THE POLITICS OF MIMESIS IN LITERARY WORKS REPRESENTING CONTEMPORARY CONFLICTS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELUCTANT FUNDAMENTALIST AND THE ARAB-ISRAELI COOKBOOK

Thesis submitted to the

Institute of Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

English Language and Literature

by

Sıddıka AŞIK

Fatih University

July 2010

© Sıddıka AŞIK

All Rights Reserved, 2010

For all those who seek peace

APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Sıddıka AŞIK
Institute: Institute of Social Sciences
Department: English Language and Literature
Thesis Subject: The Politics of Mimesis in Literary Works Representing Contemporary Conflicts: An Analysis of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook*
Thesis Date: July 2010

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Visam MANSUR
Head of Department

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Mohamed BAKARI
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Mohamed BAKARI ……………………….

Prof. Visam MANSUR ……………………….

Assist. Prof. Cemal KARAATA
……………………….

It is approved that this thesis has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences.

Assoc. Prof. Mehmet KARAKUYU
Director

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

1. The material included in this thesis has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.

2. The advanced study in the English Language and Literature graduate program of which this thesis is part has consisted of:

i) Research Methods courses both in the undergraduate and graduate programs.

ii) English literature as well as American literature including novel, poetry, and drama studies, a comparative approach to world literatures, and examination of several literary theories as well as critical approaches which have contributed to this thesis in an effective way.

iii) The thesis is composed of main sources including one novel and one drama discussed in comparison; and the secondary sources, particularly scholarly articles from a variety of journals and theoretical books.

Sıddıka AŞIK

July, 2010

ABSTRACT

Sıddıka AŞIK **June 2010**

THE POLITICS OF MIMESIS IN LITERARY WORKS REPRESENTING CONTEMPORARY CONFLICTS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELUCTANT FUNDAMENTALIST AND THE ARAB-ISRAELI COOKBOOK

This thesis firstly investigates the controversial meanings and discussions attributed to the term - mimesis starting from the ancient times focusing on the recent ones. It further explores how difficult and usually problematic it is to capture reality and represent it in texts in a globalizing postmodern and postcolonial world. Starting with Plato and Aristotle's understanding of mimesis, the thesis continues with Edward W. Said's and Erich Auerbach's humanistic approaches. Said's arguments in *Orientalism* about the representation of the Orient, Homi K. Bhabha's views on mimicry, culture and postcolonial subversive narratives along with Michel Foucault's discursive analysis form the theoretical basis of this thesis.

The aim of this thesis is basically to discuss the politics - the ins and outs - of mimesis as (re)presentation of reality in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007) and *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* (2004) by using postcolonial and cultural theory. Both the texts are about contemporary conflicts - 9/11 and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, respectively. However, while the first one as a novel in an extended monologue has a representational mode of mimesis, the latter as a documentary theater has a presentational one.

After analyzing some excerpts from both the texts generally in the first chapter, following Auerbach's model in *Mimesis*, how (re)presentation itself, along with the modes of it, constructs discourses and counter-discourses is shown by later analyzing the texts in detail. Finally, focusing on the cultural (re)presentations in the third chapter, the thesis comes to the conclusion that contrary to Mohsin Hamid's subversive narrative structure and representation in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, presentational technique used in the postmodern documentary theatre *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* offers a more humanistic and inclusive discourse rather than a political one.

Key words:

Mimesis, Discourse, Counter-narrative, Cultural (re)presentations, Identity, Documentary Theatre, Humanism, Orientalism

KISA ÖZET

Sıddıka AŞIK **June 2010**

GÜNCEL ÇATIŞMALARI YANSITAN EDEBİ ESERLERDE MIMESIS POLİTİKALARI: THE RELUCTANT FUNDAMENTALIST VE THE ARAB-ISRAELI COOKBOOK'UN BİR ANALİZİ

Bu tez, ilk olarak, mimesis (kopyalama, yansıtma) kavramına atfedilmiş çelişkili anlam ve tartışmaları eski çağlardan başlayıp yakın tarihlere yoğunlaşarak incelemektedir. Tezde daha sonra, günümüz postkolonyal, postmodern ve globalleşen dünyasında gerçeği yakalamak ve yansıtmanın ne kadar zor ve problemli olduğu tartışılmaktadır. Tez, Platon ve Aristoteles'in mimesis anlayışlarından başlayarak, Edward W. Said ve Erich Auerbach'ın humanistik yaklaşımlarıyla devam etmektedir. Said'in *Orientalism*'deki Orient (Doğulu) yansımaları hakkındaki tezleri, Homi K. Bhabha'nın mimicry, kültür ve postkolonyal karşı-söylev üzerine görüşleriyle birlikte Michel Foucault'un söylev analizi bu tezin teori temelini oluşturmaktadır.

Temelde, bu tezin amacı postkolonyal ve kültürel teori kullanarak *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007) ve *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* (2004)'daki gerçeğin yansıması olan mimesis'in altında yatanları tartışmaktır. Her iki eser de, sırasıyla 9/11 ve Filistin-İsrail olmak üzere, güncel çatışmalarla alakalıdır. Fakat, uzun monolog tarzında bir roman olan birincisi, "yansıtan" (representational) bir mimesis aracına sahipken; belgesel tiyatro olan ikincisi, "sunan" (presentational) bir araca sahiptir.

Birinci bölümde, Auerbach'ın eseri *Mimesis*'deki model takip edilerek bu iki eserden bazı alıntılar genel olarak analiz edildikten sonra, daha sonraki bölümlerde eserlerin detaylı incelenmesiyle, hem yansıtma ((re)presentation) hem de onun araçlarının nasıl söylev ve karşı söylevler oluşturduğu gösterilir. Sonunda, üçüncü bölümde kültürel yansımalara odaklanılarak şu sonuca varılır: Mohsin Hamid'in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*'te kullandığı karşıt (subversive) anlatım stili ve yansıtmasına (representaion) zıt olarak, *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook*'taki sunan (presentational) teknik, politikten ziyade daha humanistik ve kapsayıcıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Mimesis, Söylev, Karşı Söylev, Kültürel Yansımalar, Kimlik, Belgesel Tiyatro, Humanizm, Oryantalizm

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval Page..iv

Author Declarations...v

Abstract...vi

Kısa Özet..viii

Table of Contents..x

Acknowledgements...xi

Introduction...1

CHAPTER 1: The Question of Representation or Mimesis

1.1. The Origins of the Mimesis Problem..7

1.2. Mimesis within the Modern Socio-political Context: A Humanistic Approach: Edward Said and Erich Auerbach...12

1.3. The Case of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook*..32

CHAPTER 2: Representation in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*: Differences Confronted

2.1. The Problem of Mimicry……………………………………………45

2.2. Narrative Matters: Discourses and Counter Discourses…….……………53

CHAPTER 3: Representation or *Presentation* in *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook*: Differences Acknowledged

3.1. Documentary Theatre, (Re)presentation and Reality……………………...74

3.2. Cultural Identities and (Re)presentations: Mediator or Traitor…..……..…90

Conclusion………………………………………………………………..105

Works Cited………………………….…………………………………….109

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Above all, I owe my most special thanks and gratitude to my thesis advisor and professor Prof. Mohamed Bakari, whose intellectual depth and academic discipline have truly inspired me. Without his guidance, trust and encouragements, this thesis would not have been possible.

I would also like to thank my professor, chair and boss Prof. Visam Mansur for always being understanding and for providing me with the time I needed to focus on my research and complete my thesis.

I am also grateful to Assist. Prof. Cemal Karaata for always taking time to talk; for his support and care; and for being my jury member. He has always checked on me in terms of time/needs for the thesis. I hold a high respect for him in that.

In addition, I want to thank my professor Kevin McGinley who handed me *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* at a random coincidence in the hallway one day. I am sure he had/has no idea that the book was going to be part of my thesis and would offer more help had he been at the university this year. Thanks must also go to him and Carl Jeffrey Boon for their reading my thesis book and giving helpful feedback.

I am also thankful to all my other professors at Fatih University, both at undergraduate and graduate levels, whom I cannot all name here. They have laid the foundation and helped me develop critical/analytical skills necessary for this thesis.

The completion of this thesis is also indebted to many friends who always care for and support me. To name a few: Ayla Yağmuroğlu, Tuba Ağkaş, İsmahan Özdemir and my office mate Banu Mertoğlu. I thank them all for their kindness and timely help. I owe thanks to Walt Sims, as well, for the thought-provoking,

insightful and *always* challenging conversations, along with the invaluable cultural exchanges; and certainly, for providing me with numerous books necessary for the thesis.

Finally, my special thanks go to my parents, Refika and Feti Aşık who have shown me the value of being a responsible, loving, driven and compassionate individual. Lastly, I thank my brothers Yavuz and Yalçın for their support and always being there for me, and also, my one-year-old niece, Ebrar, for cheering me up with her sweet first words on the phone. It was a pleasure for me to hear my nephew, Yasir's voice as well. These were greatly relieving breaks from the thesis.

INTRODUCTION

I shall be telling this with a sigh

Somewhere ages and ages hence:

Two roads diverged in a wood, and I--

I took the one less traveled by,

And that has made all the difference.

-Robert Frost "The Road Not Taken" [1]

Difference (or the different) is attractive in rare cases but mostly fearful. It is hardly ever fully embraced; but mostly, forced to be dislocated, alienated or be distant from because; overall, it does always bring forth hardships. The term itself emerges a feeling of complexity, which human beings subconsciously try to stay away from, set limitations to or boundaries around, most of the time. However, in today's gradually more globalizing world and multicultural societies diversity and difference are inevitable realities for human beings to come to face at some point in their lives: by way of representation, if not in reality. That is almost what plays the most part in shaping the world politics today and is the 'alluded' reason of contemporary conflicts or the clash of civilizations. Moreover, many academic disciplines and humanistic fields including cultural and literary studies departments are aware of the new phase of the world today and trying to respond to the demands accordingly. Hence, the question comes readily: how will difference and diversity be handled at such a time: with inclusiveness or exclusiveness? Or will they be (re)presented to bring chaos/conflicts/loss or peace/richness/gain?

[1] <http://www.poets.org/viewmedia.php/prmMID/15717>.

This thesis is generally about the (re)presentation of reality; specifically in literary texts in such a context, that is, literary texts representing contemporary conflicts. Accordingly, it is about the 'politics' of mimesis and the modes of (re)presentation, as it appears in the title. By 'politics' I mean the ins-and-outs of the term, or in other words, the truths/means behind the scenes now that (re)presenting the socio-political realities in this context would predictably be controversial, and most of the time, *political*. Therefore, the aim of this thesis is to examine the modes, practices, and results of (re)presentation in this postcolonial and postmodern context by analyzing the two example texts comparatively: *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007) and *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* (2004).

The first chapter of this thesis starts dealing with the 'origins' of the mimesis 'problem'. I use these terms as the chapter begins with the debate over the term mimesis as a mode of art by the two Ancient Greek philosophers: Aristotle and Plato. While Aristotle celebrates the reason and effect of mimesis (especially in tragedies on the audience), Plato condemns any kind of art; that is, mimesis or diegesis for its immoral effect on the society. Then, I move on to most recent and relevant mimesis discussions in the section entitled "Mimesis within the Modern Socio-political Context: A Humanistic Approach: Edward Said and Erich Auerbach." As humanist scholars as well as modern social and cultural critics, Said and Auerbach have hugely contributed to the question of mimesis as "representation of reality" in literary texts. In this section, I use Edward Said's arguments and theses in *Orientalism* in a large degree for they serve to the overall purpose of this thesis in terms of the representation of the Other. As a firm

advocate of social and cultural diversity and complexity, Said always promotes them and is against the Orientalist discourse/representations in which the 'different' is labeled as the Other or 'they' and attributed all the negatives 'we' are not. He opposes any polarization or fixed essentialist divisions of the colonial discourse; or any stereotypical images of the East by the West. He celebrates differences offering to live with diversity in peace and inclusiveness. Similar to Michel Foucault's emphasis, Said views Orientalism as a discursive construction whose "language and conceptual structure determined both what could be said and what recognized as truth" (Young 74). Said also comments that Foucault's notion of discourse offers an alternative way of thinking about the operations of ideology which Althusser defines as "representation of the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence" (Young 74). What Said values, as the main requirement for the kind of philosophical understanding, is what Auerbach and his predecessors were meaning with and trying to practice: "one that sympathetically and subjectively entered into the life of a written text as seen from the perspective of its time and its author (*eingefühling*)"

> Rather than alienation and hostility to another time and different culture, philosophy as applied to *Weltliteratur* involved a profound humanistic spirit deployed with generosity and, […] hospitality. Thus the interpreter's mind actively makes a place in it for a foreign Other. And this creative making of a place for works that are otherwise alien and distant is the most important facet of the interpreter's philosophical mission. ("Orientalism"xix)

This first chapter is concluded by the section where I analyze excerpts from the opening scenes of the two texts I am going to deal with in terms of the discourse/narrative and the (re)presentation modes in them. This analysis is in a similar format which Auerbach uses in his book *Mimesis* while examining representations of Western realism with rich mingling of forms, languages and styles without much available secondary sources during war in exile in Istanbul, for which Said praises him.

The second chapter "Representation in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*: Differences Confronted" aims to give theoretical background about mimicry and postcolonial discursive analysis of power-knowledge-truth. In "The Problem of Mimicry," I focus on Bhabha's essay "Of Man and Mimicry" in *The Location of Culture* where he defines mimicry as "the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which 'appropriates' the Other as it visualizes power" (122). In the second section, "Narrative Matters: Discourses and Counter Discourses," it is made clear that through subversive postcolonial narrative techniques, the once marginalized becomes the main stream and the once object becomes the subject. There is a role change. Such postcolonial discourses as a resistance to imperialism and its effects celebrate the diversity and hybridity of cultures as a response to the hegemonies; stable and standardized essentialist discourses. Characteristically, it also tries to dismantle such binary oppositions as "us and them," "First World and Third World," "white and black". Chinua Achebe, who, like Said, "explores the essentially Orientalist relationship in which Africa and Africans emerge as a mere backdrop, a 'metaphysical battlefield devoid of all recognizable humanity,'" (Castle 209) asserts in his famous

essay “Colonialist Criticism” that: “[t]o the colonialist mind it was always of the utmost importance to be able to say: ‘I know my natives’, a claim which implied two things at once: (a) that the native was really quite simple and (b) that understanding him and controlling him went hand in hand—understanding being a precondition for control and control constituting adequate proof of understanding” (Ashcroft 58). In this chapter, *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* is analyzed in this respect in detail as it can be said to exemplify the postcolonial practice of subversive narrative in which the differences, power relations and the turn of whom to speak were confronted and controlled by the narrator. Hamid’s work is an extended monologue by the Pakistani narrator which works as a supposedly ‘dialogue’ from one perspective silencing the Other. The reasons and potential repercussions of such a subversive narrative technique in terms of a political and exclusive discourse are attempted to be examined.

Finally, the third chapter of this thesis defines documentary theatre and the modes of representation or *presentation* in it. The raw material of this type of theatre is everyday realities and the process of its staging is examined in the first section of this chapter. Briefly, documentary theatre, with all its thematic and structural elements, provides its readers and audience with vivid representations of the actual experience of the marginalized in contemporary societies. It is the drama of testimony and where one can find the real voices of society in the individual level. Ultimately, this gives an insight to see ‘the larger course of the real happenings’. Verbatim theatre is also away from the sensational stories presented non-stop by the media. As Linda Ben-Zvi suggests, it reflects “in the words of playwright and documentarian Peter Weiss, ‘life as

it is brought to us by the mass media,' while simultaneously critiquing its 'concealment,' 'falsification' of 'reality,' and 'lies' (44). Contrary to the subversive narrative in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* which silences the Other (the American, in this case), all the marginalized in the midst of the Arab-Israeli conflict find voice in *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook*, in which the differences are acknowledged. In the second section of this chapter "Cultural (Re)presentations: Mediator or Traitor", Bhaba's cultural theory and hybridity term is applied. Bhabha elaborates on subverting the narratives of colonial power and dominant cultures. He emphasizes the deconstructive practices of the formerly-excluded subjects as they enter into the mainstream discourse. Hybridity can be seen, in Bhabha's interpretation, as a counter-narrative, a critique of the canon and its exclusion of other narratives. The characters in *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* like Nadia and Fadi as examples to this notion are analyzed in terms of identity politics in the light of Bhabha's theory.

The thesis finally comes to the conclusion that contrary to Mohsin Hamid's subversive narrative structure and representation in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, presentational technique in the postmodern documentary theatre *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* offers a more humanistic and inclusive discourse rather than a political one.

CHAPTER 1

THE QUESTION OF REPRESENTATION OR MIMESIS

"Life is the non-representable origin of representation."

Jacques Derrida

(qtd. in Kottman 81)

1. 1. The Origins of the Mimesis Problem

Representation has *always* been the central concern of art, since ancient times. Mimesis basically stands for the notion that art imitates reality. Or, in a broader definition: "[t]he Greek word mimesis covers both 'imitation' or 'copying' and dramatic and artistic representation in the widest sense" (qtd. in Plato 149). The controversial debate on mimesis or poiesis, the Greek word for 'to re/make, re/produce, re/create re/present', traces back to the classical times. Different views on these terms even constitute the basis of the impending discussion over art between the Classical Greek philosophers, Plato and Aristotle. And, in fact, they explain the distinguishing point between their understanding of art. As Lima puts forward, "this association [between mimesis and representation] dates from ancient thought, and it has served the purpose both of dismissing art as a representation of no more than a world of appearances and opinions (Plato) and of extolling it as the artist's means of representing his "inner light," which corrects nature itself (Plotinus)" (447).

This debate over representation has, in effect, had its influences on and formed the basis of literary criticism as well. The material that constituted the body of theory about literature goes back to these Greek and Latin originals. And, Aristotle's *Poetics* is

considered the earliest work of theory. In spite of its title, as Peter Barry suggests, *Poetics* “is about the nature of literature itself” (21). Philosophers and writers like Aristotle, Plato, Moliere, Shakespeare, Racine, Diderot and Rousseau are known to have applied the mimetic theory of literary criticism to their work and lives. Also, modern thinkers such as Benjamin, Derrida, and Girard have studied again and applied their own ideas to it. Therefore, the mimetic theory can be said to be “the universal foundation of literature and of schools of literary criticism; and the concern for the moral effects of art is often drawn from this theory”. While “the pragmatic school of literary criticism deals with the relationship between text and audience,” the expressive school deals with the relationship between poet and work. The objective school, on the other hand, “emphasizes the integrity of the work itself without considering the audience, poet or external reality”[2].

