

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Terrorism as a Means of Resistance to American Hegemony in Mohsin Hamid's

The Reluctant Fundamentalist

**A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Masters of Arts in English**

By

Prakash Khatri

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

November, 2011

Tribhuvan University
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled “Terrorism as a means of Resistance to American Hegemony in Mohsin Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*”, submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Mr. Prakash Khatri, has been approved by the following undersigned members of the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Tribhuvan University

Date:

Acknowledgements

In this profound hour of happiness I would, first of all, express my gratitude to my respected teacher Mr. Pradip Raj Giri for providing me scholarly suggestions and his valuable guidance, without whose support my thesis would not have come to this form of completion.

I am very much grateful to my teacher and Head of Central Department of English, Kirtipur, Mr. Ammaraj Joshi, for his words of encouragement. I also take this moment to thank Mr. Ganashyam Bhandari who not only provided me with genuine suggestions on my research work but also guided me with valuable remarks.

I am really indebted to my parents and my brothers who managed me financial and academic environment. My sincere thanks goes to my true friends- Buddhi Ram Pandey, Ganesh Dhakal, Humnath Parajuli, Bharat Raj Dhakal, Nabaraj Tiwari, Mahendra Subedi, Jeevan Lamichane, Resham Karki who regularly helped me to bring my thesis into being.

Last, but not the least, I am grateful to all my respected teachers, colleagues, sisters and my relatives for their support and encouragement. My special thanks goes to Keshab Adhikari, Everest Computer Center Kirtipur for his assistance in computer work for the completion of this research work.

November 2011

Prakash Khatri

Abstract

Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* basically deals with representation, amalgamation of perspectives and finally the resistance. It also tries to find out how terrorism is interpreted by the west and how it tends to view the rest of the world to have influence and dominance over them. Its prime emphasis is on the explication of the protagonist Chagez and his adoption of different forms of resistance in a restrictive society where his position is determined on the basis of cultural, ethnic and national grounds. Written on the tumultuous backdrop of political unrest that followed the attacks on the World Trade Center, this dissertation shows that resistance emerges when the superiors, the powerful, impose the basic governing features upon the subordinates – the powerless. The collapse of Twin Towers is an indication to the fact that resistance to power and dominance prevails in every society in a sense that it is integrally a must for survival and existence that ultimately helps to create the truth and history.

Contents

Page No.

Acknowledgements

Abstract

I. Hamid's <i>The Reluctant Fundamentalist</i> and the Concept of Terrorism	1-7
II. Power, Politics and Representation of Subject	8-24
III. Terrorism as a Means of Resistance to American Hegemony	25-43
IV. Shifting Forms of Resistance in <i>The Reluctant Fundamentalist</i>	44-47

Works Cited

I. Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and the Concept of Terrorism

This research critically examines Mohsin Hamid's well read book *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* through Foucauldian concept of power and Gramsci's notion of Hegemony, to prove how the exercise of power and the ideological construct determine the position of the subject. This study also tries to find how terrorism is interpreted by the west and how it tends to view the rest of the world to have the influence and dominance over them. Entirely based on a one-note story, this novel is a creative manifestation of the clouds of suspicion, representation, an amalgamation of prespectives, and finally the resistance. A variety of socio-political, cultural and contextual movements engaged in complex articulatory practices are responsible in shaping the position of the protagonist and force the protagonist in adopting the different forms of resistance to the dominance, imperialism and the so-called superiority created by the west, especially by the U.S.A.

The beginning of terrorism closely followed the spread of ancient civilization. Since then, both the sides either, rebel groups or governments have used their force in achieving their political, religious or ideological goals. Though there is not any agreed definition, the term has been defined by various policy makers or public. For some the very idea of terrorism is a snare and delusion, a way of diverting the public's attention from the failings of western governments, the American and British ones especially. Terrorism is a semantic technique employed by government spokes persons to change the subject, a slick way of transforming the victims of injustice into its perpetrators.

Terrorism is hardly a value-neutral term. No matter how detached the observer is, it is hard to ignore the fact that the application of the term, calling some activity or group or organization engaged in it 'terrorists' conveys a moral judgment. They

typically respond to an attempt at such labeling by denial and by making what accounts to a counter-accusation.

Terrorist typically have political, religious or other ideological goals and they try to achieve their goal either by violence or by the creation of fear. They always seek for the revolutionary change in government or liberation from the governing power. For some, it has become a way to attract attention and support for particular political philosophies or religious beliefs. But for others, it is simply to oppose all forms of authority. Terrorism is defined as the use of violence by non-state groups against civilians for political, religious and other various purposes. Terrorism is most usefully defined for empirical research purposes as "the deliberate targeting of more or less randomly selected victims, whose deaths and injuries are expected to awaken the opponents will to persist political conflict" (*qtd in Turk 273*).

In the text, terrorism has become the central issue in changing almost all the characters' life. Changez, the protagonist of the novel, after the 9/11 attack in New York's World Trade Center, smiles with satisfaction at the news of collapse of the Twin Towers. He is remarkably pleased with the news of the attack though he has profound sense of sympathy toward the victims of the attack. Despite being almost a successful American and being in love with an American lady, his happiness towards the attack shows his strong hatred towards Americans.

After the attack, Changez relates himself with marginalized Muslims in America and therefore empathizes with the terrorists who are from his own race. He shows his close affinity towards the attackers smiling with satisfaction at the news of collapse of Twin Towers of New York's World Trade Center. This very sense prevailing inside the protagonist shows his strong disapproval toward American Hegemony and therefore he regards terrorism as a means of resistance towards

American hegemony which can challenge the so called superiority created by America over the whole world.

Mohsin Hamid, like his protagonist Changez was born and raised in Lahore, Pakistan, studied at Princeton (graduating in 1993), worked in the financial sector in New York city and came back to his home country Pakistan after the 9/11 attack. So the text is to some extent autobiographical. Hamid has also taken some big themes like identity crisis, Tradition, nationalism, globalization, capitalism, Islam, abuse of history- all are placed in the dock either explicitly or examined through the protagonist's monologue. Hamid shows sensitivity and allows his central character to walk along the fractures in East-West relations in post 9/11 world. America is no longer as unimpeachable as it once appeared; nor is he as bearded and reluctant fundamentalist as easy to caricature as the west would have believed.

Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* is shaped by cultural confusion, multiplicity of perspectives and the feelings of attachment to his race, religion and nationality. One of the critics C. Menefee responding on its narrative and style comments:

Changez, a Pakistani, confronting an American spy bent on assassinating him, manipulates the encounter, seizing the chance to tell his story and to be heard. His narrative style (monologue or perhaps an imagined dialogue) can be distracting, but clearly reveals his interior world and motivations. He is now, in America's view, an enemy.

Multiple cultures shock him over a short space of time. (144)

In Menefee's view, the style is compatible to the theme and subject matter of the novel. During the course of the narrative Changez reveals his background, origin, class, nationality and even solidarity with his race and ethnicity. With the attack on

the Twin Tower on September 11 by the terrorists, America's view to the Muslim race changes suddenly and he rebels against America. Further, he criticizes America's role in the world. In this context, he says that anyone who does not agree with American is its enemy and Fundamentalist.

Similarly East West tension and the torn existence of the protagonist are highlighted in the Kirkus reviews:

"This is the story of leaving America," says Mohsin Hamid, who delves deep into the tension between East and West in his latest novel. [. . .] It's like the way America and the Muslim World look at each other," says the author. "Is America the country that produces the music we love, or is it the country that will bomb us?" Is Pakistan full of normal people like us or crazed terrorists?" Neither side really knows. So there's this weird suspicion on both side [. . .]. Wherever he goes, he will always be torn. (5)

Hamid in his work unfurls the picture of the Muslim world, especially the east which is misrepresented by the west, especially by America. America views the Muslim countries as the world of crazy terrorists. There is a vast misunderstanding between both sides and therefore there is suspicion and prejudices.

