The Submission*, it revolves around the struggles of a Muslim American whose name is Mohammad Khan. The latter has been selected, anonymously, as the one who will design the World Trade Center memorial after 9/11 attacks. This novelist, then, depicts the reactions and debates of the American citizens as well as media soon after their realization that the winner is a Muslim.

ABSTRACT

Throughout history, Islam has been perceived as a religion of terror and violence. Recently, in the wake of September 11th attacks, this discourse has been reinforced. In the literary sphere, a large corpus of textual representation of this horrific incident sought to depict this event's impact on the country and its population. Several novelists supported Islam's perception in the Western mind while other voices, including Muslim as well as non-Muslim ones, contributed through giving a voice to the "enemy" and depicted Islam and Muslim characters positively. The purpose of the present study, then, is to provide evidence that both of Linda-Jamilah Kolocotronis and Amy Waldman portray Muslim characters' efforts to resist the distorted image they are associated with in their works *Innocent People* (2003) and *The Submission* (2011), respectively; pinpointing the strategies Muslim characters rely on in order to resist the hegemonic discourse of Islam as a religion of terror. In order to reach this aim, the researcher will follow Michel Foucault's and Maria Lugones' models which would help in analyzing Muslim characters' resistance and attempt to prove their innocence and undermine their constructed image. Moreover, the present study is an attempt to prove that both novelists highlight the subjectivity of truth and history through providing readers with a different version of Muslims' reality and opening their eyes to a different interpretation of history. To this effect, this theoretical and analytical study is carried out.

Key words: discourse, resistance, truth, subjectivity, Foucault, Lugones, Muslim characters

RESUME

L'Islam a été perçu, à travers l'histoire, comme une religion de terreur et de violence. Ce trait a été renforcé par les attaques du 11 septembre. Dans la sphere littéraire, un large éventail de textes abordant ce terrible événement ont vu le jour, mettant la lumière sur son impact sur le pays et sa population. Nombre de romanciers ont renforcé la perception de l'Islam par le monde occidental, alors que d'autres voix de musulmans et de non musulmans se sont élevées pour donner la parole à "l'ennemi" et donner une mauvaise image du musulman. Le but de notre étude est de présenter les preuves que Linda-Jamilah Kolocotronis et Amy Waldman ont apporté pour rectifier l'image faussée du musulman, à travers leurs ouvrages respectifs *Innocent People* (2003) et *The Submission* (2011), dans lesquels les romancières ont exposé différentes stratégies visant à aider les musulmans à résister à l'hégémonie du discours sur l'Islam entant que religion de terreur. Afin d'atteindre cet objectif, nous allons étudier les modèles de Michel Foucault et Maria Lugones qui nous aiderons à analyser la résistance du personnage musulman et comment prouver son innocence. Cette étude tentera de dévoiler comment les deux romancières ont mis la lumière sur la subjectivité de la vérité et de l'histoire en fournissant aux lecteurs différentes versions de la réalité des musulmans et d'avoir une autre interprétation de cette même histoire. C'est à cette tâche que s'attellera notre étude théorique et analytique.

Mots clés: discours, résistance, vérité, subjectivité, Foucault, Lugones, personnages musulmans

ملخص

انتشرت على مر التاريخ فكرة أن الإسلام دين رعب وعنف. هذه النظرة تعززت مؤخراً مع هجمات الحادي عشر سبتمبر. هذه الأحداث تناولها الفضاء الأدبي عبر نصوص عالجت هذه الأحداث المروعة ومدى أثرها على البلد وشعبه. هناك الكثير من الروائيين الذين دعموا هذا التصور في عقول الشعوب الغربية، في حين تعالت أصوات المسلمين وغير المسلمين لدعم "العدو" والشخصيات المسلمة. تهدف هذه الدراسة لتقديم الأدلة على أن كلا من ليندا جميلة كولوكوترونيس وأمي والدمان ساهمتا في تصوير الشخصيات المسلمة وجهودها في مقاومة الصورة في روايتي شعب بريء (2003) والتسليم (2011) التي تضمنت استراتيجيات الشخصيات المسلمة في مقاومتها للخطاب السائد عن الإسلام بصفته دين رعب. من أجل بلوغ هذا الهدف، سنعتمد في بحثنا على نماذج ميشال فوكو وماريا لوغونس لتحليل مقاومة الشخصية المسلمة وسعيها في إثبات براءتها. علاوة على ذلك، ستعتمد هذه الدراسة إلى رصد جهود الروائيتين فيما يتعلق بموضوعية الحقيقة والتاريخ من خلال تزويد القارئ بنظرة مغايرة لحقيقة المسلم وإثراء معرفته بقراءة مختلفة للتاريخ. لهذا الغرض، قمنا بهذه الدراسة النظرية والتحليلية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الخطاب، المقاومة، الحقيقة، الذاتية، فوكو، لوغونس، الشخصيات المسلمة