While Plato and Plotinus focused on both diegesis and mimesis as forms of representation, rejecting and condemning both, Aristotle focused on mimesis celebrating its effect, especially in tragedies. The different views of art between the two Ancient Greek philosophers, Plato and Aristotle, lie in their distinct interpretations of the potential positive or negative causes/consequences of mimesis/representation/imitation.

In the Book 10 of *Republic* which discusses the theory of art, Plato uses the word mimesis to “describe artistic creation as a whole” (421). He explains his rejection of any representation of poets or painters which he views as only secondary reality telling us nothing about real life in general: “‘You know,’ I said, ‘among all the excellent features

[2] <http://www.ehow.com/facts_5761846_mimetic-theory-literary-criticism.html>.

of our ideal state, there's none I rank higher than its treatment of poetry.' 'Why exactly?' 'Because it excluded all dramatic representation'" (Plato 421).

Plato discusses the issues of form as well earlier in Book 3, where mimesis is referred to mean "dramatic as opposed to narrative poetry" (421).

> He classes poetry according to the degree to which it employs what we should call 'direct speech' as opposed to indirect speech and narration. Direct speech involves what he calls 'representation'; that is, it requires the poet or narrator to put himself in the position of the character speaking, think his thoughts, and feel his feelings. (qtd. in Plato 149)

Plato opposes this notion of representation now that he does not want his 'Guardians' to 'deviate' from their own characters by way of representing other characters, specifically bad ones. He disapproves any sense of copying; that is, poiesis in general as the term includes both diegetic and mimetic representation.

> If the discussion seems at times, to us, academic, we should remember that the Greek schoolboy, when reciting Homer, was 'expected to throw himself into the story and deliver the speeches with the tones and gestures of an actor', and that it is to such 'imaginative identification', and therefore to any use of the drama in education that Plato, rightly or wrongly, objects. (qtd. in Plato 149)

Accordingly, Plato even wanted to keep poets out of his Utopian republic because he felt that they and their mimetic representations were a threat to the general morality of the society.

Aristotle, on the other hand, views mimesis as a natural instinct both for the reason and the affect or result of it. Unlike Plato, he is not concerned with a potential moral danger mimesis can have on society. In addition, he thinks that the drive for copying in human beings even exists in childhood. Like many ancient philosophers, Aristotle also focused on the concept of human beings' everlasting desire to observe themselves from a distance. This was the reason why drama, and specifically tragedy, as the specific type of art which (re)produces human life was praised by philosophers like Aristotle. His famous definition of tragedy reads:

> A tragedy, then, is the imitation of an action that is serious and also, as having magnitude, complete in itself; in language with pleasurable accessories, each kind brought in separately in the parts of the play; in the form of action [dramatic], not in a narrative form; with incidents arousing pity and fear, wherewith to accomplish its catharsis of such emotions. (qtd. in Fergusson 61)

As understood from his definition, Aristotle views tragedy as corrective or as an emotional relief. He focuses more on its positive pleasurable emotional effect on the audience. That is why he emphasizes catharsis, pity and fear arisen from tragedy. Also, the pathos (suffering) of the ethos (character) as two of the elements for his perfect structure of tragedy is important in Christian philosophy, too. All in all, Aristotle views imitation or mimesis as an implanted nature of human beings now that the instinctive desire to know and watch ourselves from a distance is imbedded in us according to him.

Here is a well-known passage of Aristotle's *Poetics* about the pleasure resulting from mimesis:

> There are things we see with pain so far as they themselves are concerned but whose images, even when executed in very great detail, we view with pleasure. Such is the case for example with renderings of the least favored animals, or of cadavers established not an idea of correspondence but, instead, an absolute dissimilarity between the horror of the real thing and the pleasure aroused by the mimetic image. (Lima 457)

However, although Aristotle, contrary to Plato, celebrates the mimetic representation and its pleasurable effect on the audience, this might be argued to be problematic because the pleasure taken from others' sufferings brings the issue of *Schadenfreude* to mind. This is originally a German word which is now part of the English lexicon referring to the joy in the sufferings of the other. *Schadenfreude* finds place to be discussed later in this thesis as a strong argument while analyzing the counter discourse in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*.

1. 2. Mimesis within the Modern Socio-political Context: A Humanistic Approach: Edward Said and Erich Auerbach

"'I don't think I understand people very well. I only know whether I like or dislike them'

'Then you are an Oriental.'"

(E. M. Forster 20)

The question of representation or mimesis has existed in the modern world in different and more challenging ways especially since the emergence of post-modern or post-colonial critical theories. If one considers all art, or specifically literature, as a representation of reality, it becomes clear that the debate over mimesis would turn out to be more controversial at a time when the line between reality and representation is thought to be blurring. In this phase of the world, any ideology or stable notion is challenged and enters into the period of 'post' which is more close to refer to something 'beyond or trans-' rather than simply 'after'. Therefore, in order to confront the new controversial socio-political realities - in the period of *postmodernism, postcolonialism, postfeminism*, or *transnationalism, transculturalism, transgender* - contemporary artists resort to new techniques and themes. Moreover, in this new immensely complicated cultural social and political context of the world, "the controversial shiftiness of the prefix 'post'" becomes even more complex; although "there seems to be no other proper name" to define this period according to Homi K. Bhabha in *The Location of Culture* (1). Bhabha, in his introduction to this book, quotes from Martin Heidegger: "[a] boundary is not that at which something stops but, as the Greeks recognized, the

boundary is that from which *something begins its presencing*" (Bhabha, "Location" 1). Heidegger's definition of boundary is similar to Bhabha's 'beyond' in the sense that neither of them connotes an ending or something stable or limited, contrary to the literal sense of boundary. Bhabha, then, begins his work elaborating his notion of the word 'beyond' in *Borders Lives: The Art of The Present:*

> The 'beyond' is neither a new horizon, nor a leaving behind of the past… Beginnings and endings may be the sustaining myths of the middle years; but in the *fin de siècle*, we find ourselves in the moment of transit where space and time cross to produce complex figures of difference and identity, past and present, inside and outside, inclusion and exclusion. For there is a sense of disorientation, a disturbance of direction, in the 'beyond': an exploratory, restless movement caught so well in the French rendition of the words *au-dela* – here and there, on all sides, fort/da, hither and thither, back and forth. (2)

Thus, basically, this period of 'beyond' has no limited fixed definitions or stable directions/locations. It celebrates constant shift; changes; hybridity; and differences. This notion of 'beyond' can be argued to be perfectly applied to "the location of cultures" later in the book.

The theoreticians who basically share such similar viewpoints as Bhabha laid the foundations of post-colonial studies which pinpoint the problems of representation of cultures and identities. In such a period in the globalized world, the representation of the Other, especially the post-colonial cultures, would undoubtedly be problematic and

most of the time politically oriented, reductive, minimalist, or essentialist. Therefore, such theoreticians' resistance against any fixed stable or stereotypical representations would be inevitable. Postcolonial theory evolved as a result of dissatisfaction with the mainstream Western social and literary theories in providing a framework for the analysis of social, political, historical and literary phenomena in postcolonial societies:

> [T]he determining condition of what we refer to as post-colonial cultures is the historical phenomenon of colonialism, with its range of material practices and effects, such as transportation, slavery, displacement, emigration, and racial and cultural discrimination. These material conditions and their relationship to questions of ideology and representation are at the heart of the most vigorous debates in recent postcolonial theory. (Ashcroft 7)

As inferred from this passage, such material realities and their relationship to ideology and representation play a pivotal role in characterizing postcolonial discourses. Moreover, Peter Barry maintains that "one significant effect of postcolonial criticism is to further undermine the universalist claims once made on behalf of literature by liberal humanist critics" (192). He talks about the application of such a notion to the understanding of "great literature." According to Barry, if one is to claim that great literature has a "timeless" and "universal" importance, s/he accordingly demotes or disregards "cultural, social, regional, and national differences in experience and outlook, preferring instead to judge all literature by a single, supposedly 'universal' standard" (192). After giving the example of Hardy's novels, Barry indicates that "they are just novels, but built into this attitude is the assumption that this way of writing and

representing reality is the unquestioned norm, so that the situations depicted can stand for all possible forms of human interaction" (193). He continues by explaining how and why this 'universalism' is rejected by postcolonial criticism; "whenever a universal signification is claimed for a work, then, white, Eurocentric norms and practices are being promoted by a sleight of hand to this elevated status, and all others correspondingly relegated to subsidiary, marginalized roles" (Barry 193).

Edward W. Said, who is introduced as "one of the most influential practitioners of colonial discourse analysis and the critical practice of understanding and countering the discursive hegemony of imperial cultures" (Castle 26), is best known for his widely read book *Orientalism* which appeared in 1978. *Orientalism* is basically about the representation of 'the Orient reality' as a creation of the Western intellectual and imperialist thought. As a European cultural tradition, Orientalism is defined in the book as referring to a "particular and long-standing way of identifying [and therefore, representing] the East as the 'Other' and inferior to the West" (Barry 193), which is the very idea Said upbraids in *Orientalism*. Barry regards *Orientalism* as "a specific exposé of the Eurocentric universalism which takes for granted both the superiority of what is European or Western, and the inferiority of what is not" (193).

Said in *Orientalism* also harshly opposes what linguists call the binary opposition created by some Western scholars as well as any "hard-and-fast distinctions" like "East" and "West". According to him, channeling thought into a West or an East compartment is the tendency "right at the center of Orientalist theory, practice, and values found in the West, the sense of Western power over the Orient is taken for granted as having the

status of scientific truth" (Said, "Orientalism" 46). He accuses Balfour and Henry Kissinger of doing this frequently. Later in the book, as an example, he makes a criticism of Kissinger's method in one of his essays entitled "Domestic Structure and Foreign Policy" in this sense of binary opposition:

> [H]e shows that there are two styles in foreign policy (the prophetic and the political), two types of technique, two periods, and so forth. When at the end of the historical part of his argument he is brought face to face with the contemporary world, he divides it accordingly into two halves, the developed and the developing countries. The first half, which is the West, "is deeply committed to the notion that the real world is external to the observer, that knowledge consists of recording and classifying data – the more accurately the better." (Said, "Orientalism" 46-47)

Edward Said questions the validity of this distinction or division. Hence, he finds Kissinger's division of the contemporary world into two halves identical with the orthodox one made by Orientalists, who separate Orientals from Westerners. He also links the lines drawn by Kissinger to the ones drawn by Balfour and Cromer adding, yet, that sixty or more years have intervened between him and "the British imperialists." Then, he makes a more general comparison emphasizing the dangerous and essentialist discourse of Kissinger lying under the ostensibly positive sounding one:

> [L]ike Orientalism's distinction Kissinger's is not value free, despite the apparent neutrality of his tone. Thus, such words as "prophetic," "accuracy," "internal," "empirical reality," "order" are scattered throughout his

> description, and they characterize either attractive, familiar, desirable virtues or menacing, peculiar, disorderly defects. (Said, "Orientalism" 47)

Here, Said criticizes Kissinger for definitely creating a "virtues vs. defects" binary opposition and continues:

> Both the traditional Orientalist […] and Kissinger conceive of the difference between cultures, first, as creating a battlefront that separates them, and second, as inviting the West to control, contain, and otherwise govern (through superior knowledge and commodating power) the Other. ("Orientalism" 47-48)

In complete contrast to Bhabha's understanding of 'beyond' and Heidegger's 'boundary' as introduced above, Kissinger's world is shown to be separated by real or imaginary boundaries and binary oppositions.

This quote also reinforces another central argument of *Orientalism* which is first construction then controlling of the Other by the West through representation and creating binary oppositions. Said argues that Orientalism helps the West to define its own self-image as well. Actually, Orientalism has less to do with the Orient than it does with the West itself. "The construction of identity in every age and every society involves establishing opposites and "Others". This happens because the development and maintenance of every culture require the existence of another different and competing *alter ego*"[3]. This Other is called the "Orient" by the West and the East becomes the different and competing alter ego for the West, through which the West

[3] <http://www.travelbrochuregraphics.com/extra/orientalism_revisited.htm>.

defines itself. By way of this, according to Said, the West turns out to have all opposite characteristics of the East. As long as the East is defined with negative images, the West is going to be described as the opposite of it; in other words, with all positive and good images.

However, the 'real' Orient gets lost in Orientalism. It becomes nothing more than a signifier; the signified of which is arbitrary. The reason behind the creation of this binary opposition reminds one of Ferdinand de Saussure's concept which explains the meanings of words in their relation to the other words. The East emerges as a constructed image which is created by the West. It is emphasized by Said in *Orientalism* that East-West distinctions are completely man made, both in identity and geography. The West defines the East by using its power by which it can set up a strong domination over the East. The East is described as the "Other" by the West because the West has the aim to describe itself as the positive one which is the opposite of the Other or the negative one. The East is described as uncivilized because the West is going to be defined as the civilized part of the world. The East is described as barbarous and morally corrupted because the West is going to be defined as modern and moral. Such creations of binary oppositions constitute the central arguments in *Orientalism* bringing light to problematic representations.

Said is aware of the danger of the construction of such a 'reality.' He occasionally voices his worry that what we call reality is actually a representation of reality. This idea of representation resembles the famous "Ceci n'est pas une pipe" image because it is actually not a pipe but a representation of a pipe. Simon de Beauvoir

has a similar argument in *The Second Sex* concerning gender roles: "Representation of the world, like the world itself, is the work of men; they describe it from their own point of view, which they confuse with absolute truth (De Beauvoir 143). De Beauvoir also asserts:

> History has shown us that men have always kept in their hands all concrete powers; since the earliest days of the patriarchate they have thought best to keep woman in a state of dependence; their codes of law have been set up against her; and thus she has been definitely established as the Other. (139)

Women, in her book, become passive objects subordinated controlled and overpowered by the active subject – man just like the example of the Orient and the West in Said's *Orientalism*. Unlike Hegel, Jean-Paul Sartre's argument about the Other is similar, as well. He emphasizes an "ontological separation" between consciousness bound within a historical relationship, which entails that the subject constitutes itself as the subject "by conceiving itself as not the Other".

> For Sartre, the Other transcends me and places restrictions on my freedom, and I must therefore negate and transcend the Other by making him or her into an object. The Self-Other relation in early Sartrian philosophy is therefore, as Lundgren Gothlin argues, characterized by a double negation: the Self negates itself as not the Other and negates the Other as the object to be transcended. The Self is henceforth condemned to conflict with no room for recognition of, and reciprocity with, the Other. (Tidd 164)

In Sartre's philosophy, known to have deeply influenced Beauvoir's ideas, the Self-Other relationship is based upon transcending the Other to have total freedom. By having the total freedom and transcendence, the Self restricts the Other's freedom.

To come back to the main "representation" question in the title of this section of the thesis, it might be helpful to quote from Said again as he defines and puts forward his understanding of this clearly, in *Orientalism*:

> The representations of Orientalism in European culture amount to what we can call a discursive consistency, one that has not only history but material (and institutional) presence to show for itself. As I said in connection with Renan, such a consistency was a form of cultural praxis, a system of opportunities for making statements about the Orient. (273)

Said clarifies it again that he does not believe in an existence of Oritental essence; therefore, his main point about this system of "discursive consistency" is not that it is a misrepresentation of some so-called Oriental essence. However, he believes that it is a form of cultural praxis and works for a purpose and with a tendency:

> My whole point about this system is not that it is a misrepresentation of some Oriental essence — in which I do not for a moment believe — but that it operates as representations usually do, for a purpose, according to a tendency, in a specific historical, intellectual, and even economic setting. (Said, "Orientalism" 273)

In other words, "representations have purposes" according to Said:

> they are effective much of the time, they accomplish one or many tasks. Representations are formations, or as Roland Barthes has said of all the operations of language, they are deformations. The Orient as a representation in Europe is formed - or deformed – out of a more and more specific towards a geographical region called "the East." (Said, "Orientalism" 273).

With Said's definition of representations as "formations or deformations for a purpose with a tendency" in mind, I would like to draw attention to the humanistic attributes Edward Said gives to his work in *Orientalism* now that it will also serve to the overall goal of this thesis. Said puts forward his purpose in *Orientalism* in his 2003 Preface as such:

> My idea in *Orientalism* is to use humanistic critique to open up the fields of struggle, to introduce a longer sequence of thought and analysis to replace the short burst of polemical, thought-stopping fury that so imprison us in labels and antagonistic debate whose goal is a belligerent collective identity rather than understanding and intellectual exchange. (xvii)

He continues to explain what he means by humanism, "which is a word he continues to use stubbornly in spite of the scornful dismissal of the term by sophisticated post-modern critics" (xvii). He focuses on the dynamics and dimensions of the word and gives detailed definitions in one of his latest books *Humanism and Democratic Criticism* where he attributes one chapter to his article "Humanism's Sphere."

> By humanism I mean first of all attempting to dissolve Blake's mind-for'd manacles so as to be able to use one's mind historically and rationally for the

> purposes of reflective understanding and genuine disclosure. Moreover, humanism is sustained by a sense of community with other interpreters and other societies and periods: strictly speaking, therefore, there is no such thing as an isolated humanist. (Said, "Orientalism" xvii)

This, as well as the next quote, goes along with Said's constant dismissal of isolated or homogenous cultures, politics, and identities or any reductive distinctions as well. He continues his argument with:

> This is to say that every domain is linked to every other one, and that nothing that goes on in our world has ever been isolated and pure of any outside influence. The disheartening part is that the more the critical study of culture shows us that this is the case, the less influence such a view seems to have, and the more territorially reductive polarizations like "Islam v. the West" seem to conquer. ("Orientalism" xvii)

Thus, the whole *Orientalism* can be said to be about the scholars' and intellectuals' "incumbent" responsibility to complicate and/or dismantle "the reductive formulae" and to broaden the field of discussion "not to set limits in accord with the prevailing authority" (Said "Orientalism" xvii). This is not to say Said does promote never speaking about the issues of injustice and suffering; but he rather offers to do so "always within a context that is amply situated in history, culture and socio-economic reality" (xviii).