In the same way, the protagonist has got the close affinity and strong attachment towards the attackers. *Publisher's weekly* reviews the novel as:

[. . .] an intelligent and absorbing 9/11 novel, written from the perspective of Chagez, a young Pakistani whose sympathies, despite his fervid immigrant embrace of America, lie with the attackers [. . .] after the towers fall, Changez is subject to intensified scrutiny and

physical threats, and his coworkers become remarkably less affable as his beard grows in (in a form of protest, he says). (42)

With the terrorist attack on the Twin Towers, the protagonist is viewed through biased perspectives not only by the Americans but also by the fellow colleagues. He is fired from his job. He expresses his hope and frustrations, love and hatred and after all a sense of "self" and "other" mentality. Before the attack, he was almost equal to all the Americans whereas there is the paradigm shift in the perspectives after the September 11 attack on the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center. Hamid, through Changez, expresses the diverse range of religious, ethnic, geographical and cultural confusion of the non-westerners in the west. This situation further compels us to raise question, whether one can really assimilate himself into a different culture; there is the question whether it is possible for true portrayal of one's identity when it depends on a community and ethnic group thousand of miles away.

Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* can be claimed as a fine creation written by non-western writer which is characterized by dazzling shifts of socio-cultural, political and ideological encounters that exposes the assortment of a number of such issues in the post September 11 Muslim experience in the west. In the novel, he deals with the distinctive predicament of the Muslim people as represented by every western discourse from every aspect and angle. Hamid's intention of selecting the setting of his novel as the post September 11 Pakistan, a Muslim country, and the protagonist with multiple identities has its own significance. Is Changez really a Muslim terrorist and fundamentalist? Such questions are very significant in this context. But the critics brought here for analysis does not seem to analyze how the polemical power or hegemony up brings the sense of resistance in the suppressed groups. Power indicates a state of possessing the ability to wield coercive force,

permissive authority and substantial influence. Any system is both principally and pragmatically based on the persistent circulation of power and its influence and sway generates and gathers the further force for its own effective consolidation that ultimately brings about the marketing of distinction and hierarchy in a situational entity. Concept of power is taken even negatively as unnecessarily despotic and cruel force exerted to confirm the truth. Furthermore, the exercise of power always tends to be in the favor of its masters simply for their benefits for their everlasting rule. Power is exercised creatively and destructively. However, it is a natural trait which is always used for serving the interests of the makers. In the same manner, power is universal tool used to determine one's subject position and hegemony.

The Reluctant Fundamentalist by a Pakistani writer is one of the best illustrations of power, nexus and its effective use which imply that humans and countries are born to exercise a set of powers on others. The attack and collapse of Twin Towers of World Trade Center can be taken as a counter-reply to the power or hegemony created by America. The steady and evolutionary process of use of actions against others is simply for position and power that creates the atmosphere for meaningful survival. The decisive tussle between the two power centers led by Muslims and America represents the history of fighting for the marked identity larded with power and higher position. The killing of people is not a kind of indication towards brutal deeds; rather it is a justified symptom that comes by through the exercise of power. The satisfaction shown by the central character Changez at the news of collapse of Twin Towers shows his sense of resistance to American power and so called superiority of America. The ideology and the hegemony imposed by America towards the Muslim has become the key factor in arousing the disgust on the position of America.

This thesis has been divided into four different chapters to clarify the strong resentment and the different forms of resistance with respect to the central character. The first chapter includes the general introduction to the study. It presents the elaboration of the statement of the problem against the backdrop of the different critic's commentaries on the novel and hypothesis of the researcher. The second chapter explains the methodology employed to study the text. The theoretical tools employed in this research are New Historicism and Ideology with the theorists – Michel Foucault, Antonio Gramsci, Michele Barrett and Louis Althusser in reference. The third chapter presents an extensive textual analysis to reveal how the novel documents the instances of discourse, representation, domination and the sense of resistance of the central character in restrictive socio-political, cultural, national and ethnic boundaries. The fourth chapter concludes the research with a brief recounting observation of work affirming the hypothesis. Finally all the chapters are attempting to resolve around the political and ideological make up of the characters in the society with respect to rules, norms and systems.

II. Power, Politics and Representation of Subject

Power

Michel Foucault, the most noted French philosopher and historian, is popular for his thought over power and power relation. He was greatly influenced by Nietzsche. He has given his powerful view on anti-enlightenment tradition that rejects the equation of reason, emancipation and its progress stating that an interface between modern forms of power and its relation has served to create new forms of domination. In this regard Paul Rainbow writes:

Foucault calls a new regime of 'bio-power; he explains that bio-power brought life and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculations and mode of knowledge; power is an agent of the transformation of human life. He further describes that the other pole of bio-power is the human body; the body approached not directly in its biological dimension, but as an object to be manipulated and controlled. (17)

Power is related with the language and the society. The language is the social system. The knowledge is related with language as it is concerned with the society not with the individual mind and consciousness because language is not personal individual component. That is why language plays the vital role in controlling and losing power. Language in a sense is a means of replacing and displacing the power.

Foucault, while defining truth and power points out that these two are interwoven and attached. They are not isolated concepts. He states:

The important thing here, I believe, is that truth is not outside power or lacking in power; contrary to a myth whose history and function would repay further study; truth is not the reward of free spirit, the child of protracted solitude, nor the privilege of those who have succeeded in

liberating themselves. Truth is the thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its general politics of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true. (1144)

Truth and power are interrelated. They are just like the two sides of the same coin. Linguistic discourse originates truth and truth produces power and again it is the knowledge that brings the better discourse and effective power is produced through the better knowledge.

Foucault has tried to highlight the possibility of gaining new and more effective political ways of seeing power. It is mainly concerned with the relations of power and knowledge and their respective relation to the subject. For Foucault power is distributed through social relations and is not to be reduced to centralized economic forms and determination or to its legal or judicial character. Rather power forms a dispersed capillary interwoven into the fabric of the whole social order. Foucault says: "Power is not simply repressive but productive; it brings subject into being. Power is implicated in generating forces, making them grow, and ordering them, rather than one dedicated to impeding them, making them submit or destroying them" (*Faubian* 136).

Power is conceived as hegemony (not dominant force). Power is creative, formative and productive and power which is exercised between the mutual understanding of a subject and object for the creative source of values. Power which is exercised for death, destruction, suppression is narrow, negative because it is inadequate for capturing the productive and positive aspects of power. The society does not need power seen as denial which is centralized and practiced to control rather

it desires to have that power which produces positive knowledge and induces pleasures which is the essence of power or hegemony. The negative and destructive forms of individual knowledge are not power but a domination or power abuse. Power is rooted in knowledge and is tied to systems of social control. The discourse which is regulated by the society produces effective knowledge about the exercise of power.

According to Foucault power is a creative source for positive value which is always practiced under the influence of hegemony. It is never used vertically to dominate other. His theory is not compatible to the repressive hypothesis which sees the functioning of power; the trend that confines power into a small group or society. He opines that power is not the ruthless domination by the stronger over the weak. This very idea of Foucault is near to Nietzsche who says that power is not bad at all. Nature of power to Foucault is:

Power is everywhere: not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere. Power comes from below; that is there is no binary and all encompassing opposition between ruler and the ruled at the root of power relation and serving as a general matrix- no such duality extending from the top down and reacting on more and more limited groups to the very depths of social body. (*History* 193)

Thus Foucault's main idea was against the vertical and hierarchical notion of power. He sees power not simply a repressive tool but as complex forces that produce what happens in society. It is not exercised by somebody as he himself is caught in certain discourses and practices.

Power Relation

Foucault's theory of power not only centralizes on power but also in its relation that makes a network for power circulation as the blood circulation system in

human body. It is the strategic signification for the existence of system with effect and result. Power relation has an immediate effect over the manifestation of ideology, subject position, violence, constitution of labor relation and holding the sway and rule. Power relation is in fact a means to act out the activities that are solely determined by the existing conditions created as per the time and talk. Foucault in his concept of power relation claims:

Power is nothing more and nothing less than the multiplicity of force relations extant moving within the social body. Power conditions of possibility actually consist of this moving substrate of force relations: the struggles, confrontations, contradictions, inequalities, transformations and integrations of these force relations. (*Mc Haul* 84)

Foucault describes that power relations are deeply rooted in the whole network of the society. It is a multiplicity of force relations moving within a social body.

Everybody is positioned within the struggles for power. Nobody is free from it. Foucault further describes the power relation in connection with body and domination since the body is the field to exercise it and create power for required objective. He says:

The body is also directly involved in political field; power relation has an immediate hold upon it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, and force it to carry out tasks or perform ceremonies to emit signs. This political investment of the body is bound up, in accordance with complex reciprocal relation, with its economic use; it is largely as a force of production that body is invested with relations of power and domination; but on the other hand, its constitution as labor power is possible only if it is caught up in a system of subjection; the body

becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and subjected body. This subjection is not only obtained by the instruments of violence or ideology it can be direct physical, pitting force against force. (*Discipline 25-26*)

Foucault further says that power is exercised rather than possessed. It does not only belong to the ruling elite to have acquired or preserved, but the overall effect of its strategic position is sometimes manifested and extended by the position of those who are dominated. Moreover, it is not simply exercised as an obligation or prohibitions on those who do not have it. It is transmitted through them, by them and exerts pressure upon them.

Power and knowledge directly interrelated. There can't be power relation without knowledge. In this regard Foucault says:

The exercise of power is not simply a relationship between 'partners', individual or collective; it is a way in which some act on others which is to say, of course, that there is no such entity as power with or without a capital letter, global, massive or diffused: concentrated or distributed. Power exists only as exercised by some on others, only when it is put into action, even though, of course, it is inscribed in a field of sparse available possibilities undermined by permanent structures. This also means that power is not matter of consent. In itself, it is not the renunciation of freedom, a transfer of rights, or power of each and all delegated to a few. The relationship of power may be an effect of a prior or permanent consent, but it is not by nature the manifestation of consensus. (*Faubian 340*)

Power relation is determined by the mode of action which does not act directly or immediately on others. Instead it acts upon their actions i.e. possible or actual or present action. It forces, bends, breaks, destroys and closes off all the possibilities. Its opposite pole can either be passivity or resistance; it has no other option on the other hand. It is always exerted upon the subject (the one over whom power is exercised). It is articulated on the basis of two elements that are indispensable. The one over whom power is exercised and maintained as a subject; and that, is faced with a power relation.

Michel Foucault has put his arguments in various manners which take into account of power relationship that clearly covers up the use of violence. No doubt power can't be exercised as single; it needs both at the same time. Even though consent and violence are the instruments of results they do not constitute the principal or basic nature of power and power relation.

However, a strict containment argument oversimplifies Foucault's subtle, flexible and dynamic conception of power that saturate social spaces are actually determined by the crystallization of power in the state apparatus. Foucault emphasizes that:

[P]ower's condition of possibility . . . must not be sought in the primary existence of a central point, in a unique source of sovereignty from which secondary and descendent forms would emanate; it is the moving substrate of force relations which, by virtue of the inequality, constantly engender states of power, but the latter are always local and unstable. (*History*1:93)

Foucault argues that possibility of power does not only exist in one single point. It is such a unique force through which different other forms emanate. It is a moving force

of relations which can take anyone to the different forms at different specific situations in a given society.

For Foucault, power is never monolithic; and power relations always imply multiple sites not only of power but also of resistance. He writes that such sites of resistance are of variable configuration, intensity, and effectiveness. He states:

The strictly relational character of power relationships depends on multiplicity of points of resistance: these play the roles of adversary, target, support or handle in power relations . . . resistance . . . can only be exist in the strategic field of power relations. But this does not mean that they are only a reaction or rebound, forming with respect to the basic domination and underside that is in the end always passive, doomed to perpetual defeat. (*History* 95-96)

Foucault flexible conception of power relations may accommodate local instances of a subversion that is produced for containment, but it also acknowledges revolutionary social transformations and other possible modalities of power and resistance. If, on the one hand, ideological dominance can never be monolithic, total upheavals occur relatively rarely; modes and instances of resistance- subversions, contestations, transgressions; appropriations- tend to be local and dispersed in their consequences. Thus Foucault's work confirmed the hopeless inadequacy of subversion- containment as an explanatory model for the dynamism and specificity of relations of power, and for the necessity to make more subtle discriminations among the modalities of resistance and among their various conditions of possibility.

According to Foucault, power and power relations are deeply rooted in the whole network of the society. He asserts that: "To live in a society is, in any event, to live in such a way that some can act on the actions of others. A society without power

relations can only be an abstraction (*Faubian* 343)”. It means that power works on single principle dominating the society to the grass level, with the possibilities of action vs. action which is coextensive with every social relationship to the application of power. Power takes different forms in different specific situations in a society that always tries to over impose over the others with total feelings of societies. The power state can’t only be a single form and every form in one way or other develops to create the domination or power relation.

To summarize, we can say that Foucault describes power relation through the investigation of the forms of resistance and attempt is made to dissociate these relations. This relationship is the result of differences in discourses which are involved in discursive practices.

Subject

Foucault’s concept of power also deals with the subject and its position. Subject is the ultimate outcome of power and power relation. It is a form of power defeated by the superior. Power subjugates the subject. According to Foucault, ‘subject is part of discursive formation of modernity, albeit an unstable part that generates new positions and oppositions (*Dictionary of Soc.*).

Jeremy Hawthorn defined subject as: “The subject is SITE rather than CENTER or PRESENCE where things happen or that to which things happen, rather than that which makes things happen: extra- individual forces use the subject to exert their sway, the subject doesn’t use them” (*Hawthorn* 347). For Jeremy Hawthorn subject is not that place where things happen nor is that place in which things happen rather it is something which makes things happen. It is that site which allows the individual to exercise the power to exert their sway.

Foucault in regard of subject and its power effect says:

This form of power that applies itself to immediate everyday life categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes law of truth on him that he must recognize and others have to recognize in him. It is form of power that makes the individual subjects. There are two meanings of the word “subject”: Subject to someone else by control of dependence, and tied to his own identity by conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power that subjugates and makes subject to. (*The Subject* 331)

It is obvious that there are three types of struggles against forms of domination and subject position (ethnic, social and religious), followed by resistance against exploitation. An individual always struggles for individuality, for identity and for truth. It is the way to make others recognize who he is.

According to Foucault ‘power is pervasive (8)’. He defines that power is a complex tool that makes the suitable atmosphere and produces what happens in society. A particular individual or state only can’t exercise power rather he himself is ensnared and empowered by discourses that ultimately constitute power. And in that situation power is not negative; but it is productive. However along with the dangers behind the exercise of power, there lies the attachment of the making of subjectivity to power relations.

Foucault’s concept of subject can also be interpreted through Jeremy Bentham’s plan for panopticism. Jeremy says that panopticism offers a particular vivid instance of how political technology of the body functions. It is a general functioning, way of defining power relation that determines the subjectivity. It is also a mechanism of power reduced to its ideal form. It is also a particular visual order of

human being or organization that clarifies the mechanisms of power that determines subject position.

Relation between Power and Subject Position

Foucault's main objective was to create a history of the different modes of power not to analyze its phenomena. He tries to define how human culture, humankind is made subjects- the relation between power and subject position. His schema of three modes of objectification of the subject provides a convenient means to present human beings into subjects.

The first mode of objectification of the subject is somewhat cryptically called 'dividing practices (8)' in which the subject is objectified by a process of division either within himself or from others. Secondly, he has studied the individual objectification of subjects which he calls 'scientific classification'. And finally his third mode studies subjectification which is mainly concerned the way a human being turns himself or herself into subject. According to him subject position is placed in the relation of production and signification; Foucault says:

It is certain that the mechanisms of subjection cannot be studied outside their relation to the mechanism of exploitation and domination. But they don't merely constitute "the terminal" of more fundamental mechanism. They entertain complex and circular relations with other forms. (*The Subject* 332)

Foucault's concept of 'rationalization' determines the subject position with the lead of the power. It consists in taking the forms of resistance against different forms of power. He further uses another metaphor that consists in using the resistance as a chemical catalyst so as to bring to light to power relations and locate their positions.

To understand the power relation it's significantly important to investigate the forms of resistance and plethora of attempts made to dissociate these relations. J.D Faubian supporting the importance of power struggle writes:

They are struggles that question the status of the individual. On the one hand, they assert the right to be different and underline everything that makes individuals truly individual. On the other hand, they attack everything that separates the individual, breaks his links with other, splits up community life, forces the individual back on himself, and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way. (*Faubian* 331)

Michel Foucault opines that the ultimate aim of all struggles is to seek the answer of, who we are? Thus the struggle is always meant for attacking on a technique: a form of power that determines subject position. Power relation for Foucault, implies a strategy of struggle in which two opposite forces never lose specific nature and are not imposed even though always tried by either side. Each force constitutes for the other a sort of permanent hurdle and a block for possible retreat. This confronting relation puts itself on its final state where certain relatively fixed and stable approaches give away the free rivalry reactions. However, from the moment, it is not confrontation it is fixing of power relationship with a target – the subject position. At the same time, it is virtually impossible for power relation to exist without a sense of insubordination as a means to come away.