In this respect, Said highly praises the German philologist, comparative scholar and literary critic Erich Auerbach's exceptional book *Mimesis: The Representation of*

Reality in Western Literature. Auerbach describes the subject of this book in the Epilogue as "the interpretation of reality through literary representation or 'imitation'" and adds that his original "starting point is Plato's discussion in Book 10 of the *Republic* – mimesis ranking third after truth - in conjunction with Dante's assertion that in the *Commedia* he presented true reality" (554). He talks about a developed modern realism in increasingly rich forms, "in keeping with the constantly changing and expanding reality of modern life". In *Mimesis*, Auerbach examines famous works from different time periods in every chapter in an essayistic style of criticism following approximately the same method: he first quotes a one or two page passage from the original texts and then analyzes the representation of reality in it. He starts with episodes from Homer and the Bible and concludes with the opening passage of Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*. Thus, Auerbach covers some representational texts from a wide variety of periods till the modernist movement in Western literature commenting on "the relationship between the rhetorical style of the passage and its sociopolitical context, a fear that Auerbach manages with a minimum of fuss and with virtually no learned references" (Said, "Humanism" 87). The period Auerbach wrote *Mimesis* was also controversial because of the world wars and when one considers that he was in exile in Istanbul in this writing process. Auerbach acknowledges that he had no access to most other sources than the primary ones he deals with in the book. He is appreciated by Said, who also wrote an introduction to *Mimesis*, for acknowledging this fact about the writing process of the book.

Auerbach is highly regarded for his works in many occasions by Said and especially for *Mimesis* due to his never losing sight of the original ideas of separation and mingling of styles in the composition of the book. He counts Auerbach as one of the great Twentieth Century Romance philologists who had a supremely creative contribution to his work as well as some German thinkers like Goethe, Humboldt, Dilthey, Nietzsche and Gadamer. Said, also in his 2003 Preface to *Orientalism,* talks about how he regards philology as the most basic and creative of interpretive arts even though to the young generation, it suggests something "impossibly antiquarian and musty:"

> It is exemplified for me most admirably in Goethe's interest in Islam generally, and Hafiz in particular, a consuming passion which led to the composition of the *West-Östlicher Diwan*, and it inflected Goethe's later ideas about Weltliteratut, the study of all the literatures of the world as a symphonic whole which could be apprehended theoretically as having preserved the individuality of each work without losing sight of the whole. (Said, "Orientalism" xviii)

As pointed out earlier, Said promotes plurality and diversity vs. standardization and homogeneity. He refers to this standardization and homogeneity as what Goethe's ideas were specifically formulated to deter, warning his readers against this in today's globalized world. This is also why he admires Erich Auerbach for his ideas and works as a Western scholar.

> In an essay published in 1951 entitled "Philologie der Weltliteratur", Erich Auerbach made exactly that point at the outset of the postwar period, which was also the beginning of the Cold War. His great book *Mimesis*, published in Berne in 1946 but written while Auerbach was a wartime exile teaching Romance languages in Istanbul, was meant to be a testament to the diversity and concreteness of the reality represented in Western literature from Homer to Virginia Woolf; but reading the 1951 essay one senses that for Auerbach the great book he wrote was an elegy for a period when people could interpret texts philologically, concretely, sensitively and intuitively, using erudition and an excellent command of several languages to support the kind of understanding that Goethe advocated for his understanding of Islamic literature. (Said, "Orientalism" xix)

Said elaborates on this issue of sensitivity toward representing "reality" that he observes in Auerbach and Goethe's works further by noting that no matter how necessary the positive knowledge of languages and history was, it was not ever enough. What Said values, as the main requirement for the kind of philosophical understanding in the sense of what Auerbach and his predecessors meant and were trying to practice, is "one that sympathetically and subjectively entered into the life of a written text as seen from the perspective of its time and its author (*eingefühling*)".

> Rather than alienation and hostility to another time and different culture, philosophy as applied to *Weltliteratur* involved a profound humanistic spirit deployed with generosity and, […] hospitality. Thus the interpreter's mind

> actively makes a place in it for a foreign Other. And this creative making of a place for works that are otherwise alien and distant is the most important facet of the interpreter's philosophical mission. ("Orientalism"xix)

That must be why he also celebrates the emergence of world literature departments worldwide. He finds *Mimesis* magisterial and truly successful for the following reasons he remarks on:

> It is as if Auerbach was intent on exposing his personal explorations and, perforce, his fallibility to the perhaps scornful eye of critics who might deride his subjectivity. But the triumph of *Mimesis,* as well as its inevitable tragic flaw, is that the human mind studying literary representations of the historical world can only do so as any author does, from the limited perspective of one's own time and one's own work. No more scientific a method or less a subjective a gaze is possible, except that the great scholar can always buttress his vision with learning, dedication, and moral purpose. (Said, "Humanism" 117)

Finally, Said concludes his introduction to Auerbach's *Mimesis* emphasizing and praising its humanistic example coming from this combination as: "[i]t is this combination, this mingling of styles, out of which *Mimesis* emerges. And to my way of thinking, its humanistic example remains an unforgettable one, fifty years after its first appearance in English" ("Humanism" 117).

On the other hand, in a similar sense that Said praises Goethe and Auerbach's works and views in terms of humanism, he disregards those of Harold Bloom and

Samuel Huntington who is known for his famous book based on an earlier article *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* This book, where he claims that the world is entering a new phase and his ideas/thesis in general, is known to have stirred up a good deal of controversial debate worldwide. In his book and his article entitled "The Clash of Civilizations?" Huntington focuses on what he calls the central and the most dangerous dimension of the emerging global politics. He elaborates his hypothesis as that "the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural;" and accordingly, he emphasizes his views on the emerging reality that "the clash of civilizations will be the battle lines of the future" (Huntington 22). He describes the transition to this last phase by mentioning about four influential events in the world history: the Peace of Westphalia, the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution and the Cold War and different types of conflicts in world affairs during these transition periods.

> These conflicts between princes, nation states and ideologies were primarily conflicts within Western civilization. "Western civil wars," as William Lind has labeled them. With the end of the Cold War, international politics moves out of its Western phase, and its center-piece becomes the interaction between the West and non-Western civilizations and among non-Western civilizations. In the politics of civilizations, the people and governments of non-Western civilizations no longer remain the objects of history as targets

> of Western colonialism but join the West as movers and shapers of history. (Huntington 22)

Huntington's view of the clash of civilizations is way away from Said's definition of and remarks on humanism. Said promotes and advocates for humanism and discusses the meaning and means of canon in "Humanism's Sphere." He compares Bloom and Huntington in this respect:

> Bloom's opinions about the humanistic canon show an absence rather than an invigorating presence of mind […] One should have as little truck with this sort of superficiality as with Samuel Huntington's clash of civilizations thesis: both result in the same bellicose dismissiveness; both radically misapprehend what it is about cultures and civilizations that makes them interesting – not their essence or purity, but their combinations and diversity, their countercurrents, the way that they have had of conducting a compelling dialogue with other civilizations. (Said "Humanism" 27-28)

He claims that both Bloom and Huntington completely miss what has long been a characteristic of all cultures, namely, that there is a "strong streak of radical antiauthorians" as Bloom and Huntington have forgotten that many of the figures in today's canon were yesterday's insurgents. This idea of his is quite similar to Homi K. Bhabha's which is discussed in detail in the second chapter while analyzing his postcolonial theory of subversive narratives and mimicry.

All in all, Said's views on representation of reality (how it might serve both as humanistic and divisionist reductive or essentialist); on Orientalism; and on humanism

in general contribute to the points of representation of the Other in the two texts representing contemporary conflicts that will be dealt with in this thesis. However, these views have also predictably stirred some controversial debate and criticism among scholars. Valerie Kennedy, in her book *Edward Said: A Critical Introduction*, criticizes Said claiming that he "has a tendency to talk as if the discourse of Orientalism were always and everywhere the same" (16). Similarly, Robert Irwin, in *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies*, launches an attack on Said's *Orientalism* criticizing it harshly by saying that it is hard to differentiate honest mistakes in this work from "willful misrepresentations" (282). According to Irwin, it "has the look of a book written in a hurry. It is repetitious and contains lots of factual mistakes" (282). He even goes one step further in his criticism of *Orientalism* toward the end of the book where he questions if Said's book is as bad as he thinks, why it has attracted so much attention and praise in certain quarters. He himself is uncertain of 'the correct answer'. Nonetheless, he seems to voice his harsh antagonism against *Orientalism* and Said in general as such:

> Perhaps part of it may be a resentment of the long-established 'guild of Orientalists' on the part of some adherents of younger disciplines such as cultural studies and sociology. Some writers have joined the fray on Said's side, not because they are hoots about the real history of Orientalism, but because they are anti-Zionist or anti-American. (Irwin 309)

Even Bhabha in *The Location of Cuture* finds Said's attention to representation - "a concept that articulates the historical and fantasy (as the scene of desire) in the

production of the 'political' effects of discourse" (103) - somehow inadequate. He adds that Said "rightly rejects a notion of Orientalism as the misrepresentation of an Oriental essence. However, having introduced the concept of 'discourse' he does not face up to the problems it creates for an instrumentalist notion of power/knowledge that he seems to require" (Bhabha, "Location" 103). Bhabha thinks this problem is also seen, and therefore proven, in Said's ready acceptance of the view of Roland Barthes about representations being formations or deformations.

Nevertheless, I would like to conclude my attributions to Said and Auerbach's humanistic views with a positive response to the criticisms against him. Clare Brandabur criticizes and responds to Christopher Hitchen's misinterpretations of Said's *Orientalism* in her essay entitled "Hitchens Smears Edward Said: Responding to the Words of a Weasel". She maintains that rather than wasting time over Hitchens' "pathetic effort to trivialize and seem to scold Edward Said for imagined shortcoming," it is important to acknowledge "the positive thrust" of all of Said's work:

> He [Said] advocates the hard work of "patient and sceptical inquiry, supported by faith in communities of interpretation that are difficult to sustain in a world demanding instant action and reaction." In the same article, "The secular world is the world of history as made by human beings. Critical thought does not submit to commands to join the ranks marching against one or another approved enemy." (Brandabur 1)

She adds that Said's constant message continues to be what he asserts in *Culture and Imperialism,* "There is the possibility of a more generous and pluralistic vision of the

world; the opportunities for liberation are open" (230). Finally, Brandabur concludes her response with an interesting call: "Why don't we all stand up and cheer and exchange the kiss of peace, rather than standing in line to give him the kiss of death" (1).

1. 3. The Case of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook*:

The difficulty and some pitfalls of capturing and representing reality in the period of the 'post' and in a globalized word are explored in the previous subtitle. In this respect, Blanchard in "Mimesis not Mimicry" observes that "[t]here is, however, an "Auerbach question" relevant to all our current controversies concerning the canon, identity politics, nationalisms and cultural criticism" (176). Both of the two texts that will be analyzed and compared in terms of representation and discourse in this thesis are contemporary texts dealing with some recent socio-political conflicts. In other words, since these two works are about two intractable conflicts and the difficulty of coexistence, the modes and means of representation to reflect the everyday realities used in them are crucial to analyze.

Edward Said proposes in his book *The World, The Text, and The Critic* that affirms the connection between texts and the existential actualities of human life, politics, societies, and events, that:

> The realities of power and authority – as well as the resistances offered by men, women, and social movements to institutions, authorities, and orthodoxies – are the realities that make texts possible, that deliver them to their readers, that solicit the attention of critics. I propose that these realities are what should be taken account of by criticism and the critical consciousness. (5)

Said here obviously calls for criticisms of texts representing and/or resisting the realities of "power and authority."

Based on a story of the immensely complicated cultural, social and political context of post 9/11 America, *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* is a 2007 novel by Mohsin Hamid who is a writer of Pakistani birth, American education, British residence, and joint British-Pakistani citizenship. The novel is set in a Lahore café in Pakistan on a single day, "in the recent past, from which perspective it narrates the events of several years on four continents" (Hart 507). *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* is composed of the monologue of a Pakistani university lecturer, Changez, who addresses a silent unidentified and nameless American, from which one can conclude that the whole book is an ironical implied 'dialogue' between these two main characters (from one perspective). The novel is also "concerned with subjects like cross-cultural romance, transnational capitalism, and the limits of cosmopolitan space" (Hart 507). Now that the novel will be analyzed in these terms more in detail in the following chapter, here, I would like to focus on the context of the novel as it deals with a Pakistani immigrant in the United State in the wake of 9/11. The trauma after the event and its representation by a Pakistani writer bears importance. DonDellilo, in one of his articles entitled "In the Ruins of the Future" in December 2001, defines 9/11 as the terror that overturned history and comments that "the World Trade Centre attack was the defining moment of the year - and will haunt us for decades" (1). The tragic event is narrated to have the same challenging effect on the main character (and the narrator) Changez in the book as well. He describes the radical changes in the society after these attacks and comments that living in New York was suddenly like living in a film about World War II. The period after the event is described to be the first time for him to be struck by America's

determination to look back as he has always thought of it as a nation that looked forward. Changez in the book also states how the attitudes of the Americans toward the East and Islam have changed drastically by noting about the verbal abuses Muslims are subjected to now. However, Hamid's work is an extended monologue by the Pakistani narrator which works as a 'dialogue' from one perspective silencing the Other. The reasons and potential repercussions of such a subversive narrative technique in terms of a political and exclusive discourse will be seen in the next chapter.

The Arab-Israeli Cookbook, on the other hand, is a 2004 documentary theatre about another conflict - the Israeli-Palestinian conflict - and takes place in the midst of war. The play is composed by Robin Soans, who is a British documentary playwright, out of the everyday realities. Soans interviews and gives voice to the marginalized ordinary people in the midst of the conflict in a microcosmic approach. The cultural representations through food recipes and diverse identities of people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds living in the same area in the play give Soans's work a humanistic and inclusive approach, on the contrary.

Although the distinct modes of representation used in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* will be examined in detail in the following chapters, it will be useful to give excerpts from the beginnings of both texts following the Auerbach model as an introduction before moving on to the analysis of narrative, cultural representations and discourse implemented in them. This will also provide the readers with the idea of how the two opposite ways of *mimesis,* as representation of everyday realities, operate in these texts.

To begin with, even the opening scene of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* gives important details about the discourse constructed by the dramatic monologue, unreliable first person narrator, and the lack of 'polyphony or heteroglossia' as Mikhail Bakhtin in *Dialogic Imagination* puts it. "The social and the historical voices populating language, all its words and all its forms, which provide language with its particular concrete conceptualizations, are organized in the novel into a structured stylistic system that expresses the differentiated socio-ideological position of the author amid the heteroglossia of the epoch" (300). Thus, "the novelistic word is inherently social since it involves a dialogical interralation between various voices of the era" (Cayir 184). The very first imaginary "dialogue" between the Pakistani (the first person narrator) and the American at the beginning of the novel reads as follows:

> Excuse me, sir, but may I be of assistance? Ah, I see I have alarmed you. Do not be frightened by my beard. I am a lover of America. I noticed that you were looking for something; more than looking, you seemed to be on a *mission*, and since I am both a native of this city and a speaker of your language, I thought I might offer you my services. (Hamid 1)

Here is how the reader is introduced to the two main characters at the beginning of the novel – Pakistani Changez as the narrator speaking and the unnamed silent American. Every word of this passage; in other words, the fictional representation of a Lahore evening, is worth studying in terms of the construction of discourse. The narrator and the main character Changez clearly speaks with a self-confident, 'polite', and even 'know-it-all' manner, which never changes throughout the novel. In a "writing back"

manner (which will be elaborated by discussing the postcolonial discourse), the narrator mimics, asks questions and answers them on behalf of the American or speaks on imaginary guesses:

> How did I know you were American? No, not by the color of your skin; we have a range of complexions in this country, and yours occurs often among the people of our northwest frontier. Nor was it your dress that gave you away; a European tourist could as easily have purchased in Des Moines your suit, with its single vent, and your button-down shirt. True, your hair, short-cropped, and your expansive chest – the chest, I would say, of a man who bench-presses regularly, and maxes out well above two-twenty-five – are typical of a certain *type* of American; but then again, sportsmen and soldiers of all nationalities tend to look alike. Instead, it was your *bearing* that allowed me to identify you, and I do not mean that as an insult, for I see your face has hardened, but merely as an observation. (Hamid 1-2)

Like in this passage, Changez often refers to 'a typical American expression/reaction, most 'un-American pleasures' or addresses his American guest as 'a typical of a certain *type* of American' because of his *bearing*. He seemingly tries to overcome a possible prejudice or stereotype; however, he creates yet another one himself by saying: "Do not be frightened by my beard. I am a lover of America." Whether it is reliable or not, the narrator also gives the reader the sense that the American has uneasy attitudes by "Ah, I see I have alarmed you," "your back so close to the wall?" or "And will you not remove

your jacket? So formal!" (2). However, this is just one of his endless 'guesses' throughout the book. Changez continues:

> Come, tell me, what were you looking for? Surely, at this time of day, only one thing could have brought you to the district of Old Anarkali – named, as you may be aware, after a courtesan immured for loving a prince – and that is the quest for the perfect cup of tea. Have I guessed correctly? Then allow me, sir, to suggest my favorite among these many establishments. Yes, this is the one. Its metal chairs are no better upholstered, its wooden tables are equally rough, and it is, like the others, open to the sky. But the quality of its tea, I assure you, is unparalleled. (Hamid 2)

Likewise, the idea of *mission* in italics is emphasized and bears importance because it is also repeated and referred in some other instances in the novel in different forms. One such instance is while the narrator is reflecting on the suspicions he goes through at the airport after 9/11. He is now escorted by armed guards. Not satisfied with any 'reason' Changez gives for his trip, the inspector repeatedly asks "What is the *purpose* of your trip to the United States?" (Hamid 86). So, here the reference to the *mission*, *purpose*, *business* may also be a counter discourse he uses against the American guest whose real identity is later discussed by the critics to be a CIA agent. The same is with this statement: "Instead, it was your *bearing* that allowed me to identify you, and I do not mean that as an insult, for I see your face has hardened, but merely as an observation." The narrator also sees himself as "both a native of this city and a speaker of your

language", which constitutes a certain knowledge-power relation as Foucault suggests about discourse in his definition of the term as 'who can speak and who must listen'.