Accordingly, all extension of power is intended to completely suppress the issues of subordination can cause the exercise of power up against its outer limits. That is to say, every confrontation strategy struggles to get a relationship of power that ultimately results in powerful strategy and the very position along with the tense relationship and conducts;

The relation between power and subject position is always a reciprocal appeal, a constant (perpetual) linking and a constant (perpetual) reversal. The relationship of power at every moment may have a confrontation between two adversaries. The relation between the adversaries in human society gives approaches of power that determines the power position and subject position with the clear meaning of domination as natural as the society and its polarized behaviors take place in the setting of power and its natural operation. Likewise it is also a critically strategic position which is taken for granted and consolidated within a long term confrontation between adversaries. This confrontation actually determines the subject position and domination which clearly paves the way to be the transcription of an approach of power. In this regard Foucault says:

What makes the domination of a group, a caste, or a class, together with the resistance and revolts that domination comes up against, a central phenomenon in the history of societies is that they manifest in a massive and global form, at the level of whole social body, the locking together of power relations with relations with relations of strategy and results proceeding from their interaction. (*Faubian* 348)

Thus, in a general apprehension, we can ascertain that nature of relationship between power and subject position is ever resisting and defending for achieving the ultimate goal of power seizure.

Concept of Ideology

The initial coiner of the term 'ideology' was Antoine Destutt de Tracy, who intended to create a branch of study concerned with ideas. Fifty years later Marx took up this term and gave it a quite different meaning. Ideology for him is the system of ideas and representations which dominate the mind of man or a social group.

Marx and Engels added to that view of ideology a further dimension, which was highly to be influential. They associated ideology and class, asserting that the ideas of the ruling class were the ruling ideas. Ideological illusions were an instrument in the hands of rulers, through the state, and were employed to exercise control and domination; indeed, to 'manufacture history' according to their interests. They have given rather persuasive picture of ideology. One was the need for simplified world around us. It is the desire of some individuals or groups for power and control over others. It can also be interpreted as a growing tendency to break up human activities into separate compartments. Ideology, in short, is a totalitarian system which has managed and processed all social conflict out of existence (*qtd. In Engelton 127*).

Unlike Marx and Engels, Antonio Gramsci, a radical Italian Marxist, theorist and activist, gave different manifestation of hegemony. He is best known for his notion of hegemony. According to Gramsci, ideological hegemony could be exercised by a dominant class, the bourgeoisie, not only through exerting state force but through a way being solely a tool of the state. Ideology operated and was produced in civil society, the sphere of non state individual and group activity.

Gramsci saw the notion of hegemony as a great advance, both philosophical and political, toward a critical and unified understanding of reality. In the course of historical process a new intellectual and moral order could evolve, an 'autonomous and superior culture' with 'more refined and decisive ideological weapons'.

Gramsci's theory of hegemony attempts to raise some questions Marx had left unasked. What are the forms that ideological control takes? What are the relationship, and the difference between ideological and political domination?

Michele Barrett says that the concept of 'hegemony' is the organizing focus of Gramsci's thought on politics and ideology. Its distinctive usage has rendered it as the hallmark of the Gramscian approach in general. Barrett opines that:

Hegemony is best understood as the *organization of consent* – the process through which subordinate forms of consciousness are constructed without recourse or violence or coercion. The ruling bloc, according to Gramsci, operates not only in the political sphere but throughout the whole of society. (238)

Thus, we can say that Gramsci has demystified philosophy and reintegrated it into a normal thought – processes of individuals. He did this retaining a three fold structure of political thought. One of them is an embodiment of hegemony, and displays the features of coherence and critique that hegemonic groups eventually imposed on the thinking under their control. Gramsci's emphasis is on moral and cultural norms and understandings, disseminated through the media and voluntary associations. For Gramsci, the establishment of hegemony involved the coordination of different interests and ideological expressions, so all the embracing group, possibly society as a whole, would be engaged. Hegemony produced compromise – an equilibrium that took some account of the subordinate groups. As against the abstract and reified nature of the Marxist conception of ideology, exposed as a way of concealing and inhibiting correct social practices. Gramsci sought to explore the working of ideology as a practice in the world.

The French Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser is regarded as a major redefiner of ideology within the Marxist tradition. Althusser very clearly explore the role of ideology in formation of individual as subject. Similarly, Althusser followed Marx in assigning the ruling ideology, the role of ensuring the submission of the

workers to the ruling class. Althusser very clearly presents the changing mode of bourgeois tool of exploitation i.e. from (Repressive) state Apparatus to Ideological State Apparatus.

Effectively the repressive state apparatus was the dominating political force, but ideology developed a life of its own as the symbolic controller. The ideological state apparatuses were located in religious, legal and cultural structures. For Althusser, the very notion of hegemony itself depended on the ideological concept of the subject – individuals constituted by ideology as bearers of consciousness, will and agency. In other words, ‘ideology’ and ‘subject’ were mutually defining. He says:

We are subjects and we function in the practical rituals of the most elementary everyday life (the handshake, the fact of calling by your name, the fact of knowing, even if I do know what it is, that you ‘have’ name of your own, which means that you are recognized as a unique subject etc.). This recognition gives only the ‘consciousness’ of your incessant (eternal) practice of ideological recognition – its consciousness i.e. its recognition – but in no sense does it give us the (scientific) knowledge of the mechanism of this recognition. (130)

For Althusser, ideology is plural only in its location in diverse social spheres. It is not plural in its functions, retaining only the Marxist function of exercising unified hegemonic power so as to maintain existing capitalist relations of exploitation. Althusser refused to be drawn into formulating a theory of particular ideologies, nor was he interested in aspects of ideology that were unrelated to oppressive power.

Althusser has tried to differentiate the (Repressive) State Apparatuses with the ideological state Apparatuses and the use of ideological state apparatuses. He asserts:

“no class can hold state power over a long period without at the same time exercising its hegemony over and in the State Ideological Apparatuses” (112).

According to Althusser, individuals inevitably think about the real conditions of their existence in a particular manner; they produce an imaginary account of how they relate to the real world. Ideology is a representation, an image of those relations. For example, to describe certain nations as freedom loving may allude to existing practices in their countries that suggest that individuals do not want to be ruled over arbitrarily. Ideology permits societies to imagine that such actions really do further the cause of freedom. It provides a view of their real world that explains it and reconciles them to it. Ideology does that by obscuring from a society; the illusory and distorted nature of that representation. Ideology is an imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence. In the book *For Marx*, Althusser says:

‘man’ do indeed express, not the relation between them and their conditions of existence, but the way they live the relation between them and their conditions of existence: this presupposes both a real relation as an ‘imaginary’ lived relations [. . .] In ideology, the real relation is inevitably invested in the imaginary relation. Ideology exists on in and through the human subjects and to say that the subject inhabits the imaginary is to claim that it compulsively refers the world back to itself. (*qtd. in Žižek, 214*)

Therefore, ideology for Althusser is subject centered or anthropomorphic. He used the phrase to explain the relationship between subject and ideology is ‘interpellating’ or naming. Althusser repudiated the abstractness of ideology, as well as its status solely as a group product. The ambiguity of the term ‘subject’ for Althusser prefers not only

to the free initiative of the individual, but also to the domination of the individual by a higher authority.

In modern days, there is exploitation by the means of ideologies. Individual's psychology and behaviour are more determined by prevalent ideologies of society. The state rules over its citizens more by using its Ideological State Apparatuses than through (Repressive) state Apparatus. An individual seems free in appearance but in reality he/she is chained by ideologies. Ideological State Apparatuses are best tool of present of bourgeois to exploit the proletariat. So, this present research will forecast the light on Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* as a play where ideologies play important role to create personal disintegration of the protagonist. This research will be moved forward with the help of Althusserian and Gramsci's concept of ideology and will provide baseline to interpret entire play.

III. Terrorism as a means of resistance in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*

Resistance is an act or instance of resisting against the dominating forces. Generally there are three types of struggles against forms of domination (ethnic, social, religious), followed by resistance against forms of exploitation. Resistance emerges when the superiors, the powerful, impose the basic governing features upon the subordinates- the powerless. But the act of imposing is innate and natural which is pervasive in the living engineering of human into their ever changing society. Conversely, the subordinated don't easily tend to be subordinated: the ruled resist the rulers. Sara Mills writes regarding power and resistance that: "Foucault argues that resistance is already contained within the notion of power: Where there is power there is resistance". Hence, resistance and power are two inseparable and unavoidable parts. Due to their integral relation, power imposed upon other creates resistance in accordance with its nature.