> You prefer that seat, with your back so close to the wall? Very well, although you will benefit less from the more pleasant. And will you not remove your jacket? So formal! Now that is not typical of intermittent breeze, which, when it does blow, makes these warm afternoons Americans, at least not in my experience. And my experience is substantial: I spent four and a half years in your country. Where? I worked in New York, and before that attended college in New Jersey. Yes, you are right: it was Princeton! Quite a guess, I must say.
>
> What did I think of Princeton? Well, the answer to that question requires a story. (Hamid 1-3)

The American's preference for a seat with his back so close to the wall suggests insecurity and reinforces the idea of the distrust between the 'Westerner' and the 'Easterner' in the book. The last sentences of this first excerpt prepare the reader for a story the narrator is going to tell reflecting upon his past. From now on, the technique of stream of consciousness, almost in the same manner as Virginia Woolf, starts to operate in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist.* The novel is composed of twelve separate parts and all the parts begin with the present tense (to reflect the 'conversation' between the two main characters almost all in the same manner as above) then turns into the past tense while the narrator reflects on his past experiences in flashbacks or analepses. After this first introduction, Changez tells his story of his successful Princeton years and especially

the Greek trip with his college friends where his relationship with his American girlfriend Erica blossoms. Even Erica's past story about her dead lover Chris is told in these past reflections in the same technique with high symbolism. Then, Hamid relates the narrator's application and acceptance as an employee of one of the leading companies of New York – Underwood Samson and his job experiences in different parts of the world. However, the most striking and "brave" or "attacking" scene of one of those past reflections in one of these instances is the representation of Changez's reaction to the TV images of 9/11. It also forms the turning point of the book as the reader sees Changez (ironically symbolizing 'changes' in French) undergoing an apparent transformation. This scene will be analyzed in the second chapter in accordance with the notion of Shauden-freude.

Grammar is used to signify changes in voice in the novel. Each chapter has the same structure, beginning with a "dialogue" set in the present simple continuous or future tenses, and then the text suddenly changes into the present perfect and simple past tense - that when the real time "dialogue" stops and his recounting of his past happens. At the end of each chapter there is a small return to the "dialogue". This putting everything into the past when telling the story has a cumulative effect. It gives the impression that that is how the narrator used to feel, but does not necessarily feel any more; that "what's past is past" and is immutable. This use of the past is used for simple story telling, like one might use in a fairy story that begin "Once upon a time" - where the omniscient narrator is infallible. This seems to negate any notion of the unreliable

narrator, which is also touched upon supported with Foucault's theory in the second chapter.

All the parts in the present are of course fraught with problems of the reliability of the narrator because it is only a dialogue from one perspective - the American never actually speaks. Yet, the reader only gets to know some of his statements when the narrator repeats them back to him in question form. However, these could be paraphrases of what the American said, or misunderstanding of what he said. Here emerges the 'power' of such a discourse and the underlying purpose of the subversive narrative technique as a postcolonial practice for it might be argued to be a counter-discourse considering what Homi Bhabha tells about "the colonial mimicry", as well, by: "[t]he discourse of post-Enlightenment English colonialism often speaks in a tongue that is forked, not false" ("Location" 122). Of course, the "can of worms" also works via the use of the word "fundamentalist" in the title and what a Western versus an Eastern reader would think of the positions of the actors in the drama. These along with the attacking statements, of course, lead to an antagonistic view towards the narrator from the beginning to the end (especially for the Western readers).

In *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook*, on the other hand, no construction of such a subversive representation or discourse can be found. It is about the real, factual rather than fictional characters and events which are the raw material of the documentary theatre. The first-hand speeches of the characters from the interviews and voice-recorders take place in and constitute the dialogue of the play. Here is the opening scene of the play:

> *Darkness. The sound of waves running onto a sandy shoreline. As the sky begins to lighten, we hear the muslim call for prayer from the minaret of a neighbouring mosque to the left. A few seconds later the first prayer is joined by another prayer from a mosque to the right. The two prayers intertwine, making a strange and unearthly harmony. As the light increases, we find Fadi sitting listening to the music. He has three opened books next to him on the sea wall, and a rucksack which contains more books and a box with his lunch in it. But for the moment he is listening to the Imam. (Soans 12)*

This is an authentic description of the scene by Robin Soans and soon Fadi as the first character speaks:

> There's a place on the shoreline at Jaffa, midway between two mosques… if you find the right place, you can hear the prayer from one minaret overlapping with the other, and they make a harmony. And it's mixed with the rhythm of the breaking waves. When I hear the mosque at home in my village, it's harsh and strident… it's mixed with dust and cars and ugliness. It reminds me that being neither Muslim nor Jewish… basically I don't fit in; and either way I'm fucked. I'm a Greek Orthodox Arab. (Smiles) I don't go to church very often. It's largely irrelevant to my life. I do believe in God. When I take my exams I pray for good grades… typical young man. (Soans 12)

Rather than silencing or speaking for the Other like in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, this documentary theatre gives voice to a considerable variety of people in the region –

the Arab, Israeli, Jewish, Christian find voice in it. Fadi speaks his own words here; defines his own identity. He continues:

> And I do believe in heaven…lots of shops…no, I'm kidding. Heaven is the same tranquility as I feel sitting here, where…for a moment…there is nothing to bother your peace of mind. It's something we could have had in our life and we're gradually letting go of…as…everyone had started running for money, and more money, and power and politics, and fanatical behavior. It's a vision that's beginning to blur; that we're beginning to lose sight of…that we have started to ignore.

Fadi watches the wawes tumbling onto the shoreline. Nadia enters with a small bunch of flowers. (Soans 12)

In this speech as the introduction of the play, Fadi as an impliedly educated figure showed surrounded by books throughout the play voices his own feelings and sense of identity. His is one compressed not even just "in-between" two; but three distinct identities, which is a case the reader comes across constantly through the whole play, maybe as a reminder of the diversity and general social context of the region. Nevertheless, he seems to be happy with this sense of identity. Moreover, his "*typical* young man" emphasis does not sound as reductive or essentialist contrary to the word itself now that he articulates his own accounts about himself.

In *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook,* all the characters are fairly comfortable while making such comments which would normally be regarded essentialist; however, since these are either about or targeted against the character him/herself, most of the time, this

essentialist approach does not come across as too offensive or does not fully fit in the category of a strongly one-sided discourse. The play continues with the speech of another character, Nadia, who makes a similar ‘apparently’ essentialist comment about all Arabs including herself. In contrast to Fadi, who is not much of a religious figure as understood from the first quote by him about church and prayers, Nadia appears as a devoted Christian. The scene displays ‘fresh flowers for the saints, icons of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and Saint George, pictures of the Twelve Disciples, and the Nativity.’ She is proud of having been born in Bethlehem even though it is like a ghost town now, she considers herself lucky as she thinks it is spiritually important to be close to the birth-place of Christ. Nadia ends up marrying one of the orthodox priests from the church she goes to. As soon as she gives these details about her life, she moves on to cooking. She makes a comment about all Arabs using the general pronoun *we* while she is preparing the stuffed-zucchini explaining her recipe: “What you’re going to find is I’m not very precise with quantities and times… we’re Arabs… we don’t count what we eat, we just eat. And Arabs love to stuff everything…chicken, lamb, vegetables, fish” (Soans 14).

In order to understand the postmodern presentation in the documentary theatre as opposed to a (one-sided) representation, Simerka’s definition of the postmodern film might be helpful as it applies to drama in theory as well:

> Postmodern film is a genre that flaunts its own artifices, forcing viewers to concentrate on the ways in which it, as Cynthia Baron remarks, "unmasks the process of production" (29) rather than attempting to conceal it. To invoke an inescapable critical distinction, the true subject of a postmodern

> film is its diegesis rather than its mimesis. This emphasis on diegesis is postmodern precisely because it undermines any sense that a film is offering a "simple" or "straightforward" mimetic representation of characters' actions. Someone, the viewer is constantly reminded, is telling the story. Essential to postmodern thought is just such a subversive skepticism about the relationship between narrative structures and the concepts of knowledge and truth; postmodernism regards the latter as discursive constructs and therefore as contingent and provisional at best, arbitrary and hegemonic at worst. (92)

Hence, in the light of this definition, one can also claim that the true subject of a postmodern drama is its diegesis rather than its mimesis. Therefore, it rejects and undermines any simple or straightforward mimetic representation. There is an alienation effect through which the reader and the audience is constantly reminded of an absent narrator or representation. Eventually, this postmodern presentation is skeptic about the relationship between narrative structures and power/knowledge/truth, which is regarded as discursive constructs, and is therefore, “contingent, provisional, arbitrary, and hegemonic at worst”. The idea of avoiding this kind of representation or discursive practice is very similar to the arguments of Said on Orientalism and humanism as discussed in this chapter and the overall thesis.

CHAPTER 2

REPRESENTATION IN *THE RELUCTANT FUNDAMENTALIST:* DIFFERENCES CONFRONTED

2. 1. The Problem of Mimicry

"[t]he discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference. The authority of that mode of colonial discourse that I have called mimicry is therefore stricken by an indeterminacy: mimicry emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal. Mimicry is, thus the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which 'appropriates' the Other as it visualizes power" (Bhabha, "Location" 122).

In accordance with the definitions and dimensions of mimesis or representation dealt with in the first chapter, Homi K. Bhabha's elaboration on the term 'mimicry' in his famous essay - "Of mimicry and man: The ambivalence of colonial discourse" in *The Location of Culture* - sheds light on the discursive analysis in general and serves to the arguments of the subversive narrative in this chapter. As understood from the first long quote of the definition of mimicry, it is the authority of the ambivalent mode of colonial discourse. It operates as a "representation" of the *different* but the process itself is a "disavowal." It "appropriates" the Other with its "power." Bhabha uses the word "forked" in a smartly figurative way to describe the post-Enlightenment English colonial discourse at the beginning of his essay. He claims that this discourse is not false but

“forked.” This sense of the word goes along with and is completed with the idea of the *splitting* of the colonial discourse at the end of the essay.

> There is a crucial difference between this colonial articulation of man and his doubles and that which Foucault describes as 'thinking the unthought' which, for nineteenth-century Europe, is the ending of man's alienation by reconciling him with his essence. The colonial discourse that articulates an interdictory otherness is precisely the 'other scene' of this nineteenth-century European desire for an authentic historical consciousness. (Bhabha, “Location” 130)

Bhabha makes a clear distinction between ‘reality’ and ‘desire’ while examining the colonial discourse and mimicry. Interestingly, there are many allusions in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* to such a colonial discourse. For instance, while Changez is in Manila for work, his hopeless American girlfriend’s email about the rock pools reads: “It [the rock pool] was kind of surreal. Made me think of you. – E.” (Hamid 79). Bhabha notes about the reality and the result of this splitting act: “This results in the *splitting* of colonial discourse so that two attitudes towards external reality persist; one takes reality into consideration while the other disavows it and replaces it by a product of desire that repeats, rearticulates 'reality' as mimicry” (Bhabha, “Location” 130). The ambivalence of mimicry as a problematic of colonial subjection emerges from the colonial encounter between the white presence and its black semblance. (129) Reality is reformed, created

through mimicry or representation. Bhabha gives a more detailed understanding of the word representation unlike Said who simply defines it as formations or deformations.

> Such contradictory articulations of reality and desire - seen in racist stereotypes, statements, jokes, myths - are not caught in the doubtful circle of the return of the repressed. They are the effects of a disavowal that denies the differences of the other but produces in its stead forms of authority and multiple beliefs that alienate the assumptions of 'civil' discourse. ("Location" 130)

Bhabha regards mimicry as an erratic, eccentric and ethnocentric strategy of authority in the colonial discourse just like Edward W. Said. The colonial subject-object relations are analyzed here, as well, like the self-Other of Sartre. Objectification of the Other through mimicry or representation is constantly dealt with in postcolonial theory as one of the central themes. Bhabha argues that mimicry emerges as the subject of the scopic drive and the object of colonial surveillance ("Location" 127). He makes reference to Freud about writing of the fantasy (caught between the unconscious and the preconscious) which makes the very notion of 'origins' problematic, like mimicry. Then, the problem of the representation of difference breaks out. Such a desire is not innocent, according to Bhabha, but has strategic objectives:

> *Almost the same but not white*: the visibility of mimicry is always produced at the site of interdiction. [...] The question of the representation of

> difference is therefore always also a problem of authority. The 'desire' of mimicry, which is Freud's 'striking feature' that reveals so little but makes such a big difference, is not merely that impossibility of the Other which repeatedly resists signification. The desire of colonial mimicry - an interdictory desire - may not have an object, but it has strategic objectives which I shall call the *metonymy of presence*. ("Location" 128)

Bhabha explains his notion of 'otherness,' and returns to the 'split' identity as opposed to the fetishized one. This quote about the fixed colonial representations resembles Said's arguments in *Orientalism* as discussed in the first chapter. Here, Bhabha explains the ambivalence of mimicry with his famous words: *almost but not quite.*

> 'This culture ... fixed in its colonial status', Fanon suggests, '[is] both present and mummified, it testified against its members. It defines them in fact without appeal. The ambivalence of mimicry - almost but not quite - suggests that the fetishized colonial culture is potentially and strategically an insurgent counter-appeal. What I have called its 'identity-effects' are always crucially *split*. Under cover of camouflage, mimicry, like the fetish, is a part-object that radically revalues the normative knowledges of the priority of race, writing, history. For the fetish mimes the forms of authority at the point at which it deauthorizes them. Similarly, mimicry rearticulates presence in terms of its 'otherness', that which it disavows. ("Location" 130)

Another claim in “Of Mimicry and Man” is that mimicry emerges as one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge. (Bhabha, “Location” 122). Consequently, there is a clear knowledge-power structure formed, which postcolonial discourses are all about. In the same sense, Bhabha argues that “For the epic intention of the civilizing mission, 'human and not wholly human' in the famous words of Lord Rosebery, “writ by the finger of the Divine” often produces a text rich in the traditions of *trompe-l'oeil*, irony, mimicry and repetition” (“Location” 122). Bhabha’s discussions and disregard of such a construction of ambivalent discourse by the colonial forces are similar to those of Said as discussed in the first chapter and to those of Foucault whom he quotes a lot from:

> Within that conflictual economy of colonial discourse which Edward Said describes as the tension between the synchronic panoptical vision of domination - the demand for identity, stasis - and the counterpressure of the diachrony of history - change, difference - mimicry represents an *ironic* compromise. If I may adapt Samuel Weber's formulation of the marginalizing vision of castration, then colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*. (“Location” 125)

Hamid’s main character and the narrator, Pakistani immigrant, Changez in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* can be argued to exemplify this desire in a counter discourse. He is narrated to mimic the silent and unnamed American guest; he is polite but not

quite; and the simple language and narrative definitely have political objectives under the surface. From one of the alluded "conversations" between the American guest who is discussed to be a CIA agent by critics and Changez, an instance when the lights go off while they were sitting at the Lahore café will provide a good example for this kind of writing. Changez narrates:

> What a bad luck! The lights have gone. But why do you leap to your feet? Do not be alarmed, sir; as I mentioned before, fluctuations and blackouts are common in Pakistan. Really, you are overreacting; it is not yet so dark. The sky above us still contains a tinge of color, and I can see you quite clearly as you stand there with your hand in your jacket. I assure you: no one will attempt to steal your wallet. For a city of this size, Lahore is remarkably free of that sort of petty crime. Do sit down, I implore you, or you shall force me to stand as well. As it is, I feel rude to remain in this position while my guest is uncomfortable. […] I would offer you a whiskey to settle your nerves, if only I could. A Jack Daniel's, eh? You smile; I have hit upon a spirit to which you are partial. (Hamid 69)

In this passage, Changez ironically tries to assure the American to be safe. His 'over' politeness while referring to the idea that he will feel rude to remain sitting while his guest is uncomfortable might be a show of respect, politeness and hospitality that he was not treated with in his guest's country. He constantly tries to break the possible prejudices in the American's mind about Pakistan and Lahore in-between the lines.

Also, the attribution to a culture-specific beverage like Jack Daniel's is deliberate now that it definitely shows the Easterner's "knowledge" of the Western culture. Here, it is important to remember Bhabha's elaboration on mimicry above: "The ambivalence of mimicry - almost but not quite - suggests that the fetishized colonial culture is potentially and strategically an insurgent counter-appeal. […] Under cover of camouflage, mimicry, like the fetish, is a part- object that radically revalues the normative knowledges of the priority of race, writing, history" ("Location" 130).

Changez continues in another instance exemplifying a similar purpose in language and narrative:

> Observe, sir: bats have begun to appear in the air above this square. Creepy, you say? What a delightfully American expression – one I have not heard in many years! I do not find them creepy; indeed, I quite like them. They remind me of when I was younger; they would swoop at us as we swam in my grandfather's pool, perhaps mistaking us for frogs. (Hamid 71)

In this quote, the first allusion to "observation" is ironic in terms of colonial discursive practices just like the "knowledge" as they both bring forth power. Here, it is not the East which is shown to be exotic but "a delightfully American expression." Changez is shown to use his knowledge of the Western language and culture quite often throughout the book. He knows how to 'pretend' pretty well, for instance. He talks about how he had to pretend or wear a mask in business meetings to fit in. In his first Underwood

Samson assignment in Manila, Philippines from late July to mid September (when 9/11 happened), he is the only non-American in his group. He does something he has never done before. “I attempted to act and speak, as much as my dignity would permit, more like an *American.* […] I learned to cut to the front of lines with an extraterritorial smile; and I learned to answer, when I asked where I was from, that I was from New York” (Hamid 74). These might be where Changez’s anger and eagerness to use his knowledge in a counter manner comes from.

> In mimicry, the representation of identity and meaning is rearticulated along the axis of metonymy. As Lacan reminds us, mimicry is like camouflage, not a harmonization of repression of difference, but a form of resemblance, that differs from or defends presence by displaying it in part, metonymically. Its threat, I would add, comes from the prodigious and strategic production of conflictual, fantastic, discriminatory 'identity effects' in the play of a power that is elusive because it hides no essence, no 'itself'. (“Location” 122)

Both these instances in both passages from the book and almost all the narrative used by Hamid are examples to such mimicry and representation in a counter sense.

2. 2. Narrative Matters: Discourses and Counter Discourses

A writer's life is a highly vulnerable, almost naked activity. We don't have to weep about that. The writer makes his choice and is stuck with it. But it is true to say that you are open to all the winds, some of them icy indeed. You are out on your own, out on a limb. You find no shelter, no protection—unless you lie—in which case of course you have constructed your own protection and, it could be argued, become a politician.