Resistance to power and authority is easily obvious to be noticed between the two rival power centers. Seemingly fearsome situation of the collapse of Twin Towers is an indication to the fact that resistance to power and dominance prevails in every human society in a sense that it is integrally a must for survival and existence that ultimately helps to create the truth and history. The attack of Al. Qaeda on the World Trade Center of America gives the notion that struggle for power and resistance to it is normally part of social human life. Foucault describes power relation that is almost relevant to the situational event in the novel. He says that:

Obviously the establishing of power relations doesn't exclude the use of violence anymore than it does the obtaining of consent; no doubt, the exercise of power can never do without one or the other often both at the same time. But even though consent and violence are

instruments or results, they do not constitute the principle or basic nature of power. (*Faubian* 340-41)

Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* is fairly based on a one note story of Changez, the protagonist, in which an immigrant's experience of discrimination, ignorance and representation develop the sense of alienation, identity crisis and resistance as a whole. Hamid's novel is distinguished by its portrayal of Changez class aspirations and inner struggle; while at the same time, the sense of nationalism, his sympathy for his race, ethnicity and religion, his inclination to his tribesmen and intent sympathy for the terrorists attackers etc keep him in the state of confusion initially and later develop the sense of resistance. In this backdrop, Publishers Weekly read the novel as "a superb cautionary tale and a grim reminder of the continuing cost of ethnic profiling, miscommunication and confrontation" (7). This review highlights that the novel obviously deals with the issue of racial confrontation. It focuses on the dialectics between Muslims and Christians; east and west which results the gradual inclination of Changez towards his own tribe, race, religion and nation. However, it also focuses on the other issues like class, gender, identity crisis etc which are also the main concern of this research. The novel has transparently shown that the brutality of terrorism is not merely a delusion, a way of diverting public attention from the failings but it is an act of resistance against state terrorism, domination, racism and imperialism.

A young Muslim's experience in America raises his consciousness and shapes his future in this delicately thrilling novel. It has been presented as a 'conversation' of which we hear only the voice of protagonist and narrator Changez, speaking to the unnamed American stranger he encounters in a café in Changez's native city of Lahore. Changez describes his arrival in America as a scholarship student at

Princeton, his academic success and lucrative employment at Underwood Samson's, 'a valuation Firm', that analyses its clients business and counsels improvement via trimming expenses and abandoning inefficient practices i.e. going back to 'Fundamentals'. Changez's success is crowded by his semi romantic friendship with beautiful, rich classmate Erica, to whom he draws close during a summer vacation in Greece. But the idyll is marred by Erica's distracted life for the former boy friend who died young by the events of September 11, which simultaneously make all 'foreigners' objects of suspicion.

Changez reacts in a manner sure to exacerbate such suspicions by supporting the attack. A visit to a home country under siege, the breakdown of the fragile relationship with Erica, and the increasing enmity with the non-whites all take their toll and Changez withdraws from his cocoon of career and financial security. He feels that his "days of focusing on fundamentals were done" (88).

Finally Changez exits the country that had promised so much, becoming himself the bearded, vaguely meaning "stranger". Changez's resentment against America and Americans, his sympathy and support for his race, nationality and religion, his advocacy for his working class is in part self-loathing or resistance, directed at the Americans he had been on his way to becoming. Such confusions, confrontations and reactions keep him under doubt and suspicion. For him, to be an American, is to view the world in a certain way- a perspective with a sense of domination.

Since 9/11 Americans have desperately wanted, or at least have claimed to want, to understand the workings of 'the Islamic Fundamentalist mind'. Nothing seems more inscrutable to them than the sense that someone out there could so dislike them as to want to kill them on principle. 'Why do they hate us' (6)?

One answer points in the direction of fundamentalists' grievances, another in the direction of the fanatical dictates of their religion. But for Americans, are these mutually exclusive options and are they exhaustive of the options? It is safe to say that no one in American political discourse has answered these questions in a fully satisfactory way and that on the whole. And so the wars against terrorism continue without resolution against a series of unidentifiable and seemingly incomprehensible enemies.

The inner story of the novel consists of Changez's brief autobiography as told in his monologue with the American. Changez goes to America in his college years to make a success of himself, and seems at first to become a success. Along comes 9/11 itself and the American reaction to it awakens Changez's hitherto latent Islamist-Nationalist sympathies. After a while he comes to the resentful realization that life in America has made him a traitor to his identity, and made him a mercenary for American interests. And so he abandons his ostensibly successful American life, returning to dismantle the house that American imperialism has built.

Outwardly two preposterous things are seen: a) that Changez is in danger of being killed by the American and b) that the American is in danger of being killed by Changez. To credit the Changez-in-danger scenario, the reader has to bring himself to believe that the CIA would send an assassin to the Anarkali bazaar to assassinate an insignificant (if pretentiously bearded) tea drinker whose most significant revolutionary activity consists of some anti-imperialist number-crunching in the finance department of the local university. To credit the 'American in danger' scenario, Hamid makes us believe that an insignificant number-crunching tea drinker in Anarkali bazaar might well turn out to be an American murdering terrorist. On this

scenario, Changez, wounded late by a comparison of himself to an Ottoman mercenary (151).

Changez, the protagonist of the novel, articulates cosmopolitanism masks an overwhelming, narcissism, obsession with status, and sense of superiority to almost around him. Changez goes to U.S. to attend university at Princeton; his first moments at Princeton inspire in him ‘the feeling that my life was a film in which I was the star and everything is possible’. This narcissist admission revealing both for its pomposity as well as for its detachment from reality, sets the stage for the obsessively invidious comparisons that follow. Whenever Changez compares himself to the people around him in America – and he can’t stop- he comes invariably to the conclusion that he is in some way superior to them: more intelligent, hard working, thriftier, pluckier and better at working in a hierarchical setting; also, more gracious, more reserved, more polite. It’s an incongruous set of traits, at once bourgeois and aristocratic: the cosmopolitan gentleman as go- better. But Changez conveys it best: “Princeton student were ‘clever’, he says but he was something special like a perfect breast, if you will – tan, succulent, seemingly defiant of gravity. . .” (5).

Changez regards himself as a part of broader malaise afflicting not only the formerly rich but much of the formerly middle class as well: a growing inability to purchase what we previously could. Confronted with the reality, one has two choices; pretend all is well or work hard to restore things to what they were. I chose both (10-11).

The things that were are as unreal as their time and location. What Changez seems to have in mind by ‘the way things were’ is a rosy, hazy and protean conception of a collective past – implicitly, one gathers a cross between the Munhall Empire and Muslim Aliphate? So, Changez feels mortification when it is discovered

that he needs a merital part-time job at Princeton to make himself in public like a “young price, generous and carefree” (11). He conceives of Lahore, the easternmost city in Pakistan, as “the last major city in a contiguous swath of Muslim lands stretching west as far as Morocco [. . .] as standing at the eastern edge of Muslim ‘Frontier’” (127).

Unsurprisingly, Changez’s desire to return to an imagined past is facilitated by the resolution to pretend to accept the realities of the present. The pretense produces disorientation, which in turn, produces resentment and shame. Thus, on his first day of work at Underwood Samson, New York place. The sense of wonder quickly gives way to an invidious comparison that strikes down his ethnic pride. “Their offices were perched on the forty-first and forty-second floors of building in mid town – higher than the two structures here in Lahore would be if they were staked on a top the other”(33-34). What might otherwise be a natural architectural fact becomes an occasion for envy shame and the reflexive assertion of collective identity.

The resentment and shame Chagez feels is on behalf of an entirely national, indeed preposterous sense of affinity with a civilization to which he could not possibly have any real connection. There is no sane sense in which the contemporary denizens of Lahore are the same ‘people of the Indus River basin’ as those to whom Changez refers, hence no same way of making sense of the ‘we’ that facilitates Changez’s resentment nor, is there any coherent way of thinking of oneself as a member of the civilization of the ‘Indus River basin’ and thinking of Lahore as the boundary of a ‘frontier’.