Harold Pinter, "Art, Truth, and Politics" (qtd. in Hart)

Any analysis of research on narratology and representation and their relation to power must make use of poststructuralist discursive analysis. Michel Foucault describes discourse as "a constellation of hidden historical rules that govern what can be and cannot be said and who can speak and who must listen" (qtd. in Childs and Williams 61-62). Silencing the American with an extended monologue, the narrative technique Mohsin Hamid uses in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* subverts this notion of discourse as put forward by Foucault for the Pakistani's favor successfully.

This technique exemplifies the common postcolonial practice of subversive renarration. The very idea behind the postcolonial studies is to prove that what is once pushed on the margins after a while becomes the mainstream. This is also what Said claims as seen in the first chapter that both Bloom and Huntington completely miss what has long been a characteristic of all cultures, namely, that there is a "strong streak of radical antiauthorians" as Bloom and Huntington have forgotten that many of the figures in today's canon were yesterday's insurgents. ("Humanism" 27-28) Hamid's Pakistani narrator and main character Changez exemplifies such a subversive narration. As an

example, he uses the idea of *purpose* or *mission* against the silent American. As a dark skinned guy with a beard, he was inquired constantly about his *purpose* especially after the attacks at the airports while he used to travel for work. Now, through narration (monologue), it is Changez's turn to inquire the silenced American guest about his *purpose* ironically. "Have you been to the East, sir? Truly, you are well-travelled for an American. […] I am increasingly curious as to the nature of you *business*" (Hamid 72). He also makes reference to the American's "demeanor" just like the "*bearing*" reference at the beginning of the novel and as a counter discourse for he used to be judged in the US by his skin color and beard in almost the same manner:

> I fear I have been negligent in my duties as a host. Besides, I wish now to hear more of *you:* what brings you to Lahore, what company you work for, et cetera, et cetera. […] You hesitate, sir; I did not mean to put you on the spot. If you are not yet ready to reveal your *purpose* in traveling here – your demeanor all but precludes the possibility that you are a tourist wandering aimlessly through this part of the world – then I will not insist. Ah, I see that you have detected a scent. Nothing escapes you; your senses are as acute as those of a fox in the wild. (Hamid 88)

Changez, here and throughout the book in the same fashion, definitely creates a counter discourse. He is "polite" ostensibly; but not quite.

Post-colonial literature as a shift in paradigm operates in a process of writing back, re-writing, subverting, and re-reading. "By recognising how the binarisms of colonial discourse operate (the self-other, civilised-native, us-them manichean polarities)

post-colonial critics can promote an active reading which makes these texts available for re-writing and subversion. It is this process which brings into being the powerful syncretic texts of contemporary post-colonial writing" (Ashcroft 8). In this process, usually the well-known literature is interpreted or mocked/mimiced by the member of the formerly colonized countries. So, in the case of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, although the novel is not a direct renarration of a certain Western text, it still uses the subversives technique in the form of "The Empire Writes Back" which the postcolonial discourses are all about. The differences, power relations and the turn of whom to speak in the book were confronted and controlled by the narrator. The concern of governing leads to a role change – white man's burden becomes the Pakistani narrator's.

These concepts of postcolonial discourse are examined in "The Other Question: Stereotype, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism" by Bhabha as well. Here, he maps out the efficacy of racial stereotypes for colonialism; aided by the concept of "apparatus," Bhabha exposes how the exercise of colonial power is premised on the "production of knowledges" ("Location" 79). He describes the situation of the colonial subject and the object as such:

> Racist stereotypical discourse, in its colonial moment, inscribes a form of governmentality that is informed by a productive splitting in its constitution of knowledge and exercise of power. By knowing the native population in these [stereotypical] terms, discriminatory and authoritarian forms of political control are considered appropriate. The colonized population is then deemed to be both the cause and effect of the system, imprisoned in the

> circle of interpretation. What is visible is the *necessity* of such rule which is justified by those moralistic and normative ideologies of amelioration recognized as the "civilizing mission" or the "white man's burden. Being illegitimate in its claim of conquest, colonialism requires incessant creation of new "stereotyping knowledges" to justify its rule. By recruiting numerous types of knowledges to construct the racist stereotypes of both the colonizer and the colonized, colonial power is exercised through the "critique of specific, historical texts." The established colonial discourse then authorizes itself through such a "critique"; instead of accusing the colonizer of imposing violent subjugation on the native people, the "critique" is hurled at the colonized: it is the "backwardness" of the colonized that "burdens" the white men to enlighten the subjugated people themselves. ("Location" 75)

The unreliable "I" narrator in the novel creates a definite power structure. The American in the book becomes a passive object subordinated by the active subject (or narrator). Slavoj Žižek maintains that "an ideology really succeeds when even the facts which at first sight contradict it then start to function as arguments in its favor" (Miller 211). Hamid's seemingly passive first person narrator "actively" holds the reins in his hands to guide the reader even having the potential power to distort reality and make the reader believe in his own accounts. He also decides whom to speak and even talks on behalf of the Other (American in this case). These all are analyzed with the help of the excerpts from the text in the first chapter as well.

In Said's and Foucault's terms, the only way in which the colonialist discourse succeeds its policy is the power-knowledge formation. However,

> The exercise of colonialist authority requires the production of differentiations, individuations, identity effects through which discriminatory practices can map out subject populations that are tarred with the visible and transparent mark of power. Such a mode of subjection is distinct from what Foucault describes as 'power through transparency': the reign of opinion, after the late eighteenth century, which could not tolerate areas of darkness and sought to exercise power through the mere fact of things being known and people seen in an immediate, collective gaze. […] Colonial authority requires modes of discrimination (cultural, racial, administrative…) that disallow a stable unitary assumption of collectivity. The 'part' (which must be the colonialist foreign body) must be representative of the 'whole'(conquered country), but the right of representation is based on its radical difference. Such doublethink is made viable only through the strategy of disavowal, which requires a theory of the 'hybridization' of discourse and power that is ignored by Western post-structuralists who engage in the battle for 'power' as the purists of difference. (Ashcroft 33-34)

There are some more obvious instances in the novel where Hamid makes distinction between Lahore/Pakistan and America in a counter discourse. He repeatedly mentions Lahore's rooted civilization of its own being much greater than the history of

America also deconstructing the essentialist discourse of the West in the same manner as a counter attack in his conversation with the unnamed and unvoiced American at a Lahore cafe:

> We were not the crazed and destitute radicals you see on your television channels but rather saints and poets and –yes-conquering kings. We built the Royal Mosque and the Shalimar Gardens in this city, and we built the Lahore Fort with its mighty walls. And we did these things when your country was still a collection of thirteen small colonies, gnawing away at the edge of a continent. (116)

On the other hand, he does not feel much different than his American acquaintances (especially coworkers while working for the Underwood Samson). Therefore, this drawing attention to such distinctions and Changez's talking highly of his country and nation can be said to come from his anger. Actually, he feels himself as an 'insider' most of the time rather than an 'outsider'.

He does not even feel at home when he returns to Lahore. His accounts are significant in terms of identities in the diaspora:

> There are adjustments one must make if one comes here from America; a different way of *observation*. I recall the Americanness of my own gaze when I returned to Lahore that winter when war was in the offing. I was struck at first by how shabby our house appeared, with cracks running through its ceilings and dry bubbles flaking off where dampness had entered its walls. The electricity had gone that afternoon, giving the place a gloomy

> air, but even the dim light of the hissing gas heaters our furniture appeared dated and in urgent need of reupholstery and repair. I was saddened to find it in such a state – no, more than saddened, I was ashamed. *This* is where I came from, this was my provenance, and it smacked of lowliness. (Hamid 141)

Such statements as “the Americanness of my own gaze” from the mouth a ‘fundamentalist’ while observing his own home country are striking. Changez is saddened by, even “ashamed” of his own home’s condition. Moreover, he admits that the place where he came from is “smacked of lowliness.” Returning home, he definitely undergoes an adaptation period acknowledging: “*I* had changed; I was looking about me with the eyes of a foreigner, not just any foreigner, but that particular type of entitled and unsympathetic American who so annoyed me when I encountered him in the classrooms and workplaces of your country’s elite” (Hamid 141). It is also striking that Changez’s statements remind one of Bhabha’s elaboration of the “colonial desire” in “Of Mimicry and Man” as analyzed above:

> It is a desire that reverses 'in part' the colonial appropriation by now producing a partial vision of the colonizer's presence; a gaze of otherness, that shares the acuity of the genealogical gaze which, as Foucault describes it, liberates marginal elements and shatters the unity of man's being through which he extends his sovereignty. (“Location” 126)

It is the Pakistani subject now who takes over “the desire” and “a gaze of otherness” towards his own country after migrating to America. However, he is not happy with this

situation. He soon comes to a realization and regrets turning into what he used to criticize subconsciously.

At this point, Changez goes through an identity crisis and questions himself. Only slowly can he see his own house 'properly' again, "appreciating its enduring grandeur, its unmistakable personality and idiosyncratic charm" (Hamid 142). Now, the extreme negatives about his house turn into extreme positives.

> Mughal miniatures and ancient carpets graced its reception rooms; and excellent library abutted its verenda. It was far from impoverishment; indeed, it was rich with history. I wondered how I could have ever been so ungenerous – and so blind – to have thought otherwise; and I was disturbed by what this implied about myself: I was a man lacking substance and hence easily influenced by even a short sojourn in the company of others. (Hamid 142)

Bhaba in *Nation and Narration* "Introduction: narrating the nation" talks about a large and liminal image of the nation in which he sees a particular ambivalence "that haunts the idea of the nation, the language of those who write of it and the lives of those who live it" (1). In spite of the 'origins' of nation as a sign of the 'modernity' of society the historians speak of, this ambivalence according to him emerges from a growing awareness that "the cultural temporality of the nation inscribes a much more transitional social reality" (1). Changez's statements when he returns to Lahore is relevant here: "It was odd to speak of that world here, as it would be odd to sing in a mosque; what is natural in one place can seem to be unnatural in another, and some concepts travel rather

poorly, if at all" (Hamid 143). Bhabha reinforces his view of this ambivalence in the nation which he elaborates more with the notions of 'cultural temporality' and 'transitional social reality' with a quote from Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* as well: "What I am proposing is that Nationalism has to be understood, by aligning it not with self-consciously held political ideologies, but with large cultural systems that preceded it, out of which – as well as against which- it came into being" ("Nation" 19). He reinforces this idea with the next quote as well:

> The nation's coming into being as a system of cultural signification, as the representation of social *life* rather than the discipline of social *polity* emphasizes this instability of knowledge. It is the cultural representation of this ambivalence of modern society that is explored in this book. If the ambivalent figure of the nation is a problem of its transitional history, its conceptual indeterminacy, its wavering between vocabularies, then what effect does this have on narratives and discourses that signify a sense of 'nationness.' (Bhabha, "Nation" 2).

The 'locality' of national culture, according to him, is neither unified nor unitary in relation to itself, nor must it be seen simply as 'other' in relation to what is outside or beyond it (Bhabha, "Nation" 2). The boundary is Janus-faced and the problem of outside/inside must always must always itself be a process of hybridity, incorporating new 'people' in relation to the body of politic, generating other sides of meaning and, inevitably, in the political process, producing unmanned sites of political antagonism and unpredictable forces for political representation. (Bhabha, "Nation" 4).

The "we vs. you" division created by the narrator is important to analyze because the form of the text can also be political and the semantic is formed from the technique basically. Although these seem to be apparently nationalistic comments, Hart notes:

> For all this, however, his nationalism contains no ethnopoetics of Pakistani difference. Indeed, Changez is critical of how, in the wake of 9/11, America gave itself over "to a dangerous nostalgia," a black-and-white image of a Technicolor world: "What your fellow countrymen longed for was unclear to me—a time of unquestioned dominance? of safety? of moral certainty? I did not know—but that they were scrambling to don the costumes of another era was apparent." (Hart 115)

Changez describes the "mourning" New York after the destruction of the World Trade Center. Changez describes the floral motifs of the dead and the missing everywhere.

> They reminded me of my own uncharitable - indeed, inhumane – response to the tragedy […] Other reproaches were far louder. Your country's flag invaded New York after the attacks […] They all seemed to proclaim We are American – not New York, which, in my opinion means something quite different – the mightiest civilization the world has ever known; you have slighted us; beware our wrath. (Hamid 89)

Shortly, Hamid in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* makes it clear with his counter discourse "whose turn it is to speak and whose turn it is to listen." Changez as the main character in the book confesses towards the end of the book while describing the new America after 9/11: "Affronts were everywhere; the rhetoric emerging from your

country at that moment in history – not just from the government, but from the media and supposedly critical journalists as well – provided a ready and constant fuel for my anger" (Hamid 190). These statements are also indicative of the role of media as well as politics in the process of the dismantling relationship and alarming distrust between the East and West. This theme of distrust is reinforced and implied throughout the novel from the opening to the closing scene. The 'dialogue' between Changez and the American and the hopeless relationship of Changez and Erica are representatives of this distrust. In the café, while they are ordering and having food, Changez constantly tries to reassure the American that he is just an innocent hospitable host. "For your own safety, I would suggest that you avoid this yoghurt and those chopped vegetables. What? No, no, I meant nothing sinister; your stomach might be upset by uncooked foods, that's all. If you insist, I will go so far as to sample each of these plates myself first, to reassure you that there is nothing to fear" (Hamid 139).

One of the rare instances where Hamid makes an American speak or uses a direct quote from him in the book is when Changez recalls an 'annoying' conversation with the father of his American girlfriend. When Erica's father asks him how things are back home and he replies as quite good. The father comments:

> Economy is falling apart though, no? Corruption, dictatorship, the rich living like princes while everyone else suffers. Solid people, don't get me wrong. I like Pakistanis. But the elite has raped that place well and good, right? And fundamentalism. You guys have got some serious problems with fundamentalism. (Hamid 63)

Upon this, Changez feels "bridle" and Hamid narrates not talking to the guy himself:

> There was nothing overtly objectionable in what he had said; indeed, his was a summary with some knowledge, much like the short news items on the front page of *The Wall Street Journal*, which I had recently begun to read. But his tone – with, if you will forgive me, its typically *American* undercurrent of condescension – struck a negative chord with me, and it was only out of politeness that I limited my response to, "Yes, there are challenges, sir, but my family is there, and I can assure you it is not as bad as that." (Hamid 63)

These quotes are worth analyzing in terms of the construction of discourse, too. One of these representations or mimesis is supposed to be from the mouth of a Westerner and the other from an Easterner; nevertheless both are produced within the confines of the unreliable first person narrative of a Pakistani writer. Both of the quoted passages include essentialist and biased elements that come across to *the other* as attacking – "corruption, dictatorship, solid people, you guys" and "his tone with its typically *American* undercurrent of condescension". It is interesting that Changez in this passage criticizes the American because of his tone in "his summary with some knowledge", that is to say his particular discourse, creating a similar one himself by making a generalization in the same fashion. Whether his claim is true or not, he also comments about the journal he "has recently begun to read"; therefore, has little knowledge of. Moreover, similar attacking views in the novel become clearer and harsher as Changez

turns his back to the West once he witnesses the dismantling 'American dream' after 9/11 - "an American dream turning to dust in the rubble of the twin towers". He now goes further and relates:

> America was engaged only in posturing. As a society you are unwilling to reflect upon the shared pain that united you with those who attacked you. You retreated into myths of your own difference, assumptions of your own superiority. […] Such an America had to be stopped in the interests not only of the rest of humanity, but also in your own. (Hamid 190)

Derek Walcott, who is one of the imaginative writers who represent the crucial role played by creative writers in developing a critical discourse in the postcolonial world along with Rabindranath Tagore, Raja Rao, Wole Soyinka, Chinua Achebe, Edward Kamau Brathwaite, Judith Wright, Tom King, Margaret Atwood, Dennis Lee, Alan Curnow, Keri Hulme (Ashcroft 7), articulates in *Omeros* that "observation is character" alluding to the colonial powers. Representations based on observations (or 'knowledge') are central the postcolonial theory. Said writes in *Orientalism* that "[t]he Orient is *watched*, since its almost (but never quite) offensive behavior issues out of a reservoir of infinite peculiarity; the European, whose sensibility tours the Orient, is a watcher, never involved, always detached, always ready for new examples of what the *Description de l'Egypte* called "bizarre jouissance." The Orient becomes a living tableau of queerness" (103). Therefore, as Said suggests, this tableau "quite logically" turns out to be a special subject for texts. "The Orient can turn into something one writes about in

a disciplined way. Its foreignness can be translated, its meanings can be decoded, its hostility tamed; yet the generality assigned to the Orient, the disenchantment that one feels after encountering it, the unsolved eccentricity it displays, are all redistributed in what is said or written about it" (203). Hamid quite often makes use the idea of 'observation' in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist.* The "gaze" or "glaring" is quite often referred to. Changez talks to the American at the beginning of the novel: "it was your *bearing* that allowed me to identify you, and I do not mean that as an insult, for I see your face has hardened, but merely as an observation" (Hamid 1-2). Another allusion he makes to the notion of 'observation' to the American guest is: "you will have noticed in your time here that glaring is something we men of Lahore take seriously" (Hamid 76).

The following excerpt which is going to be examined as the most striking part and turning point of the novel reads as follows. Again the narrator is speaking to the silenced American reflecting upon his memories during the 9/11 attacks when he was in Manila on work:

> The following evening was supposed to be our last in Manila. I was in my room, packing my things. I turned on the television and saw what was at first I took to be a film. But as I continued to watch, I realized that it was not fiction but news. I stared as one – and then the other – of the twin towers of New York's World Trade Center collapsed. And then I *smiled.* Yes, despicable as it may sound, my initial reaction was to be remarkably pleased.

> Your disgust is evident indeed, your large hand has, perhaps without your noticing, clenched into a fist. But please believe me when I tell you that I am no sociopath; I am not indifferent to the suffering of others. When I hear of an acquaintance who has been diagnosed with a serious illness, I feel – almost without fail – a sympathetic pain, a twinge in my kidneys strong enough to elicit a wince. When I am approached for a donation to charity, I tend to be forthcoming, at least insofar as my modest means will permit. So, when I tell you I was pleased at the slaughter of thousands of innocents, I do so with a profound sense of perplexity.
>
> But at that moment, my thoughts were not with the *victims* of the attack – death on television moves me most when it is fictitious and happens to characters with whom I have built up relationships over multiple episodes – no, I was caught up in the *symbolism* of it all, the fact that someone had so visibly brought America to her knees. Ah, I see I am only compounding your displeasure. I understand, of course; it is hateful to hear another person gloat over one's country's misfortune. But surely you cannot be completely innocent of such feelings yourself. Do you feel no joy at the video clips – so prevalent these days – of American munitions laying waste the structures of your enemies? (Hamid 82-84)

Many critics argue that these are the most provoking instances in Hamid's novel. Here the main character confesses openly that he *smiles* to the images of the twin towers collapsing and that "I was caught up in the *symbolism* of it all, the fact that someone had

so visibly brought America to her knees" along with "[w]hen my team gathered in Jim's room later that evening, I feigned the same shock and anguish I saw on the faces around me". Hamid also brings about the issue of "Schadenfreude" here which refers to the joy in the sufferings of the others. This idea finds place in Hart's article:

> The key event in this narrative is Al-Qaeda's September 2001 attacks on NewYork. Changez witnesses the carnage on TV from his Manila hotel room, and his first reaction, before being overcome with shame, is one of satisfaction: "I stared as one—and then the other—of the twin towers of New York'sWorld Trade Center collapsed. And then I *smiled*. Yes, despicable as it may sound, my initial reaction was to be remarkably pleased. . . . Iwas caught up in the *symbolism* of it all, the fact that someone had so visibly brought America to her knees" (72–73). *Schadenfreude* has a price, however, and for a Muslim male like Changez it comes quickly. Returning to the U.S., he is challenged by an immigration agent, who quashes any hope that membership in the corporate elite trumps race or citizenship: "'What is the purpose of your trip to the United States?' she asked me. 'I live here,' I replied. 'That is *not* what I asked you, sir,' she said" (75). Soon after, he has to confront public racism, a traumatized girlfriend, and the suspicion of his colleagues. Beloved Manhattan is festooned with flags, transformed into an island fortress. (508)

It is ironic that he explicitly tells his American guest not to have any suspicion because he does not enjoy the misfortunes of others. He tries to convince the American as

“please believe me when I tell you that I am no sociopath; I am not indifferent to the suffering of others.” It is important to note here that the idea of ‘schadenfreude’ was also alluded by Aristotle while he was supporting the instinctive drive for mimesis or imitation giving the example that people like to watch the dangerous images on stage as they are not affected by them directly themselves (referring to the dramatic representation). Similar to Aristotle’s view; however contradicting himself again (in saying he does not take pleasure from others’ misery), the narrator asks his American guest that “But surely you cannot be completely innocent of such feelings yourself. Do you feel no joy at the video clips – so prevalent these days – of American munitions laying waste the structures of your enemies?”

The role of the media in contemporary world along with the blurring of fact and fiction in postmodern contexts are important to deal with here. The narrator states: “I turned on the television and saw what was at first I took to be a film. But as I continued to watch, I realized that it was not fiction but news.” The destructive role of media in the contemporary world as seen in this excerpt and in the composition of discourse in narration is explained in the following quote:

> We walk around with media generated images of the world, using them to construct meaning about political and social issues. The lens through which we receive these images is not neutral but evinces the power and point of view of the political and economic elites who operate and focus it. And the special genius of this system is to make the whole process seem so normal

> and natural that the very art of social construction is invisible. (Gamson et al. 374)

Towards the end of the book while describing 'the new America' after 9/11 Changez also states related to the role of media that: "Affronts were everywhere; the rhetoric emerging from your country at that moment in history – not just from the government, but from the media and supposedly critical journalists as well – provided a ready and constant fuel for my anger. (Hamid 190)

Changez does not deny his appreciation of America at the beginning of the novel. He even confesses to be 'a product of an American University' and is proud to earn a perfect American salary and to be in love with an American woman. While reflecting upon his luxurious business trips, flying first class, he tells how he was terribly excited. In his own eyes, he was, indeed, "a veritable James Bond – only younger, darker, and possibly better paid". However, even he himself cannot answer why 'one part of him desire to see America harmed.

> But you are at war, you say? Yes, you have a point. I was not at war with America. Far from it: I was the product of an American university; I was earning a lucrative American salary; I was infatuated by an American woman. So why did part of me desire to see America harmed? I did not know, then; I knew merely that my feelings would be unacceptable to my colleagues, and I undertook to hide them as well as I could. When my team gathered in Jim's room later that evening, I feigned the same shock and anguish I saw on the faces around me. (Hamid 84)

As the novel develops, Changez's views against the 'new face' of America and his stance get clearer. He makes statements about his own crumbling American dream. He confesses: "how odd it seems now to recall that time; how quickly my sense of self-satisfaction would later disappear!" (Hamid 72). He cannot stand his being separated from his American team members whom he is once identified with and tells to be tired of secondary inspections. Now he has to join the queue for foreigners at immigration which makes him arrive anywhere hours later than his team members. He even feels himself as a 'modern janissary' with the 'help' of Juan-Bautista, the chief of the publisher company in his prestigious job. Then he decides to return to his 'real home' Lahore, where he gets a job as a university lecturer; grows a beard as a protest. He claims repeatedly that his only goal is to arouse a consciousness among his students and that he just wants to persuade them for a greater independence for Pakistan's domestic and international affairs; however, he also asserts that this aim of his would be labeled as Anti-American by foreign media.

All in all, the destroying effect of these events which launch an unending distrust and fear between both sides is central to the novel. The whole 'conversation' between Changez and the American stranger is seemingly based on the fact that mutual trust as it is supposed to be understood from the overly polite attitudes and peace messages going through the whole conversation. So, it is true that the novel explores the fear and bias of *the other* rich in intelligence and irony. However, Hamid uses the narrative structure in the form of an extended monologue which silences *the other*, where emerges yet another one-sided discourse, fear and bias ironically – the very idea

Hamid seems to oppose. Therefore, it is disputable whether Hamid contradicts himself by so doing as the constant messages in between the lines in the book are revealed to be peaceful and based upon mutual understanding and dialogue. Even at the end of the novel, there is a reference to the potential danger of *the other*: Changez suspects a glowing metal in the stranger's pocket, the nature of which remains untold. This notion constitutes the third and last excerpt which is the closing sentences of the book:

> Since then, I have felt rather like a Kurtz waiting for his Marlow. I have felt endeavored to live normally, as though nothing has changed, but I have been plagued by paranoia, by an intermittent sense that I am being observed. I even tried to vary my routines – […] – but I have come to realize that all this serves no purpose. I must meet my fate when it confronts me, and in the meantime I must conduct myself without panic.
>
> Most of all, I must avoid doing what you are doing in this instant, namely constantly looking over my shoulder. It seems to me that you have ceased to listen to my chatter; perhaps you are convinced that I am an inveterate liar, or perhaps you are under the impression that we are being pursued. Really, sir, you would do well to relax. Yes, those men are now rather close, and yes, the expression on the face of that one – what a coincidence; it is our waiter; he has offered me a nod of recognition – is rather grim. But they mean no harm, I assure you. It seems an obvious thing to say, but you should not imagine that we Pakistanis are all potential terrorists, just as we should not imagine that you Americans are all undercover assassins.

> Ah, we are about to arrive at the gates of your hotel. It is here that you and I shall at last part company. Perhaps our waiter wants to say goodbye as well, for he is rapidly closing in. yes, he is waving at me to detain you. I know you have found some of my views offensive; I hope you will not resist my attempt to shake you by hands. But why are you reaching into your jacket, sir? I detect a glint of metal. Given that you and I are now bound by certain shared intimacy, I trust it is from the holder of your business cards. (Hamid 208-209)

Inferring from this excerpt which has just the same contradictory discourse and representations, one can ask whether it would be better to make a representation based upon the seemingly peace and mutual understanding messages throughout the novel rather than a 'successful' representation of the fear and bias of *the other* because there seems to be no evidence in the novel to refute the clash of civilizations or to make the dialogue of civilizations not seem like a utopia. Just like the very discourse, and all the contradictions told in the explanations of the excerpts (in fact starting from the very title), the very last reference to the potential danger of *the other* with the glowing metal in the stranger's pocket does not serve to any resolution; if it does not contribute to the conflict and distrust more. With this idea, the narrator allegedly suggests that no matter how much time and friendship they have shared with the American mutual trust and a true dialogue is impossible. Shortly, Hamid engages in a highly political use of discourse promoting the fear of "the different" or the Other, however rich it is in irony and intelligence

CHAPTER 3

REPRESENTAION OR *PRESENTATION* IN *THE ARAB-ISRAELI COOKBOOK: DIFFERENCES ACKNOWLEDGED*

3. 1. Documentary Theatre, (Re)presentation and Reality

"Realism is one of the most elusive of artistic terms. 'Unrealistic', for example, is not necessarily the same as 'non-realist'. You can have a work of art which is non-realist in the sense of being non-representational, yet which paints a convincing picture of the world" (Eagleton 17).

The discussion of (re)presentation of reality as appeared in the first chapter will be elaborated in this chapter with another mode of representation: documentary theatre, which is the style of the second text dealing with a contemporary conflict. Documentary theatre, as a fairly contemporary branch of drama, is based upon historical events, real happenings and people in different geographical parts of the world. Also known as theatre of testimony or verbatim theatre, documentary theatre as a noticeable new trend in drama makes use of archival material. Interviews, documents, videos, films, photographs, hearings, voice records are the basic materials in its composition and final production. At the present time when "[m]ere dramatic fiction has apparently been seen as an inadequate response to the current global situation" (Bottoms 57), documentary theatre, as Carol Martin defines it, is where "the technological postmodern meets oral-theatre culture" (9).

The purpose of these kinds of plays is often to put anything marginalized in the political, social, and familial, that is to say public and private sphere, on the stage. This may include the outcasts, the oppressed, gay men, lesbian women, the poor, the disabled, the old who are not usually given voice. Documentary theatre is generally considered to date back to 1930s. However, Gary Fisher Dawson in his book *Documentary Theatre in the United States: An Historical Survey and Analysis of Its Content, Form, and Stagecraft* regards the German playwright Georg Büchner as "the Copernicus of documentary theatre; a theatrical Galileo" (1) because his purpose was to come as close to an actual event using primary sources at the center of his creation. Bücher's *Danton's Death* (1835) is the proto-documentary play in the modern sense.

As Paula Rabinowitz claims in the *Preface and Acknowledgements* of her book, *They Must Be Represented: The Politics of Documentary*, it is important to note and explore the theory and politics of documentation and documentary theatre in our present moment of "post-industrial and late capitalism." Rabinowitz maintains her ideas about the changing paradigms towards a documentation age in detail through the whole book. She explains why she is telling the story of the politics and rhetoric of documentary as it has been practiced in the United States during the past half-century or so -- our age of documentation (xi):

> The age of documentation corresponds to the age of mechanical reproduction, as Walter Benjamin called it: sound and image recorded on tape and film to resemble the natural world heard and seen by the human senses. This age is largely past, in the West as well as in Eastern Europe, not

> because the need to document disappeared with a freer political system, as Fialka hopes -- in the 'free world' we too must document the natural and social mutations wrought by capitalism -but because the age of mechanical reproduction, the age of realisms as diverse as Balzac and Brecht, has largely given way to the age of electronic simulation and virtual reality. Digitalized images and sound can literally remake history… Our present moment of post-industrial, late capitalism perhaps requires another mode of postmodern representation… (Rabinowitz xi)

Moreover, Rabinowitz adds about the work of intellectuals in the age of Post/Modern representation and how she herself got to have a tendency towards the documentation despite her background:

> I was thinking about why, despite being raised by an abstract expressionist painter, I love realism so much; why documentaries in film, photography, and print excite me. And why, despite being didactic, dogmatic, predictable, and thoroughly un(post)modern, they appeal to so many others as well. Really, I concluded, it was history that held imaginative power over me and so many others; during the amnesiac years of Reaganism, remembering the stories of yesterday seemed politically important. Documentary presents itself as much more performative than even fictional forms. Precisely because fictional performances (at least those coded within realistic conventions) efface their constructions through naturalizing gestures, the response within the audience is contained; but in shifting the site of

> documentary from the object of vision to the subject of action by insisting on the dynamic relationship of viewer to view, documentary forms invoke performance within their audiences as much as within their objects. (9)

Rabinowitz's own account of her interest and the general 'need' for documentation is relevant here in terms of the construction of discourse and the subject-object roles. She argues that documentary forms are much more performative than fictional ones.

Another critic, Bruce Robbins regards theatre of testimony as one which gives voice to revolutionary individuals. He states:

> [d]ocumentary performance and address is always about crossing boundaries -- racial, sexual, class, gender, regional, temporal -- as outsiders to a subculture enter into it, or as insiders from a subculture project it outward; and the intellectual -- whether in Gramsci's terms traditional or organic, universal or specific in Foucault's typology -- acts as the coyote smuggling across borders. (Robbins 86)

Similar to this "revolutionary" attribution to the documentary theatre, a famous documentary playwright, David Hare, notes in 2005, "All revolutions in art are a return to realism" (qtd. in. Buttoms 56).

Contrary to the 'observation' theme and the 'objectification' through narrative dealt with in the previous chapter, Rabinowitz notes in *They Must Be Represented: The Politics of Documentary* that documentary circulates between the public and private, personal and political spheres by becoming simultaneously an aesthetic and archival

object (6). She puts “this boundary-crossing” at the center of the documentation as well and states:

> [W]hy I insist that gender is a central category within documentary rhetoric, though one often ignored, suppressed, or resisted, because it is not always clear who occupies what position when. For instance, during the 1930s, a small army of female photographers became makers of documentary images which have become icons, objectifying poverty and reifying its machinery. They confounded the simplistic notion that women are objectified through visual representations. Which women? One must ask. Besides, what is so bad about objectification? Objects can speak also -- listen to the commodities in *Capital* -- and what they say perhaps undoes the subject itself. The social uses of documentary -- their 'value' to Leftists, radicals, reformers, and so forth, but also to governments and corporations -- develop from their simultaneous and dual place between object and subject. (Rabinowitz 6)

These exchanges and boundary crossings are also crucial to the political projects of radical documentaries. Therefore, Rabinowitz’s whole book is about what the documentary says, to whom, about whom, and for whom and *how* it says it (7), which are all significant for understanding the dynamics of documentary as a way of (re)presentation; and even relevant to arguments of the famous postcolonial critic Gayatri Spivak’s essay “Can The Subaltern Speak?” In this respect, documentary theatre can be said to be brave with “boundary crossings” as well and it has a narrative; even

though, in this case, strongly one-sided or political discourses are through the character's own narratives, not much through the author's.

According to Carol Martin, technology is essential to the production of documentary theatre as everything presented in this kind of theatre is part of the archive. It is composed of the precise interrogation of specific events, systems of belief, and political affiliations through the creation of the playwright's own versions of events, beliefs, and politics by exploiting technology that enables replication – here, the sometimes visible, sometimes invisible technological equipments include: video, film, tape recorders, radio, copy machines, and computers (9):

> While documentary theatre remains in the realm of handcraft—people assemble to create it, meet to write it, gather to see it—it is a form of theatre in which technology is a primary factor in the transmission of knowledge. Here the technological postmodern meets oral-theatre culture. The most advanced means of replication and simulation are used to capture and reproduce "what really happened" for presentation in the live space of the theatre. Technology is often the initial generating component of the tripartite structure of contemporary documentary theatre: technology, text, and body. (Martin 9)

The composition process of documentary theatre diverges considerably from that of both traditional and modern drama. Playwrights generally write about their 'interesting' story of how their last production has come about in the introduction of documentary plays. As a liberal American journalist, novelist and playwright, George

Packer, for instance, tells about this composition process in the introduction of his 2008 documentary play *Betrayed*. He goes to Iraq for the sixth time since the beginning of the war. His idea then is just to write another article for *The New Yorker* about the Iraqis who work for the Americans in Iraq as they embrace the American project in their country. This minority of men and women who are highly enthusiastic about the American project in their fields constitute the subject material of *Betrayed.*

The second text which will be analyzed in this sense in the thesis is *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* (2004) by Robin Soans, a British documentary playwright. The play is composed out of the everyday realities of another conflict - the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The project began when the Caird Company sent the writer Robin Soans and one Arab one Jewish director, Rima Brihi and Tim Roseman, to Israel, Gaza and the West Bank in 2003. There they sampled a variety of dishes in homes, restaurants, shops and cafés and met dozens of people with different cultures, backgrounds and beliefs. Each person had a story to tell and a recipe to cook. Robin Soans has constructed a verbatim play from the words he collected. Arab and Israeli voices come together to bring insight and understanding to the melting pot of Middle Eastern affairs. Soans states that he has done hundreds of interviews in the composition process of the play and never used anything other than a pencil and notebook. The following statements by Soans in the introduction of *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* give an insight of his understanding of a good documentary play framework and the role/duties of the playwright in the production process of it:

> I believe there are four indispensable rules when writing a verbatim play [another term for documentary play]. The first is: *don't* try to write a political play. If you do, it'll end up as agit-prop – worthy, one-dimensional and boring. If on the other hand, you write a humanitarian play, it has every chance of being funny, moving *and* political. Secondly, always look for detail, the minutiae of people's lives. Thirdly, and this was something said to me by a man in a bail hostel in Leeds, 'Never forget it's someone's life.' If people are letting you into their lives, you should treat them with the respect they deserve. And fourthly, never pre-judge. The less prejudiced you are when you arrive – the more likely you are to write a faithful account. (Soans 8)

In fact, *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* exemplifies Soans' notion of a good verbatim play as it can be said to be adhere to these four "indispensable" rules. Food is used in the play as part of "the minutiae of people's lives." One can make up his or her own recipe book while reading or watching the play.