Changez, then, is not just the victim of national identity, but of multiple and conflicting ones. As he moves through life, when he does move, he cannot help but think of himself as a member of some ‘we’ - but he cannot, for that, seem to consistent

set of them. He is, at different times in the novel, a third worlder, a Muslim, a Pakistani, a member of Indus River Basin Civilization, a New Yorker, and a Princetonian. Even his acts of rebellion and assertion (growing beard) are expression of collective identity and resistance - Changez - as - Muslim rebellion against America. This appropriation of collective identities produces an unstable mix of superiority and inferiority complexes as well as sense of powerful and powerlessness. On the one hand, it mitigates Changez's sense of inferiority by making him something larger than himself –an ethnicity, a nation, a religious, and a culture. On the other hand, this very conception of power enervates him because it is the source of this obsession with invidious comparison making. He feels resentment at American achievement to the extent that he insists on viewing that achievement from the perspective of some anti-American collective whose identity he tries on. But he feels self-contempt when he realizes he is not in fact a genuine member of the entities, like Pakistan, to which he “professes attachment” (128-9).

Changez has a great sympathy to the Muslim race and religion which we can find in his appreciation of the terrorist attacks and his resentment at American achievement to the extent that he insists on viewing that achievement from the perspective of some Anti-American collective whose attachment to "terrorists" can be found through his expression. He says:

I stared at 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... I was caught up in the symbolism of it all, the fact that someone had so visibly brought America to her knees. (72-73)

Of course, Changez is so deeply structured in the Muslim culture and thus develops the antagonistic perspectives to the Americans. Though he was educated in American University, he has a remarkable job and even a beautiful girlfriend in America; still he can't detach himself from his cultures, and eventually expresses his resentment to America. He smiles at the terrorist attack at the Twin Towers. He internalizes the Muslim-Islamic perspectives and thus views the West through biased perspectives.

Changez always relates himself to the people and civilization of Lahore. He seems proud to be a Pakistani. When Erica, his beloved in the very first encounter asks him where he is from, he narrates as:

I said I was from Lahore, the second largest city of Pakistan, ancient capital of Punjab, home to nearly as many people as New York, layered like a sedimentary plain with the accreted history of invaders from the Aryans to the Mongols to the British. I hesitated because this question made me feel uncomfortable. (7-8)

Changez further replies boastfully her question, saying that Pakistan has “many things; from seaside to desert to farmland stretched between rivers and canals” (27). He talks more about Pakistani and Muslim culture; [. . .] “alcohol is illegal for Muslims to buy and so I had a Christian bootlegger who delivered booze in Suzuki pick up” (27).

While viewing from America's perspective, certainly, America was the bombing victim. However, Changez is lashing out against America. It's because at the core of his heart, Changez considers himself a man from Lahore, a foreigner and Muslim whom America will never truly accept as its own citizen. As an outsider, he feels personally insulted by America's foreign policy, particularly, its heavy hands in Asia. He resentfully reels off the list of American constant interference on Asia:

I reflected that I had always resented the manner in which America conducted itself in the world; your country's constant interference in the affairs of others was insufferable. Vietnam, Korea, the straits of Taiwan, the Middle East, and now Afghanistan: in each of the major conflicts that ringed my mother continent of Asia, America played a central role. Moreover I knew from experience as a Pakistani – of alternating periods of America aid and sanctions – that finance was a primary means by which American empire exercised its power. (156)

For Changez, the troubles in Vietnam, Korea, the Taiwan Strait, the Middle East, and Afghanistan all began with American involvement there; nothing pre-existed that involvement and not other historical fact is relevant. It does not occur changez to imagine that anyone but America could have ringed my mother continent Asia (any more than it occurs to him to question the compatibility of simultaneous allegiance to Pakistani, Muslim, Indus River, and Asian identities): a solid ring of communist regimes around mother Asia is simply to be taken for granted, like Jasmine in the night air. There was, in other words, no communist insurgency in Vietnam, no communist invasion of South Korea, no Chinese aggression against Taiwan, no Soviet instigation of the 1967 Arab Israeli War, and no Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. In this universe, American action takes place in a vacuum that effaces all other agents.

Changez believes America's pursuit of single minded goal, dressed up as self consequences and thus Changez charges that as a society the American were always unwilling to reflect upon the shared pain that united them with those who attacked. Further, he goes on accusing them of retreating into myth, of their own superiority; and acting out those beliefs on the stage of the world so that the entire planet was rocked by the repercussions of their traumas, not least only his family. Although in

the very beginning Changez claims as “ I am a lover of America” (1), as the story progresses, it becomes ominously clear that he does not become entirely forthright. He is an anti-American and claim as: “It was right for me to refuse to participate any longer in facilitation this project of domination; the only surprise was that I had required so much time to arrive at my decision” (45).

Certainly, Changez turns out to be an anti-American and opposes the American policy of domination. While he works for the American Underwood Samson’s valuation firm, he comes to realize that to help any American agency for its betterment is to support the American policy of domination and thus he finds himself to be like the “Modern day Janissaries” (151). Juan Batista, whom he meets in Chile, reminds him of his situation comparing with that of Janissaries who were the Christian boys captured by Ottomans and trained to be soldier in the Muslim Army, at that time the greatest army in the world. They used to be ferocious and utterly loyal. They had fought to erase their own civilizations. They used to be taken in childhood so that it would have been so easy to devote themselves to their adopted empire and later on they would destroy their own civilization. He comes to the resentful realization that life in America made him a traitor to his own tribe and nation, and made him a mercenary for American interests. He feels shame on what he is doing. Being panicked, he makes nasty and hasty decision of leaving America forever but he regrets why he took so much time to come to the decision – “the only surprise was that I had required too much time to arrive at my decision” (46). In this regard, *Kirkus Reviews* reviews the novel as: This is the story of leaving America; [. . .], in the shadow of 9/11, a young man’s life, love and cultural identity all suffer profound global shifts” (5). Changez leaves America because of his critical situation after the sep. 11 attack. America creates a discourse about the Muslims as terrorists and thus he

decides to leave America by sacrificing his love and position. This review highlights the discursive representation of the protagonist.

The situation in Pakistan, with America setting out to attack Afghanistan in relation against the Taliban, and the tension between India and Pakistan rising to dangerous height, obviously affects him. Indeed he resents American attitudes both on the smaller, interpersonal scale, as well as global stage. Even as there are some who reach out to him, even when Jim, his American friend, extends a hand in friendship too, Changez finds he can no longer be a part of this establishment. He essentially sees off the branch on which he is sitting, assuring that he will have no other options. The pull of nostalgia proves to be powerful for him when he winds up back in Pakistan. Still he explains why he is so much aggressive to America: “I was not at war with America. Far from it: I was product of an American university; I was earning a lucrative American salary; I was infatuated with an American woman. So why did part of me desire to see America being harmed? I remained aware of the embers glowing within me” (106).

In spite of having everything that a young man generally desires to possess – a beautiful girlfriend, money and career, Changez is intermittently dissatisfied with his situation in America. In some inner provinces of his heart, he has a sense of jealousy; and a sense of revenge against American policy of domination and creation of hegemony over the world. As a Muslim and Pakistani, he shares the feelings with those marginalized race in the U.S.A. That is why he resists American domination and part of him desires America’s downfall.

Changez narrates the incidents after the September 11 attack. After the attack on the Twin Towers, Changez’s team, which is in Manila, is unable to leave for the U.S.A. for several days, on accounts of flights being delayed. Even at the airport,

Changez is escorted by armed guards into a room where he is made to strip down to his boxer shorts. He has rather embarrassingly, chosen to wear a pink pair. He explains that he flies to New York uncomfortable in his own face. “I was aware of being under suspicion; I felt guilty and became self conscious” (74).

American perspective to the Muslim suddenly changes after the terrorist attack on the Twin Tower – Changez as a Muslim feels guilty and worried about his situation. All the Muslims of the world are behaved differently. America creates a discourse and represents the Muslims as “terrorists”. Changez further complains that when they arrived at the airport, he is separated from his team at immigration. Other colleagues join the queue for American citizens; he joins the one for foreigners. The officer who inspects his passport “was a solidly built woman with a pistol at her hip and a mastery of English inferior to mine; I attempted to disharm her with a smile” (75). After being inspected, he is asked many questions. When Changez replies that he lives there, she rudely responds that that is not the answer she expects. Thus, Changez is behaved as a terrorist.