The technique of doubling of characters is central to documentary plays. There are many documentary plays with an abundance of characters; however, a relatively small amount of actors. Hence, one actor often plays the role of more than one character. In *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook*, there are forty two major and minor characters, yet nine actors and actresses. All the characters are chosen from ordinary people of the hybrid society of the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. Hossin (Ismail Abou-El-Kanater) is a Palestinian hummus maker. Rose (Dorothy Constantine) and Abdullah (Louis R. Plante)

are an older, inter-faith couple having a daughter named Hala (Dre Slaman). Yaakov (Ric Borelli) drives a bus on one of the most dangerous routes in Jerusalem, and his wife Nina (Sarah Bell) worries about him. Three characters who resurface frequently are Nadia (Ros Gentle), a homemaker in Bethlehem; Fadi (Iman Nazemzadeh) a Palestinian student; and Rena (Jill Holden), a ex-Manhattanite now living in Jerusalem.[4]

Characters of documentary theatre are usually chosen from the 'marginalized' society. The pariahs, the outcasts of the society become the protagonists of documentary theatre. Almost every single character Robin Soans meets during the directors' and his trip to Jerusalem is included in *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook.* The reader comes across all the characters he mentions in his account of the events during their trip in the introduction later in the play itself. Soans seems to practice one of his four indispensable rules strictly when writing a verbatim play even here, in his *detailed* account, just like the careful attention given to details during the food preparation and the Arab-Israeli recipes like hummus, falafels, *Azkadinya* fellets or kunefes:

> […] we had lunch with a Bedouin, celebrated Erev Shabbat with an inordinately brave bus driver and Rosh Hashanah in an elegant house on the outskirts of Jerusalem. I had my hair cut by an Arab in a village south of Haifa, where his green-eyed wife cooked stuffed chicken, and I was allowed into a women's cooperative in the back streets of Ramallah. We crossed checkpoints, and were shouted at by fisherman in Jaffa Point. I was arrested outside the Hebrew University and was cooked noodles by a gay couple in

[4] <http://www.curtainup.com/arabisraelicookbook.html>.

> Tel Aviv, who also showed me their underwear. We met theatre directors, farmers, priests, transvestite hookers, photographers, soldiers, butchers, students, the young, the old, the orthodox, the unorthodox, the wounded, the mended, the pessimistic, the hopeful, the angry, the defiant, the stoical and the conciliatory. (Soans 9-10)

These statements give a clear idea of the real, factual rather than fictional characters and events which are the raw material of documentary theatre. However, Soans' concluding sentence in the introduction is like the most important of all for the formation and aim of documentary theatre. Soans claims: "Most importantly, I have given a voice to those whose opinion would not normally be heard" (10).

The most well- known play of Soans and another example of documentary theatre - *Talking to Terrorists* is a play commissioned by the Royal Court and Out of Joint. The writer, director and actors again interviews people from around the world, this time however, these people are the ones who have been affected by or involved in terrorism. This is an attempt to know what makes ordinary people do extreme things. Peacemakers, journalists and hostages again appear on the stage. Both significant figures from recent history and those who have crossed the line find voice in this particular play. And their stories are from Africa, Israel, Turkey, Iraq, Ireland and Britain. Characters in *Betrayed* are somehow from a similar background. They are seen as traitors in their own country as they pursue their willingness to work for the Americans whether they feel 'betrayed' or not in the end. George Packer introduces these characters who he has interviewed secretly to have no protectors:

> To survive, they had to either to live entirely on American turf in Iraq, to establish double lives and move about as easy targets, or to leave the country. Normal existence in their homeland was impossible for years – maybe for the rest of their lives. These Iraqis were as hunted and helpless as European Jews in the early 1940s. Conversations with them, which – once we could find a reasonably secure place to talk – lasted hours or even days, made my eyes burn with shame. (Packer viii)

The dialogue of documentary theatre is made up of real conversations between real people. As Packer puts it in the introduction of *Betrayed*: "[a]s for the dialogue, it all but wrote itself. […] at least half of the dialogue comes from life; it would have been foolish to try to improve on how the Iraqis spoke and what they said" (xi). Earlier he comments that he speaks with thirty or forty of these Iraqis working for Americans and claims to learn that "when they are not too intimidated by dictators or insurgents, Iraqis are wonderful talkers" (vii). Hence, the interviews and recording process gain crucial importance for the playwright in the process of real writing of the play. Soans explains how he was concerned whether people are willing to talk or not. When asked, he answers that so far they seem positively ardent to do so. He adds: "[w]hile the politician's voice is usually the only one to be broadcast, there is a corresponding voice clamouring to be heard – 'Look, I have to live with this. Listen to my point of view.' That's the voice I'm interested in listening to" (9).

The dialogue of documentary theatre is accordingly simple, ordinary speech as it is composed of the actual words of those ordinary people who are usually in the midst of social conflict. It aims at, Bottoms observes,

> presenting a "realism" that purports to present us with the speech of "actual" people involved in "real" events, rather than merely fictional ones. Moreover, this emphasis on the verbatim tends to further obscure the world-shaping role of the writer in editing and juxtaposing the gathered materials: on examination, Soans's "theology" turns out to be the standard white mythology of "us" as normal and decent and "them" as the dark and dysfunctional. (59)

The conversations are made up of the interviews with those who observed, suffered, or are oppressed, excluded. The reader reads the real accounts of life experiences - expressions, confessions, witnesses, and truths of these marginalized people who are often pretty brave and open. Therefore, the dialogue may even include some hate speech or slang words. Laith in *Betrayed* talks about the threats and dangers they go through or even about the first moment he hated the Americans. The various opinions of Saddam Hussein are revealed openly in the play, too. *Betrayed* even has an 'ill-dressed and poor looking' cursing man who waves a photo of Saddam Hussein in scene one. Although this cursing man only appears very little in the play, he talks of Saddam upon this photograph as "you dog, you destroyed my life. You sent me to fight the Iranians and see what they did to me!" (Packer 12). Adnan, also a volunteer Iraqi

working for the Americans, similarly opens up to the Regional Security Officer and says, "All the sacrifices, all the work, all the devotion mean nothing to you. We are still terrorists in your eyes" (Packer 88).

More significantly, theatre of testimony is presentational rather than representational. It has a minimalistic setting. Carol Martin asserts about the period when documentary theatre emerged: [b]ecause so much documentary theatre has been made in order to 'set the record straight' or to bring materials otherwise ignored to the public's attention, we ought not to ignore its moral and ethical claims to truth. It is no accident that this kind of theatre has reemerged during a period of international crises of war, religion, government, truth, and information" (14). Thus, this moral or ethical aim has much to do with the stimulating and conflicting world events that are the materials of the verbatim theatre. In both *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* and *Betrayed,* the last words of the characters carry a humanitarian, even touching message. *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* is a play all about the recipes of every single traditional food and dessert, restaurants, and waiters of the Arab and Israeli community on the surface, to the extent that one who is not interested in food or recipes might find it nonsense. However, the real conversations of these people in the microcosmic realm who come from diverse origins contain meaningful messages in between the lines. For example, one of the main characters, Nadia, at the end of the play says:

> All we can do is live for God and not for man. My way forward is to live my life quietly and responsibly, caring for my family and caring for my children. I grow pomegranates, apples, pears, figs, lemons, and herbs. I tend

> them every day… water them… I follow the seasons through them. And I pray at my table with the pictures of my family, of the Saints, Christ and the Virgin Mary. I polish the table every day, and clean the pictures every other day. I light a candle, which burns during the day, and in the evening I burn a small olive lamp. And I pray at the table. I pray for my family, and I pray for peace. (Soans 86-87)

These words may seem to be of no importance for an 'outsider' or the reader/audience. They might even be criticized for being too conservative or pious. Nevertheless, this is the voice of an ordinary house wife which does not usually find place to be heard, especially in such a turbulent content – at the heart of the Arab-Israeli conflict in one of the most dangerous zones of the world in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. Even during the conversations of the people Soans interviews, they are in the midst of bombings and shots. The characters often refer to the voices of the bombardments or comment on the war while preparing food. Therefore, such peace messages and longings in the public level as opposed to the constant war/clash/contradiction messages in the media and the bureaucracy are significant in the context of the play.

In the introduction of the novel *The Lemon Tree* which is somehow written in a documentary form, Sandy Tolan notes about the process and success of his (re)presentation of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The book shares some same characteristics with the work of Soans:

> Despite the forests of newspaper stories and miles of videotape documenting the intractable conflict between Israelis and Palestinians, precious little light

> had fallen on the human side of the story, the common ground between enemies, and genuine hopes for coexistence. (xviii)

He confesses that like many Americans, he grew up with one part of the history, "as told through the heroic birth of Israel out of the Hollocaust", and he knew nothing about the Arab side:

> Digging for the human story that would move beyond the heartbreaking images of transmitted from the region I encountered many dead ends and broken leads. But then I came across something real. It was the true story of one house, two families, and a common history emanating from walls of Jerusalem stone on the coastal plain east of Tel Aviv and Jaffa. Not everyone is comfortable hearing the story of the Other. A talk show host on Arab radio said he was sick of the story of the Jewish love for Israel; a woman in Los Angeles chastised me for telling the story of the Arabs of a "nonexistent 'Palestine.'" The key to this openness, I think, lies in the interweaving narratives: When someone sees his or her own history represented fairly, it opens up the mind and heart to the history of the Other. (Tolan xix)

Similarly, Soans brings together the public and the private, the political and personal, the Arab and the Israeli, the Muslim, the Christian, the Jew, and most importantly, the war and peace in his play. Even with the ostensibly and deceptively simple idea of traditional foods, *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* gives important social messages like every problem can melt down when one focuses on the similarities and common grounds rather than the differences. "The audience is not being bombarded with slogans, propaganda, or points

of view, but involved in a conversation. It's not that the play ignores the dangers its characters continually face -- for example, an unattended backpack causes an entire café to freeze in panic in one scene. But the moderate tone allows the audience to gauge the characters' passions. [5]

[5] <http://www.curtainup.com/arabisraelicookbook.html>.

3. 2. Cultural Identities and (Re)presentations: Mediator or Traitor?

"Human beings are not born once and for all on the day their mothers give birth to them, but that life obliges them to give birth to themselves"

Gabriel García Márquez

(Said, "Humanism" 86)

The concept of identity and the (re)presentation of it are some of the most controversial concepts in multicultural societies. These become more complex in colonial and postcolonial contexts where the dominant imperial powers have the influence to shape the local culture in a quite important degree. In this sense, not only texts but also mass media and technology play an important role in providing a creation of a subconscious inferior-superior structure among people. Certain representations impose a standardized or unified form of identity to be superior and imitated.

In line with the introductory *Márquez* quote, cultural identity is a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being'. It belongs to the future as well as to the past. It is not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture. Hall argues that "[i]dentities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within the narratives of the past" (52).

The effect of the colonial experience shows that cultural identity is fluid and representation may become an important element in shaping it.

> Instead of thinking identity as an already accomplished fact, which the new cultural practices then represent, we should think, instead, of identity as a

> ‘production’, which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation. (Hall 51)

Cultural identity can also be described as:

> the sense of belonging to a cultural community that reaffirms self or personhood for the individual and is created by: the people, their interactions, and the context in which they relate. Cultural identity is comprised of values, mores, meanings, customs, and beliefs used to relate to the world; it continually defines what it was, what it is, and what it is becoming. (Jackson 10)

Diaspora, as well, represents transnationality, political struggles, local community, and historical displacement. The aforementioned struggles contribute to the fluidity and fixity of diaspora and the diasporic consciousness, which ultimately impacts one’s social and cultural inclusion or dislocation (Patton 32-33). Both the texts analyzed in this thesis are rich in diasporic and postcolonial identities/subjects. They go through some kind of identity crisis even claiming to “lack a stable core” at times. The narrator of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* himself is a Pakistani immigrant in America.

Definitely, the ones who suffer most from the bias against difference are the ones who are *different* in their own societies: those who undergo racism or essentialism in multicultural and postcolonial contexts or in the diaspora. Identity problems in such contexts are usually at its peak stemming from the lack of a shared history, language and cultural values. Michelle Maria Wright in *Becoming Black: Creating Identity in the African Diaspora* touches upon a similar problem comparing Black Africans to Blacks

in the diaspora. She argues that the latter "possess an intimidating array of historical, cultural, national, ethnic, religious, and ancestral origins and influences. At the same time, despite this range of differences, they are most often identified in the West as simply 'Black' and therefore as largely homogeneous. Given these contradictions, they attempt to offer an overarching definition for Blackness" (1, 2) because it is looked down on and being Black becomes like a losing game. All in all, being different or *the other* becomes an extremely difficult social problem especially in exclusive rather than inclusive societies. *The other* has to redefine himself for the sake of being recognized, accepted or included.

In "Masks of Difference: Cultural Respresentations in Literature, Anthropology and Art",Steven Tyler's review of Paul Friedrich's poetry emphasizes the textual status of anthropology when he writes that the Structuralist analogy of language and culture goes beyond the discovery of meaningful patterns to an apprehension of something else which is also a part of anthropology: "Culture as well as language is a structure in process involving meanings and contexts, and many of its symbols are analogous in part to poetic figure. Culture is, to a significant degree, a work of art" (226).

If culture is to anthropology what literature is to criticism – a work of art – then according to Webster, "narrative theory can make clearer to us the dialogue implicit in both fieldwork and ethnography, and help overcome the dogma which obscures the dialectic of fiction and truth inherent in both" (227). Homi Bhabha also articulates similarly:

> Culture becomes as much an uncomfortable, disturbing practice of survival and supplementarity—between art and politics, past and present, the public and the private—as its resplendent being is a moment of pleasure, enlightenment or liberation. It is from such narrative positions that the postcolonial prerogative seeks to affirm and extend a new collaborative dimension, both within the margins of the nation-space and across boundaries between nations and peoples. ("Location" 251-52)

When the binary oppositions between black and white are solved, Bhabha believes that cultures can interact freely. This notion is also close to Said and Auerbach's views promoting diversity and difference as humanist critics. He insists that cultural identity is hybrid and this stems from the interactions of cultures and mutual assimilations they experience. In the words of Bhabha:

> The theoretical recognition of the split-space of enunciation may open the way to conceptualizing an *inter*national culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription, articulation of culture's *hybridity*. To that end we should remember that it is the 'inter'—the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the *inbetween* space that carries the burden of the meaning of culture. ("Location" 56)

Edward Said also agrees with Bhabha on hybridity of cultures, and in *Culture and Imperialism,* he asserts that it is now time to rejoin the cultural and aesthetic realms. However, Said is aware that this is not an easy task because since the eighteenth century isolating them was the essence of experience in the West, "not only to acquire distant

domination and reinforce hegemony, but also to divide the realms of culture and experience into apparently separate spheres" ("Culture" 68).

In a poem by Derek Walcott *The Schooner 'Flight'*, similar themes and hybridity are dominant thanks to both the background of the protagonist Shabine and the mixed language Walcott uses. The following lines from *The Schooner 'Flight'* are like a summary of the recurrent idea of the triangular Caribbean identity and hybridity central to Walcott's art:

> I'm just a red nigger who love the sea,
> I had a sound colonial education,
> I have Dutch, nigger, and English in me,
> And either I'm nobody, or I'm a nation. (Lines 40-43) [6]

Saint Lucia has a proper atmosphere and physical condition to serve this celebration. There are constant references to the shape and abundance of the islands in the poem and the sea metaphor is also repeatedly there. These may also refer to the 'beyond' again. Admitedly, there are clear boundaries of the island to separate it from the sea and from the rest of the world; however, Walcott's idea here is more close to Heidegger in that: "A boundary is not that at which something stops but, as the Greeks recognized, the boundary is that from which *something begins its presencing*" (153). Therefore the space, like the time and identity, even though it has clear-cut borders, has no restraint either. His representation of the Caribbean or its peoples does not necessarily resemble the postcolonial authors' aim to bring the marginalized into the mainstream making

---

[6] <http://www.eliteskills.com/analysis_poetry/The_Schooner_Flight_by_Derek_Walcott_analysis.php>.

them elevated. It goes beyond that. Philoctete's constant staring at the sea or the sky conveys a similar meaning. His wound or scar is not a fixed representation or stereotypical image as it may first seem to either. It is healed in the end although Plunkett while talking of his memories of Tobruk says: "He has to be wounded, affliction is one theme /of this work, this fiction, since every 'I' is a//fiction finally" (*Omeros* V). Walcott's characters, their fate, identity and history are changeable, as Bhabha suggests their culture as a strategy of survival is both 'translational and transnational'.

> I sang of quiet Achille, Alfolabe's son,
>
> Who never ascended in an elevator,
>
> Who had no passport, since the horizon needs none,
>
> Never begged nor borrowed, was nobody's waiter
>
> […]
>
> I sang our wide country, the Caribbean Sea.
>
> Who hated shoes, whole soles were as cracked as a stone,
>
> Whom no man dared insult and who insulted no one. (*Omeros* LXIV)

Lack of a stable origin and hybrid identity are central to *Omeros* like Walcott's other poems and many other postcolonial texts and subjects just like in Leila Ahmed's *A Border Passage* where she claims to have many identities at the same time being proud of it. The main character is an ageless blind man – 'Blind singer/Old St. Omere/Seven Seas'. The father of Helen's child is unknown. And Achille prefers an African name.

Also, this comment about St. Lucia refers to an uncertain past and not a fixed history or memory: “but the builders' names are not there, /not Hector's ancestors, nor Philoctete's, nor Achille's” (*Omeros* LXII). Moreover, in another poem by Derek Walcott *The Schooner ‘Flight’*, similar themes and hybridity are dominant thanks to both the background of the protagonist Shabine and the mixed language Walcott uses. The following lines from *The Schooner ‘Flight’* are like a summary of the recurrent idea of the triangular Caribbean identity and hybridity central to Walcott’s art:

> I’m just a red nigger who love the sea,
> I had a sound colonial education,
> I have Dutch, nigger, and English in me,
> And either I’m nobody, or I’m a nation. (Lines 40-43) [7]

In another part of the poem he makes reference to “a parchment Creole” clarifying his color in between black and white. Likewise, the Middle Passage (also referred to in *Omeros*) as well as the Sargosso Sea both stand for this same theme symbolically.
Jean Paul Sartre acknowledges that “one’s reality and identity are both confirmed and threatened by the look of the Other” (Bjork 44)

About cultural hybridity, similarly, Edward Said emphasizes in *Culture and Imperialism:*

> No one today is purely *one* thing…Imperialism consolidated the mixture of cultures and identities on a global scale. But its worst and most paradoxical gift was to allow people to believe that they were only, mainly, exclusively,

[7] <http://www.eliteskills.com/analysis_poetry/The_Schooner_Flight_by_Derek_Walcott_analysis.php>.

> white or black, or Western, or Oriental. Yet just as human beings make their own history, they also make their cultures and ethnic identities. No one can deny the persisting continuities of long traditions, sustained habitations, national languages, and cultural geographies, but there seems no reason except fear and prejudice to keep insisting on their separation and distinctiveness, as if that was all human life was about (407-08).