Changez’s anti-American attitude and his sense of nationalism became more poignant in his comments about U.S attack on Afghanistan after 9/11. ‘Afghanistan’, Changez complains, was our friend, a fellow Muslim nation besides, and the sight of what I took to be the beginning of its invasion by your countrymen caused me to tremble with ‘fury’ (100). Changez ‘fury’ wipes out the relations and with it, the preceding decade of Pakistani involvement in Afghanistan. It allows him to forget that it was Pakistan that supported the Taliban, Pakistan that secured Al-Qaeda’s military base there, and Pakistan that was there by complicit in Al-Qaeda’s actions there. It also allows him to forget that it was Al-Qaeda that declared war against U.S from Afghanistan as early as 1996, and allows him to ignore the American negotiation

between 1998 and 2001 intended to resolve. Al-Qaeda's problem and avert military action. Being worried about the situation of his fellow Muslim nation Afghanistan, Changez cannot sleep the whole night on the day of the declaration of war against Taliban. He trembles with fury. This is Changez's feelings of solidarity with his race. When his colleagues ask him why he is late at work he pretends to be calm but he is no longer capable for self deception:

My fury had ebbed, but much though I wished to pretend I had imagined it entirely, I was no longer capable of so though self deception. I did however, tell myself that I had overreacted, that there was nothing I could do all this world events were, playing out on the stage of no relevance to my personal life. But I remained aware of the embers glowing within me, and that day, I found at which was normally so capable of fundamental. (100)

The question on whether Changez is really a terrorist or an anti-American is also an ideological construct. Changez's identity as a terrorist is a representation in a certain context. After the terrorist attack on Sep. 11, all the Muslims and foreigners were kept under suspicion and they are charged of being anti-American and Fundamentalist.

Changez is just a discursive construct whose identity is changeable in the dynamic interplay of contending forces. Changez says:

. . . We were not the crazed and destitute radicals you see on your television channels but rather saints and poets and yes- conquering kings. We build the Royal Mosque and Shalimar Gardens in this city, and we build the Lahore Fort with its mighty walls and wide ramp for our battle- elephants. And we did these things when your country was

still a collection of thirteen small colonies, gnawing away at the edge of continent. (102)

Changez here seems to be resisting the American neocolonialism by landing his glorious history which is far older than that of America. He says that Pakistan is not only the land of crazed radicals but also of peace-loving people. Further, it is not a country that cannot sustain without the foreign aid. According to Changez, his nation is a self-sufficient country which could stand on its own. So he asserts that any support from the foreigners is interference. On the other hand, what is represented by America is on the basis of ideology, by creating a discourse about the Muslims. America creates the truth about Changez and his race on the basis of power, by virtue of multiple forms of constraints. Satya Bhaba critiques the novel as:

. . . an American dream as seen through the eyes of young Princeton graduated from Pakistan in a post 9/11 world. As the protagonist, Changez, finds moderate business success and romantic love in New York City, his heritage and identity will be lost in a sea of subtle and blatant bigotry as well as international politics. (56)

Changez's intense sense of nationalism is manifested in his hostility for India. He criticizes India for preparing war against Pakistan as a revenge of the terrorist attack on Lok Sabha in December 2001. He defends Islamist terrorist attack and manages to construct the hostilities in paranoid fashion as an "Indo-American Conspiracy" (126) against Pakistan, with "India as the aggressor and America as accessory" and despite the assistance we had given America in Afghanistan, America would not fight at our side" (127). Changez's anger rises when telling America's role in Pakistan ". . . all America would have to do, would be to inform India that an attack on Pakistan would be treated as an attack on American Ally" (143). He accuses America of "maintaining

strict neutrality between the two potential combatants, a position that favoured of course, the larger and - at that moment in history – the more belligerent of them” (143).

Changez engages here in self-removal: having identified himself with Pakistan and Pakistan’s actions from his narrative, thereby absolving it of responsibility for anything it could have done, and absolving himself of the need for a bit of intellectual honesty. Pakistani actions simply drop out of his narrative as though they had never happened. The act of dropping out ends up, in a perverse way, of being a kind of self-effacement: having identified his own self with Pakistan’s innocence and its sense of grievance by effacing its history and in a sense, effacing his own identity.

The Reluctant Fundamentalist can be taken as a grim remainder of the continuing cost of ethnic profiling, miscommunication and confrontation. Throughout the novel, we find Changez of being invariably lopsided to his ethnic origin and race; a great sense of protectiveness and sympathy has been offered from his side to the Muslims. Changez presents superiority/inferiority complexes by means of race. His race is frequently linked to create hierarchy of social and material superiority as well as subordination. He resists historically and structurally subordinated Muslim race in America. Changez’s inclination to his race creates a social and cultural boundary, and becomes a fundamental means of division of society and creates a kind of fundamentalism.

When Changez finds the bombing on Taliban, he avoids watching on television news. He does not want to see his fellow Muslim being beaten and he finds the war between America and Afghanistan to be a “mismatch” (99). The American bombers are with their twenty first century weaponry where as Talibans are “ill equipped and ill-fed tribesmen below” (99). Even at Unerwood Samson’s, he cannot

entirely escape the growing importance of his tribe. Once he is driving his car in a parking lot of a cable company he is approached by a man whom he does not know. The man makes a series of unintelligible noises – “Akhala – Makhala” (117), and presses his face, alarmingly close to his face. Changez shifts his stance, presenting him with his side and raising his hands to shoulder height, thinking that he may be mad, or drunk, or a mugger and he becomes prepared for striking. Just then, another man appears and glares at him and takes his friend by the arm and tugs at Changez. The man pronounces “Fucking Arab” (117). Though Changez is not an Arab, his blood throbs and furiously he calls out:

“say to my face, coward, not as you run and hide”, . . . I unlocked the boot retrieving the tire iron from where it lays; the cold metal of its shaft, rested hungrily in my hands, and I felt, at that moment, fully capable of wielding it with sufficient violence to shatter the bones of his skull. I stood still for a few murders seconds; then my antagonist was once again pulled at and he departed muttering a string of obscenities. When I sat in my car, my hands were unsteady. (118)

Although Changez is not an Arab, he is misbehaved as Arab. Changez realizes that Arabs are closer to him by race and ethnicity. A sense of racial proximity instigates him to present violently in front of the American who misbehaved him.

Changez’s propensity for self-removal in the political context parallels the same propensity in his personal life. This comes out vividly in one of the least commented but most revealing scenes, involving Changez’s relationship with his girl friend, Erica, who has lost her previous boy friend, Chris. Changez is no doubt a male chauvinist; Hamid provides the traditional roles and responsibility to his protagonist on the basis of gender. Changez boasts of his masculinity and supposes himself as a

protector and savior of his beloved Erica. He admires her beauty and describes his first meeting as:

When I first saw Erica, I could not prevent myself from offering to carry her backpack – so stunningly regal was she. Her hair was piled up like a tiara on her head and her navel – ah, what a navel: made firm, I would later learn by years of tae kwon do – was visible beneath a T – shirt [. . .] She smiled as she shook my hand – whether because she found me irresistibly refined or oddly and chronistic. (17)

This appreciation is a tool to possess female body. By presenting himself bold and brave and differentiating himself from Erica, who he supposes to be fragile and meek, he tries to create hierarchy. He presents her typically as a female highlighting her feminine qualities: “She blushed uncharacteristic shyness” (24). Changez claims himself as a protector of Erica. He explains perhaps it was the sense of protectiveness that prevented my attempting to kiss Erica; equally likely it was the shyness and awe that accompany first love” (87).

The ‘way forward’ comes to Changez, characteristically, through an act of pretence allied to one of self removal. If the 9/11 schadenfreude scene is (supposedly) motivated by a perverse sense of political grievance, this scene seems to be motivated by Changez’s Zelig – like desire to be anyone and anything for someone who, as far as characterization is concerned is himself a non entity. For the romance that Changez has with Erica is at once puzzling and vacuous. Later on, Changez realizes himself that it is not always possible to restore one’s boundaries after they have been blurred and made permeable by a relationship: “try as we might, we cannot reconstitute ourselves as the autonomous beings we previously imagined ourselves to be” (173-4). But the trouble with Changez is precisely his consistent refusal throughout the novel

to be an autonomous agent. What autonomy he had is; like so much of his life, merely pretence. Changez, a member of minority group, is discriminated and marginalized because of his racial and ethnic origin. Muslim race is marginalized in America. And Changez feels a sense of domination especially by the whites and Christians. When he attends the interview for the job in Underwood Samson's valuation firm, the interviewer Jim asks him many irrelevant questions which infuriate. Changez narrates the story of his interview as:

I was telling you about I interview with Underwood Samson, and how Jim had found me to be, as he put it, hungry. I waited to see what he would say next [. . .] I would like to think that I was in that moment, outwardly calm but inside I was panicking [. . .] I looked at Jim, but he didn't seem to be joking. (12)

Being a member of minority Muslim, Changez is always harassed by people in America. Even his employer Jim thinks him to be "hungry". Changez is thus, insulted, dominated and discriminated by the members of dominant group who suppose themselves to be culturally and economically superior to him.