Being the professor of Mohsin Hamid in his creative writing classes, Toni Morrison follows Said's and Bhabha's example that cultures are hybrid, and she believes that there has to be a balance between African and American culture in the formation of African American identity. As an African American herself she doesn't regard this diversity as a curse, on the contrary she believes that this is a positive quality. This is why she talks about this feature in her Nobel Lecture in 1993:

> I'm a Midwesterner, and everyone in Ohio is excited. I'm also a New Yorker, and a New Jerseyan, and an American, plus I'm an African-American, and a woman. I know it seems like I'm spreading like algae when I put it this way, but I'd like to think of the prize being distributed to these regions and nations and races. (qtd. in Grimes)

These words remind one of Leila Ahmed's along with many characters in *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* like Nadia's sense of identity.

Morrison is also proud of her ancestral heritage and this is why she wants to make her readers aware of their culture. Creating culture awareness can be possible with

the help of writing novels and she acknowledges that African Americans need novel today:

> We don't live in places where we can hear those stories anymore; parents don't sit around and tell their children those classical, mythological, archetypal stories that we heard years ago. But new information has got to get out, and there are several ways to do it. One is in the novel. ("Roootedness" 328)

In order to achieve the certainty of oneself, self-recognition is essential, and since African Americans are not recognized effectively by the other, the other remains to be the theme of their actions (216). African Americans encounter a psychological dilemma of viewing themselves from a Euro-American perspective which forces them to imitate Euro-American culture. Their diasporic situation puts them into a position that their practice of cultural tradition is restricted and over time it is blended with European American culture:

> As Clifford illustrated, the black diaspora seems to be "complexly related to Africa and the Americans, to shared histories of enslavement, racist subordination, cultural survival, hybridization, resistance and political rebellion". Therefore, diaspora represents transnationality, political struggles, local community, and historical displacement. The aforementioned struggles contribute to the fluidity and fixity of diaspora and the diasporic consciousness, which ultimately impacts one's social and cultural inclusion or dislocation. (Patton 32-33)

African American culture is distinct from the mainstream culture because white America achieves its identity in relation to black America with its power of whiteness which marginalizes other identities. Due to this exclusion, black America inevitably forms its own distinctive culture which may result "in double consciousness." W.E.B Du Bois explains this situation in these words:

> After the Egyptian and Indian, The Greek and Roman, The Teuton and Mongolian, the Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world,—a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his twoness,—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (Du Bois 7)

African Americans want to embody two different identities at the same time: they embrace African culture by tradition and accept American culture out of necessity. The conditions they live in do not give any other choice: to be recognized, they need to embody American elements. The conflict between the two oppositional cultural realities then turns out to be the biggest weapon of imperialism which is called by Ngugi wa Thiong'o the "cultural bomb." He argues that the cultural bomb has the effect:

> …to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them to see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from the wasteland. It makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves. (3)

One can infer from this quote that African American identity is defined by two conflicting cultural essences: African and American. That is to say African culture is not only different from "but still part of the dominant American culture, it is itself a pluralistic entity. By definition, African American culture is a combination of African and Euro-American elements…simultaneously part of and separate from white culture" (wa Thiong'o 13). The problem of African American identity is the result of the crash between natural African personality and unnatural influence of American society. This clash creates alienation from American society which is described by Du Bois as being "shut out from their world by a vast veil" (6). It is this veil that creates a double consciousness within the black personality as well as many other diasporic identities.

Identity is explored in *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* in many ways supporting hybridity. The play begins at dawn with the sound of waves running onto a sandy shoreline joined by the sound of the "muslim call to prayer" from the minaret of a neighboring mosque. A few seconds later, this first one is joined by a second "prayer" from another nearby mosque and Fadi talks as the first character the reader is introduced to. He has three opened books next to him and a rucksack which contains more books.

These are the first implications by the playwright as to describe his character; however, what he speaks and what is directly presented to the reader tells more about his identity:

> There's a place on the shoreline at Jaffa, midway between two mosques… if you find the right place, you can hear the prayer from one minaret overlapping with the other, and they make a harmony. And it's mixed with the rhythm of the breaking waves. When I hear the mosque at home in my village, it's harsh and strident… it's mixed with dust and cars and ugliness. It reminds me that being neither Muslim nor Jewish… basically I don't fit in; and either way I'm fucked. I'm a Greek Orthodox Arab. (12)

In this short speech as the introduction of the play, Fadi as an impliedly educated figure showed surrounded by books throughout the play voices his own feeling of identity. His is one compressed not "in-between" two but three distinct identities. Maybe this representation of a tri is not as eloquent enough a as identity as the main character Shabine's in the narrative poem *Schooner Flight* by Derek Walcott and this first hand voicing of the hybrid identity might come across as more effective and sympathetic to the reader now that it is away from the constraints of any unreliable narrative.

The main character, Changez, in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* goes through a similar identity crisis as a former Princeton student and prosperous American employee being the only Pakistani, that is the only non-white of their team. He tells he lacks a stable core. He is definitely in-between defining himself as a New Yorker at times and undergoing an adaptation problem when he returns to his own home country.

On the other hand, Rena who is introduced to have an American accent has a strong sense of identity. Contrary to Fadi, she regards this aspect of her as a gain; not something negative or a loss. As she is complaining about: "Here, let me give you some advice about that. They need to hire a 'me' who's an Anglo, which I certainly am, and an Israeli, which I certainly am, with a cadre of friends, which I certainly have, who speaks Hebrew, which I certainly do, and who's articulate, which I most certainly am, and that's very important" (Soans 17). Rena often repeats statements like: "I've often said to the Israeli government, what they need is a 'me'. They should hire a 'me'" throughout the play. The 'me' that she is emphasizing here is a combination of different identities she has: all the things that make her herself in short. And hers is again definitely a hybrid identity – one that is hard to be defined with limited sides.

In *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook,* all the characters are fairly comfortable while making comments which would normally be regarded as essentialist; however, since these are either about or targeted against the character him/herself most of the time this essentialist approach does not come across as too offending or does not fully fit in the category of a strongly one-sided discourse.

Nadia who is proud of having been born in Bethlehem even though it is like a ghost town now as she thinks it is spiritually important to be close to the birth-place of Christ, ends up marrying one of the orthodox priests from the church she goes to. As soon as she gives these details about her life, she moves on to cooking and she makes a comment about all Arabs using the general pronoun 'we'. "What you're going to find is

I'm not very precise with quantities and times… we're Arabs… we don't count what we eat, we just eat. And Arabs love to stuff everything…" (Soans 14).

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is one that is intractable for most critics. However, there are critics who focus on the common legacy of the two worlds. In his book – *Power, Faith, and Fantasy* Michael B. Oren asserts that "America's policies in Iraq, Iran, and the Palestinian-Israeli dispute are today the focus of intense controversy both within the United States and abroad" (14). He wants to make it clear that his purpose in the book which digs into the history of the Middle East and the international disputes and interests "is not to advocate for any side in these disputes, [but rather] it seeks to generate an appreciation of the common legacy of the two worlds in which I live and which I equally esteem" (Oren 14). Similarly, as a humanist, Said claims that

> I have spent a great deal of my life during the past thirty-five years advocating the rights of the Palestinian people to national self-determination, but I have always tried to do that with full attention paid to the reality of the Jewish people and what they suffered by way of persecution and genocide. The paramount thing is that the struggle for equality in Palestine/Israel should be directed toward a humane goal, that is, co-existence, and not further suppression and denial. ("Orientalism" xviii).

Just as a small piece of (re)presentation of such a conflict, *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* can be argued to serve such a humane goal.

All in all, cultural (re)presentations are crucial to the play. A microcosmic understanding of diversity and difference is shown through characters and the use of

food/recipes, which play a pivotal role in the construction and the overall theme of the play. All the characters, regardless of their nationality, background, sex, ethnicity, religion are given voice and, in the midst of the conflict, they demonstrate the hybridity of cultures and identities. Diversity and difference are acknowledged and celebrated in *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook*. Rena's comment about the Israeli food can be argued to allegedly refer to the whole issues at hand: "There is no longer a typical Israeli food. It's totally cosmopolitan" (Soans 15). There is a possibility of living together and in peace as there are still common grounds, even if it is food, to bring people together leading to dialogue. Therefore, one can rightfully claim that in *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook*, food is used as an inclusive and uniting mediator, as well as the presentational technique as the mode of mimesis, which serves the same purpose.

CONCLUSION

Culture has a lot to do with representation and language because just as Hall suggests: “to put simply, culture is about ‘shared meanings’. Now, language is the privileged medium in which we ‘make sense’ out of things, in which meaning is produced and exchanged. Meanings can only be shared through our common access to language” (1). Thus, language, accordingly literary representations in this case, is central to meaning and culture and has always been regarded as the key repository of cultural values and meanings.

As a practice of representation, *stereotyping* is to what critics like Said and Bhabha rejects and condemns harshly to a great degree. According to Said, it creates binary oppositions; imaginary distinctions and power relations between people in general. This approach, being in line with Bhabha’s notion of the *splitting* of the colonial discourse, deteriorates any humanistic analysis of social and cultural realities especially in this recent pace of global affairs in the midst of the ongoing “clash of civilizations” discussions. Therefore, studying the modes and practices of representation in texts gives insight into rationally and critically analyzing today’s ‘apparent’ conflicts in a period of ‘post’ or ‘beyond’ in Bhabha’s terms as analyzed at the beginning of this thesis.

As long as diversity and differences exist, they should be and can be celebrated. Therefore, this field becomes more important for the understanding and knowing of the long-constructed Other and the representations of it in especially contemporary conflict zones where coexistence is a problem. The study of the humanistic approaches to the (re)presentation and mimesis in general helps one become an open-minded individual

and societies to be inclusive rather than exclusive. Although representation and resistance in postcolonial theory and literature is too board to deal with wholly in one thesis, this thesis has attempted to do this in a limited way by discussing the politics - ins and outs - of mimesis as representation of reality in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007) and *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* (2004) by using postcolonial and cultural theory.

In the documentary theatre the marginalized are given voice and speak for themselves. As Carol Martin asserts: "[i]t is no accident that this kind of theatre has reemerged during a period of international crises of war, religion, government, truth, and information" (14). One can claim that the true subject of a postmodern drama is its diegesis rather than its mimesis. Therefore, it rejects and undermines any simple or straightforward mimetic representation. There is an alienation effect as an absent narrator or representation. This practice is skeptic about the relationship between narrative structures (power) and knowledge/truth which is regarded as discursive constructs and is therefore suggested to be avoided according to the view which promotes diversity and is against essentialism (Simerka 92). Thus, this presentational approach is closer to what Said articulates about humanism, which is mostly about celebrating differences and avoiding divisions and power relations:

> There can be no true humanism whose scope is limited to extolling patriotically the virtues of our culture, our language, our monuments. Humanism is the exertion of one's faculties in language in order to understand, reinterpret, and grapple with the products of language in history, other languages and other histories. In my understanding of its relevance

> today, humanism is not a way of consolidating and affirming what "we" have always known and felt, but rather a means of questioning, upsetting, and reformulating so much of what is presented to us as commodified, packaged, uncontroversial, and uncritically codified certainties, including those contained in masterpieces herded under the rubric of "the classics." Our intellectual and cultural world is now scarcely a simple, self-evident collection of expert discourses: it is rather a seething discordance of unresolved notations, to use Raymond William's fine word for the endlessly ramifying and elaborated articulations of culture. (Said, "Humanism" 28)

This quote summarizes much about the things discussed in this thesis and is also similar to and in line with Said's proposal in the third section of the first chapter. He suggests that the realities of power and authority – as well as any resistance to them offered by men, women, and social movements to institutions, authorities, and orthodoxies – make texts possible. He argues that these realities are what should be taken account of by criticism and the critical consciousness; hence, calling for criticisms of texts representing and/or resisting the realities of "power and authority."

In the light of these discussions, this thesis comes to the conclusion that contrary to Mohsin Hamid's subversive narrative structure and representation in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, presentational technique in the postmodern documentary theatre *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* offers a more humanistic and inclusive discourse rather than a political and exclusive one. Both the texts deal with contemporary conflicts where the question of the coexistence is difficult; in a religious perspective as well especially after

9/11. The differences (not only in the personal level like identities but also in the social and national level) are confronted in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* while they are acknowledged in *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook*, in which food is a uniting and mediating cultural tool rather than a divisive one. (Re)presentation of diverse identities gives an insight to the diversity. The style - the mode of (re)presentation - in general in *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook* promotes the hope for peace, dialogue and integration; while the style of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* creates distrust: the Other and the differences are confronted instead of being acknowledged.

WORKS CITED

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. New York: Verso, 1991.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin eds. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader.* London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

Atal, Yogesh. "One World, Multiple Cultures." *Globalization & Civilization: Are They Forces in Conflict?* New York: Global Scholarly Publications, 2008. 19-28.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature.* Trans. Willard Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000.

Ben-Zvi, Linda. "Staging the Other Israel: The Documentary Theatre of Nola Chilton." *The Drama Review* 50.3 (Fall 2006): 42-55.

Bhaba, Homi K. *Nation and Narration*. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

------. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

------. "The Other Question: Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism." *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures*. Ed. Russell Ferguson et al. New York: MIT P, 1990. 71-87.

Bjork, Patrick Bryce. *The Novels of Toni Morrison: The Search for Self and Place Within Community.* New York: Peter Lang, 1994.

Bottoms, Stephen J. "Putting the Document into Documentary: An Unwelcome

Corrective?” *The Drama Review* 50.3 (Fall 2006): 56-68.

Brandabur, Clare. “Hitchens Smears Edward Said: Responding to the Words of a Weasel” *Counterpunch* September 19, 2003.

Castle, Gregory, ed. *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*. UK: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

Cayir, Kenan. *Islamic Literature in Contemporary Turkey: From Epic to Novel*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Childs, Peter and R. J. Patrick Williams. *An Introduction to Post-colonial Theory.* Cornwall: Prentice Hall, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1997.

Dawson, Gary Fisher. *Documentary Theatre in the United States: An Historical Survey and Analysis of Its Content, Form, and Stagecraft.* London: Greenwood Press, 1999.

De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. Trans. and ed. H.M. Parshley. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, Inc, 1989.

Don DeLillo. “In the Ruins of the Future.” *The Guardian* December 22, 2001.

Du Bois, W.E.B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Pocket Books, 2005.

Eagleton, Terry. “Pork Chops and Pineapples: *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* by Erich Auerbach.” *London Review of Books* 25.20 (October 2003): 17-9.

Fergusson, Francis. *Aristotle’s Poetics.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1961.

Forster, E. M. *A Passage to India.* England: Penguin Books, 2005.

Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-*

1977. Great Britain: The Harvester Press, 1980.

Gray, Richard. "Open Doors, Closed Minds: American Prose Writing at a Time of Crisis." *American Literary History* 21.1 (Spring 2009): 128-48.

Grimes, William. "Toni Morrison Is '93 Winner Of Nobel Prize in Literature." *The New York Times.* 8 October 1993. 3 August 2008 <http://www.nytimes.com/books/98/01/11/home/28957.html>.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." *Identity and Difference*. Ed. Kathryn Woodward. London: Sage, 1997. 51-59.

------ ed. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage Publications Ltd., 1997.

Hart, Matthew. "Introduction: Contemporary Literature and the State." *Contemporary Literature* 49.4 (Winter 2008): 491-513.

Heidegger, Martin. "Building, Dwelling, Thinking." *Poetry, Language, Thought*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Huntington, Samuel P. "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72.3 (Summer 1993): 22-49.

Irwin, Robert. *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies.* England: Penguin Books, 2006.

Jackson, Ronald L. *Negotiation of Cultural Identity: Perceptions of European Americans and African Americans.* Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 1999.

Kennedy, Valerie. *Edward Said: A Critical Introduction.* UK: Polity Press, 2000.

Kottman, Paul A. “Memory, "Mimesis," Tragedy: The Scene before Philosophy.” *Theatre Journal* 55.1 (March 2003): 81-97.

Lima, Luiz Costa. “Social Representation and Mimesis.” *New Literary History* 16.3 (Spring 1985): 447-66.

Martin, Carol. “Bodies of Evidence.” *The Drama Review* 50.3 (Fall 2006): 8-15.

Miller, Paul Allen. “Toward a Post-Foucauldian History of Discursive Practices.” *Configurations* 7.2 (Spring 1999): 211-25.

Morrison, Toni. "Rootedness: The Ancestor as Foundation." *Literature in the Modern World: Critical Essays and Documents*. Ed. Dennis Walder. New York: Oxford University P, 1990.

Oren, Michael B. *Power, Faith, and Fantasy.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company Ltd., 2007.

Plato. *The Republic*. Great Britain: Penguin Classics, 1974.

Richards, David. *Masks of Difference: Cultural Representations in Literature, Anthropology and Art.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Rabinowitz, Paula. *They Must Be Represented: The Politics of Documentary*. New York: Verso, 1994.

Rothberg, Michael. “A Failure of the Imagination: Diagnosing the Post-9/11 Novel: A Response to Richard Gray.” *American Literary History* 21.1 (Spring 2009): 152-58.

Said, Edward W. *Culture & Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1994.

------. *Humanism and Democratic Criticism.* The United States: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

------. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books, 2003.

------. *The World, The Text, and The Critic*. London: Vintage, 1991.

Simerka, Barbara and Christopher B. Weimer. "Duplicituous Diegesis: 'Don Quijote' and Charlie Kaufman's 'Adaptation.'" *Hispania* 88.1 (2005): 91-100.

Soans, Robin. *The Arab-Israeli Cookbook*. UK: Aurora Metro Press, 2004.

Sohn, Stephen Hong. "Theorizing Asian American Fiction." *MFS Modern Fiction Studies* 56.1 (Spring 2010): 1-18.

Tidd, Ursula. "The Self-Other Relation in Beauvoir's Ethics and Autobiography." *Hypatia* 14.4 (1999): 163-74.

Tolan, Sandy. *The Lemon Tree*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2006.

Tyler, Steven A. "The Poetic Turn in Postmodern Anthropology: The Poetry of Paul Friedrich" *American Anthropologist* 86.2 (1984): 328-36.

Wa Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers, 2004.

Walcott, Derek. *Omeros*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1990.

------. *The Schooner 'Flight'*. <http://www.eliteskills.com/analysis_poetry/The_Schooner_Flight_by_Derek_Walcott_analysis.php>.

Wright, Michelle M. *Becoming Black: Creating Identity in the African Diaspora*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2004.

Young, Robert J. C. "Colonialism and the Desiring Machine." *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*. Gregory Castle, ed. UK: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.