Changez often suffers from the political, economic, cultural and representational subordination which force him to relate himself to his own Muslim race and culture. Changez expresses his discontents with his inferior status in America assuring himself that he can never assimilate and accommodate himself fully in America. He gets disoriented being marginalized in the environment of foreign country. He remembers one more event; while he is with his colleagues on the way to his office, he is mired in traffic, unable to move and he glances out his window to see a jeepney returning to his gaze. There is an "undistinguished hostility" in his expression and his dislike was so obvious" (67). But when he finds later, one of his

colleagues saying him that he looks “so foreign” (67), Changez at that time finds himself to be much closer to the unknown driver than his colleagues. Here, Changez shares a sort of “third world sensibility” (67) with the driver. He says “I found it difficult to sleep that night” (68). Changez as a member of minority group, is under privileged in the U.S.A. He is misbehaved, discriminated, dominated and suspected not only by the whites outside but even by his colleagues and his employer. These all factors are equally responsible in arousing disgust and sense of resistance in the protagonist, Changez.

IV. Shifting Forms of Resistance in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*

Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, reveals quite arbitrary and ambiguous nature of terrorism. In post modern time, identity, dimensions and nature of terrorism are unidentifiable as it prevails randomly causing difficulty to interpret. It is complex to find who the enemy is either the subordinated attackers or dominating victim. Moreover this study shows how terrorism is interpreted from west and how it tends to view the rest of the world and how it takes itself of being the patron of civilization. This research has examined the novel from the perspective of New Historicism in the sense that western notion of terrorism and barbarism had blatantly exercised to have their influence or dominance over the rest. Westerners do not realize this truth whereas the same precedence is being applied to them and they are snared in a trap of indecision and failure just like the September 11 Talibans' attack in World Trade Center.

This novel presents a practical depiction of human's desire for power and the sense of resistance at the same time that normally determines one's authority and subject position. The rapid development in economy, science and technology, media, weaponry and all globalization have pushed human for power that justifies every loss of life to the nature of acceptance. Concerning Hamid's angles of presentation and depiction of post 9/11 attack and its impact on marginalized Muslims, this thesis has shown the link between human's natural desire for power and its effect on shaping the subject position; and the rationality of the activities and dispositions. The humans demonstrate at this juncture in order to achieve the goal that would satisfy their innate desire to emerge around the power and its catchments. That is the thesis has strived to raise the topic related questions as required to prove the hypothesis through the illustrative introduction, theoretical modality and textual analysis.

Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* is the story of a young Muslim man's loves, losses, daubed against the tumultuous backdrop of political unrest that followed the attack on the World Trade Center on 9/11. Changez, an expatriate Pakistani in America, relates himself with Pakistani and his marginalized Muslim race and shows his close affinity to the attackers of World Trade Center. He resents America and American domination to the Muslim race and shows his fury against constant American interference upon Asian countries. He turns out to be an anti-American and a rebel by resisting what America does to his nation and race. Changez's ugliest and the most controversial manifestation of his latent Islamist-nationalist and anti-Americanism can be sensed in his expression of profound satisfaction on the terrorist attacks on September 11. He is remarkably pleased with the news of attack although he is sympathetic to the victims. Due to his Islamic background, he finds himself being insulted by America's aggressive foreign policy; and because of this, in an inner province of his heart, he has the sense of jealousy and revenge and thus he desires America's downfall, despite having a job with lucrative salary and a beautiful American girlfriend in America. At last, he realizes that any support from his side to any American agencies would be against his religion, ethnicity and nationality as a whole. He also regards himself as modern day Janissary captured and then conscripted by America and compelled to do battle against his own civilization. So, he decides to leave America forever. It's an act of resistance against American policy of colonization and domination.

The next issue of resistance can be found on the defending attitude of the protagonist, Changez, in the novel. Changez always defends Pakistan and other Muslim countries. He removes Pakistan's action in his narrative. Changez becomes extremely furious at the American attack on Afghanistan which he considers his

fellow Muslim nation. While narrating, he forgets the fact that it was Pakistan who supported the Talibans and it was his own nation which secured the military base of Al-Qaeda. He criticizes India and America for making a conspiracy against Pakistan as being India an aggressor and America as accessory. He does not like America's apparent neutrality which becomes on favour of powerful ones. Having identified himself with Pakistan and preserving Pakistan's innocence, Changez fulfills his responsibility and intellectual honesty to his non Muslim nations.

The issue of race, culture, and ethnicity are also the important aspects of this research on social ground. One race is distinguished from the other because of distinct biological groupings of people with common physical characteristics and such characteristics are often attributed to cultural and personal identity of the people who share them. Generally issue of race, ethnicity and culture is raised to create hierarchy of social and political superiority and subordination. Changez, as a Muslim, is misbehaved, dominated and subordinated in the U.S.A. While working in Underwood Samson's firm he is marginalized and exploited. The whites like Jim and his fellow colleagues suppose themselves as superior not because they are more efficient and capable but only because they are whites and Christians. In this way, the politics of race is concerned here just as a means to exploit, to subjugate and to marginalize.

Moreover, the sense of subordination and marginalization haunts Changez when he tries to go closer to his girl friend Erica. Erica's passive participation in romance and her nostalgia of her dead white boyfriend humiliates Changez as he realizes from Erica's attitude that he is far more inferior to a dead white man. The rejection of the suggestion given by the white man Jim to cut the beard also symbolizes that Changez does not want to adopt the imperialist notion of America and

hence he desires to prevent his own culture and Nationality, showing his close affinity to the attackers of the World Trade Center.

Thus, Changez's forms of resistance shift from one to other. Initially in the novel he adopted terrorism as a means of resistance to American hegemony. His profound sense of sympathy and affinity towards the attackers of World Trade Center shows his strong resentment and disgust to American foreign policy and its interference to the Muslim countries. He supposes that terrorism is a counter-reply to the domination and hegemony created by America especially over Muslim countries. The sense of his hitherto-latent Islam teaches him that America is trying to wipe out his national culture and religion. His unwillingness in shaving his long beard after the post 9/11 attack and his breaking of relationship with an American girl friend show the cultural resistance of the protagonist in the novel.

Works Cited

- Bhabya, Satya. "Rev. of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, by Mohsin Hamid." *Publishers Weekly* 252.22 (2007): 56.
- Billington, Rosmand, et al. *Culture and Society*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1991.
- Boehmer, Elleke. "Postcolonialism." *Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. New York: OUP, 2006. 340-361.
- Faubioun, James D. *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954*. London: Penguin Books, 1994.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon, 1977.
- . "Truth and Power." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Washington: University of Washington, 1992. 1135-1145.
- . *The History of Sexuality* (vol-I). Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.
- . *The History of Sexuality* (vol-II). Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1985.
- . *The History of Sexuality* (vol-III). Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1986.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. Eds. and Trans. Quintin Haore and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. Hyderabad: Longman, 1996.
- Hamid, Mohsin. *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 2007.
- Hawthorn, Jeremy. *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*. London: Arnold, 2000.
- Mautner, Thomas. *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. UK: Blackwell, 2004.

- McHoul, Alec et al. *A Foucault Primer*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Menefee, Christine C. "Rev. of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* by Mohsin Hamid." *School Library Journal* 53.8 (2007): 144.
- Mills, Sara. *Discourse*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- . *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "Truth and Falsity in Ultramoral Sense." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Washington: University of Washington, 1992. 634
- Rabinow, Paul. *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1958.
- Weinberg, Leonard. *Global Terrorism*. London: One World Oxford, 2005.
- Zizek, Slavoj. *Mapping Ideology*. New York: Verso, 1994.